

Legitimate against Illegitimate IRSs on MISO Wiretap Channels

Sepehr Rezvani, Pin-Hsun Lin, Martin Le, and Eduard Jorswieck

Institute for Communications Technology, Technische Universität Braunschweig, Braunschweig, Germany
e-mails: {Rezvani, Lin, Le, Jorswieck}@ifn.ing.tu-bs.de

Abstract—The low-cost legitimate intelligent reflecting surfaces (IRSs) are applied to the wiretap channel in physical layer security to enhance the secrecy rate. In practice, the eavesdropper can also deploy an IRS, namely illegitimate IRS, to deteriorate the secrecy rate. This paper studies the interplay between a transmitter, a legitimate IRS, and an illegitimate IRS in a multiple-input single-output (MISO) wiretap channel. We formulate a max-min secrecy rate problem, where all the information is available at the transmitter and the receivers. We aim to design an efficient transmit beamforming and phase shifting strategy of the legitimate IRS, under the worst-case secrecy rate achieved based on optimizing the phase-shifting strategy of the illegitimate IRS. We propose three solution methods based on the gradient descent ascent (GDA), the alternate optimization (AO), and the mixed Nash equilibrium (NE) in zero-sum games in strategic form. Simulation results show that for the continuous phase-shifting strategies, AO usually does not guarantee convergence, although it may achieve better performance than GDA in some iterations. GDA usually converges to a stationary point. Discrete phase-shifting strategies improve the convergence behavior of AO and GDA, while there is a single mixed NE with the highest secrecy rate.

I. INTRODUCTION

INTELLIGENT reflecting surface (IRS) has been developed as a key enabler to enable programmable and controllable signal propagation environment [1], [2]. The IRS can be thought of as a low-cost (smart) thin metasurface including passive reflecting elements, each of which is capable of modifying the amplitude and phase of the electromagnetic waves by using external stimuli, resulting in higher spectral efficiency [2]. The passive elements of IRSs lead to much less power consumption compared to the traditional active transceivers or relays [1], [2]. Due to the low hardware cost and high compatibility of IRSs, these surfaces are considered in various wireless communication systems, e.g., [3] and [4].

Due to the feature of independent on the centralized infrastructure of key management, physical layer security has attracted much research attention in the decade [5]. Thanks to the capability of IRSs to make the wireless channels reconfigurable, recent research studies investigate the advantages of low-cost passive IRSs to improve the PLS of wireless communications [6]–[15]. The research studies on IRS-aided wiretap channels mainly focus on the advantages of legitimate IRSs under the control of the transmitter (Alice) to provide secure communications. However, the eavesdropper (Eve) can also use low-cost IRSs, called illegitimate IRSs, to deteriorate the secrecy rate. There are few works on PLS with the existence of illegitimate IRSs. In [16], the authors consider a wiretap channel, where Eve uses an IRS to degrade the legitimate receiver’s (Bob’s) reception by a passive jamming. In [17], a P2P transmission with the existence of an IRS jammer is




Fig. 1. The exemplary model of an IRS-assisted MISO wiretap channel with the existence of an illegitimate IRS.

studied. To the best of our knowledge, the interplay between legitimate and illegitimate IRSs on the secrecy rate is not yet studied in the literature. In this work, we consider the case that both Bob and Eve use independent IRSs. Our contributions are as follows: 1) We study the effects of legitimate and illegitimate IRSs on the secrecy rate. In this scenario, we show that depending on certain channel conditions, each IRS can act as a jammer or signal enhancer; 2) we formulate a novel max-min secrecy rate problem, where our goal is to design efficient beamforming at Alice, and Bob’s IRS phase-shifting strategy to maximize secrecy rate. To make the system robust, we consider the worst-case secrecy rate, achieved by optimizing the phase-shifting strategy of Eve’s IRS; 3) We propose three solution methods based on the gradient descent ascent (GDA), the alternate optimization (AO), and non-cooperative game theory. We study the convergence behavior of AO and GDA for different feasibility domains of phase-shifting strategies.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Network Model

We consider the following model: a single transmitter (Alice) equipped with M antennas communicates with a single-antenna legitimate user (Bob) in the presence of a single-antenna eavesdropper (Eve) overhearing the broadcast signal as shown in Fig. 1. In this network, an IRS with N_B elements under the control of Alice/Bob, namely legitimate IRS or Bob’s IRS, is deployed. Bob’s IRS is responsible for enhancing the data rate of Bob and/or degrading the data rate of Eve, thus enhancing the secrecy rate of the multiple-input single-output (MISO) wiretap channel. In contrast, Eve’s IRS with N_E reflecting elements is out of the control of Alice, and is responsible for enhancing the data rate of Eve and/or degrading the data rate of Bob, thus degrading the secrecy rate. The set of the reflecting elements of Bob’s and Eve’s IRS is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_B = \{1, \dots, N_B\}$, and $\mathcal{N}_E = \{1, \dots, N_E\}$, respectively. Theoretically, the reflection coefficient of each

IRS element n is modelled by $\alpha_n e^{j\beta_n}$, where $\alpha_n \in [0, 1]$, and $\beta_n \in [0, 2\pi)$ represent the amplitude and phase shift of this element, respectively [3]. We assume the reflecting amplitude $\alpha_n = 1$ for each reflecting element of Bob's and Eve's IRSs, i.e., each reflecting element n can only tune the phase shift β_n . Thus the reflecting element is referred to as phase-shifting element. Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_B = [\theta_1^B, \dots, \theta_{N_B}^B]^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_E = [\theta_1^E, \dots, \theta_{N_E}^E]^T$ denote the vector of phase shifting coefficients of Bob's and Eve's IRS, respectively, where $\theta_m^B = e^{j\phi_m^B}$, $\forall m \in \mathcal{N}_B$, and $\theta_n^E = e^{j\phi_n^E}$, $\forall n \in \mathcal{N}_E$. The parameters $\phi_m^B \in [0, 2\pi)$ and $\phi_n^E \in [0, 2\pi)$ represent the phase of the m -th and n -th phase shifting elements of Bob's and Eve's IRS, respectively. In practice, due to the hardware limitation, the phase shifts can take only a finite number of discrete values [4]. Denoted by L_B and L_E , the number of discrete values that each phase shifting element of Bob's and Eve's IRS can take, respectively. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\phi_m^B \in \{\frac{2k\pi}{L_B} | k = 0, \dots, (L_B - 1)\}$, $\forall m \in \mathcal{N}_B$, and $\phi_n^E \in \{\frac{2k\pi}{L_E} | k = 0, \dots, (L_E - 1)\}$, $\forall n \in \mathcal{N}_E$. Subsequently, we define the discrete set of possible phase shifting coefficients of each phase shifting element of Bob's and Eve's RIS, respectively, by $\mathcal{L}_B = \{e^{j\frac{2k\pi}{L_B}} | k = 0, \dots, (L_B - 1)\}$, and $\mathcal{L}_E = \{e^{j\frac{2k\pi}{L_E}} | k = 0, \dots, (L_E - 1)\}$.

In this system, Alice intends to send a confidential message by the code symbols $x \in \mathbb{C}$ with zero mean and unit variance to Bob over a quasi-static flat-fading Gaussian wiretap channel. The beamforming vector is denoted by $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times 1}$. The general complex channel vector/matrix from Alice to Bob, Alice to Bob's IRS, Bob's IRS to Bob, Bob's IRS to Eve, Alice to Eve, Alice to Eve's IRS, Eve's IRS to Eve, and Eve's IRS to Bob are denoted by $\mathbf{h}_{A,B} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times M}$, $\mathbf{h}_{A,I_B} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_B \times M}$, $\mathbf{h}_{I_B,B} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N_B}$, $\mathbf{h}_{I_B,E} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N_B}$, $\mathbf{h}_{A,E} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times M}$, $\mathbf{h}_{A,I_E} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_E \times M}$, $\mathbf{h}_{I_E,E} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N_E}$, $\mathbf{h}_{I_E,B} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N_E}$, respectively. We assume that the perfect CSI of all the links is available at Alice and Eve. The received signal at Bob and Eve can thus be formulated, respectively, by

$$y_B = \underbrace{(\mathbf{h}_{A,B} + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,B} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_B \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B} + \mathbf{h}_{I_E,B} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E})}_{\mathbf{h}_B(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E)} \mathbf{w} x + n_B, \quad (1)$$

$$y_E = \underbrace{(\mathbf{h}_{A,E} + \mathbf{h}_{I_E,E} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E} + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,E} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_B \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B})}_{\mathbf{h}_E(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E)} \mathbf{w} x + n_E, \quad (2)$$

in which $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_B)$, $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_E)$, and n_B and n_E are the zero-mean additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) at Bob and Eve with variances σ_B^2 and σ_E^2 , respectively. The row vectors $\mathbf{h}_B(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times M}$, and $\mathbf{h}_E(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times M}$ denote the effective/equivalent channel gain between Alice and Bob, and between Alice and Eve, respectively. The secrecy capacity can be formulated as

$$C_s(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) = \log_2 \left(\frac{\sigma_B^2 + |\mathbf{h}_B(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) \mathbf{w}|^2}{\sigma_E^2 + |\mathbf{h}_E(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) \mathbf{w}|^2} \right) + \log_2 \left(\frac{\sigma_E^2}{\sigma_B^2} \right). \quad (3)$$

B. Problem Formulation

In this system, both Alice and Eve aim to optimize the phase-shifting strategy of their controllable IRSs to maximize and minimize the secrecy capacity, respectively. We consider

the worst case scenario, where Eve can access the information about the adopted \mathbf{w} , and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B$, and then optimize $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E$ efficiently. Indeed, the secrecy capacity in the worst case scenario is given by $\min_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E} C_s(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E)$. In this work, we aim at designing robust and efficient joint active (\mathbf{w}) and passive ($\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B$) beamforming to maximize the worst-case secrecy capacity. The resulting max-min secrecy capacity problem is formulated by

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_B} \quad & \min_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E} C_s(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \leq P, \theta_m^B \in \mathcal{L}_B, \forall m \in \mathcal{N}_B, \theta_n^E \in \mathcal{L}_E, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}_E, \end{aligned} \quad (4a)$$

$$(4b)$$

where P denotes the maximum available transmit power of Alice. In (4a), we omit the operator $\{\cdot\}^+$ without loss of optimality, since the optimal value is always non-negative.

III. SOLUTION ALGORITHMS

In this section we propose three algorithms to solve (4).

A. Alternate Optimization

We propose a 3-step AO method as follows: 1) Finding $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B$ for the given $(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E, \mathbf{w})$; 2) Finding \mathbf{w} for the given $(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E)$; 3) Finding $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E$ for the given $(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \mathbf{w})$. Note that we should optimize $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E$ at the ending step of each AO iteration, due to considering the worst-case secrecy rate.

1) *Findig $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B$* : Let us define $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_B = [\boldsymbol{\theta}_B^T, 1]^T$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_B = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_B \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_B^H$, and \mathbf{E}_m is a $(N_B + 1) \times (N_B + 1)$ diagonal matrix, whose (i, j) -th element, represented by $[\mathbf{E}_m]_{(i,j)}$, is

$$[\mathbf{E}_m]_{(i,j)} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j = m, \\ 0, & \text{o.w.,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{h}}_B &= \sigma_B^{-2} (\mathbf{h}_{A,B} + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,B} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}) \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^H (\mathbf{h}_{A,B} + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,B} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B})^H, \\ \bar{\mathbf{h}}_E &= \sigma_E^{-2} (\mathbf{h}_{A,E} + \mathbf{h}_{I_E,E} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}) \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^H (\mathbf{h}_{A,E} + \mathbf{h}_{I_E,E} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E})^H, \end{aligned}$$

and $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_B(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_E(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E)$ are given by (6) and (7), respectively. From Charnes-Cooper transformation (CCT) [18], by defining $\lambda = (\text{tr}(\bar{\mathbf{H}}_E(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_B) + \bar{\mathbf{h}}_E(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) + 1)^{-1}$, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_B = \lambda \boldsymbol{\Theta}_B$, (4) can be equivalently expressed as follows:

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B, \lambda} \quad \text{tr}(\bar{\mathbf{H}}_B(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_B) + \lambda (\bar{\mathbf{h}}_B(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) + 1) \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \text{tr}(\bar{\mathbf{H}}_E(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_B) + \lambda (\bar{\mathbf{h}}_E(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E) + 1) = 1 \quad (8b)$$

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{E}_m \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_B) = \lambda, \forall m \in \mathcal{N}_B, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_B \succcurlyeq 0, \lambda \geq 0. \quad (8c)$$

Problem (8) is a semidefinite programming (SDP) program which is convex, and can be optimally solved by using the convex solvers, e.g., the interior point methods [18]. After finding the optimal $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_B^*$, we obtain $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B^* = \frac{1}{\lambda} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_B^*$. Then, due to constraint $\text{rank}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B) = 1$, we apply the standard Gaussian randomization method and obtain $\boldsymbol{\theta}_B$. Finally, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_B$ can be easily determined based on $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_B = [\boldsymbol{\theta}_B^T, 1]^T$. For any given $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_B$, we can solve $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_E$ by formulating a problem similar to (8).

The output of the proposed algorithm for solving (8) may be infeasible, due to the relaxation of constraints. In this line, we apply the quantization method based on the Euclidean distance [13]. In this method, we apply the quantization method to

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_B(\Theta_E) = \frac{1}{\sigma_B^2} \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_B,B}) \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B} \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}^H \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_B,B}) & \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_B,B}) \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B} \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^H (\mathbf{h}_{A,B}^H + \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^H \Theta_E^H \mathbf{h}_{I_E,B}^H) \\ (\mathbf{h}_{A,B} + \mathbf{h}_{I_E,B} \Theta_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}) \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}^H \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_B,B}) & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_E(\Theta_E) = \frac{1}{\sigma_E^2} \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_B,E}) \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B} \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}^H \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_B,E}) & \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_B,E}) \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B} \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^H (\mathbf{h}_{A,E}^H + \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^H \Theta_E^H \mathbf{h}_{I_E,E}^H) \\ (\mathbf{h}_{A,E} + \mathbf{h}_{I_E,E} \Theta_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}) \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^H \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}^H \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_B,E}) & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

each random vector generated based on the Gaussian randomization algorithm. The quantization method is described as follows: Let us denote a generated vector by the Gaussian randomization algorithm as $\theta_B^{(0)} = [\theta_m^{B,(0)}]$, $\forall m \in \mathcal{N}_B$. The feasible $\theta_B^{(1)} = [\theta_m^{B,(1)}]$, $\forall m \in \mathcal{N}_B$ can be obtained as $\theta_m^{B,(1)} = \frac{2k_m^* \pi}{\sigma_B} \cdot \forall m \in \mathcal{N}_B$, where $k_m^* = \arg \min_{k=0, \dots, (L_B-1)} \left| \theta_m^{B,(0)} - e^{j \frac{2k\pi}{L_B}} \right|$.

2) *Finding w*: We define $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_B(\Theta_B, \Theta_E) = \frac{1}{\sigma_B^2} \mathbf{H}_B^H(\Theta_B, \Theta_E) \mathbf{h}_B(\Theta_B, \Theta_E)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_E(\Theta_B, \Theta_E) = \frac{1}{\sigma_E^2} \mathbf{H}_E^H(\Theta_B, \Theta_E) \mathbf{h}_E(\Theta_B, \Theta_E)$. The optimal beamforming can be obtained by $\mathbf{w}_{\text{opt}} = \sqrt{P} \mathbf{u}_{\text{max}}$, where \mathbf{u}_{max} is the normalized eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of $(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_E(\Theta_B, \Theta_E) + \frac{1}{P} \mathbf{I}_M)^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_B(\Theta_B, \Theta_E) + \frac{1}{P} \mathbf{I}_M)$, in which \mathbf{I}_M denotes an $M \times M$ identity matrix [19].

3) *Finding Θ_E* : The algorithm proposed to find Θ_B can be easily modified to be used for finding Θ_E . Due to the space limitations, the detailed mathematical analyses are omitted here.

B. Gradient Descent Ascent

To invoke GDA, similar to the steps to formulate (8), we can define $\lambda_2 = \left(\text{tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{B2}(\Theta_B, \tilde{\Theta}_E) + \bar{\mathbf{h}}_{B2}(\Theta_B) + 1) \right)^{-1}$ and $\tilde{\Theta}_E = \lambda_2 \tilde{\Theta}_E$ and then formulate a linearized inner optimization problem with respect to $\tilde{\Theta}_E$ and λ_2 , where the objective function is as:

$$f(\Theta_B, \tilde{\Theta}_E, \mathbf{w}, \lambda_2) = \text{tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{E2}(\Theta_B, \tilde{\Theta}_E) + \lambda_2 (\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{E2}(\Theta_B) + 1)) \quad (9)$$

and the constraints are similar to (8b) and (8c), but just replace $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_B$, $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_B$, $\tilde{\Theta}_B$, and λ by $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_E$, $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_E$, $\tilde{\Theta}_E$, and λ_2 , respectively, where we define:

$$\tilde{\Theta}_E = \lambda_2 \bar{\theta}_E \bar{\theta}_E^H, \quad \bar{\theta}_E = \left[\theta_E^T, 1 \right]^T, \quad \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^H, \quad (10)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{E2} = \sigma_E^{-2} (\mathbf{h}_{A,E} + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,E} \Theta_B \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}) \mathbf{Q} (\mathbf{h}_{A,E} + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,E} \Theta_B \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B})^H, \\ \bar{\mathbf{h}}_{B2} = \sigma_B^{-2} (\mathbf{h}_{A,B} + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,B} \Theta_B \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}) \mathbf{Q} (\mathbf{h}_{A,B} + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,B} \Theta_B \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B})^H,$$

and $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{E2}(\Theta_B)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{B2}(\Theta_B)$ are defined as (11) and (12), respectively, at the end, $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_n$ is a $(N_E + 1) \times (N_E + 1)$ diagonal matrix, defined similar to (5). Please note that $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{E2}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{E2}$ are both functions of \mathbf{w} and to simplify the notation, we omit \mathbf{w} when parameterizing them. The GDA scheme includes the following two main steps:

Step 1: given Θ_B , \mathbf{w} , $\tilde{\Theta}_E$, and λ_2 from the r -th round, we can update Θ_B in the $(r+1)$ -th round by GDA as follows:

$$\Theta_B^{(r+1)} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_B}^{(r+1)} \Theta_B^{(r)} - \alpha \lambda_2^{(r)} \left(\mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}^* \mathbf{A}^H \Theta_E^{(r)} \mathbf{h}_{I_B,E}^* + \sigma_E^{-2} \mathbf{h}_{I_B,E}^H (\mathbf{h}_{A,E} + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,E} \Theta_B^{(r)} \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}) (\mathbf{Q}^{(r)})^T \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}^H \right), \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_E,E}^*) \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^* \mathbf{w}^* \mathbf{w}^T$, and

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_B}^{(r+1)}(\Theta_{B0}) = \arg \min_{\Theta_B \in \mathcal{T}_B^{(r+1)}} \|\Theta_B - \Theta_{B0}\|_F^2, \quad (14a)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_B^{(r+1)} = \{ \Theta_B : \text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{E}}_n \Theta_B) = \lambda_2^{(r)}, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}_B, \Theta_B \succeq \mathbf{0}, \\ \text{tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{B2}(\Theta_B, \tilde{\Theta}_E^{(r)}) + \lambda_2^{(r)} (\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{B2}(\Theta_B) + 1)) = 1 \}, \quad (14b)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_n$ is an $N_B \times N_B$ diagonal matrix, defined similar to (5) except the last diagonal term. Given the updated Θ_B , we update \mathbf{w} by the same way as in Sec. III-A.

Step 2: Given Θ_B and \mathbf{w} from the $r+1$ -th round and also $\tilde{\Theta}_E$ and λ_2 from the r -th round, we can update $\tilde{\Theta}_E$ and λ_2 in the $(r+1)$ -th round as follows:

$$(\tilde{\Theta}_E^{(r+1)}, \lambda_2^{(r+1)}) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_E}^{(r+1)} \left(\tilde{\Theta}_E^{(r)} + \alpha \nabla_{\tilde{\Theta}_E} f(\Theta_B^{(r+1)}, \tilde{\Theta}_E^{(r)}, \mathbf{w}^{(r)}, \lambda_2^{(r)}), \right. \\ \left. \lambda_2^{(r)} + \alpha \nabla_{\lambda_2} f(\tilde{\Theta}_E^{(r)}, \Theta_B^{(r+1)}, \mathbf{w}^{(r)}, \lambda_2^{(r)}) \right) \\ = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_E}^{(r+1)} \left(\tilde{\Theta}_E^{(r)}, \lambda_2^{(r)} + \alpha (\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{E2}(\Theta_B^{(r+1)}) + 1) \right), \quad (15)$$

where (15) is from [20, Table 4.3] and $\nabla_{\tilde{\Theta}_E} f = \frac{df}{d\tilde{\Theta}_E^*}$ with the fact that $\frac{d\text{tr}(\mathbf{A} \tilde{\Theta}_E)}{d\tilde{\Theta}_E^*} = 0$, the projection in (15) is defined as:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_E}^{(r+1)}(\tilde{\Theta}_{E0}, \lambda_0) = \arg \min_{(\tilde{\Theta}_E, \lambda_2) \in \mathcal{T}_E^{(r+1)}} \|\tilde{\Theta}_E - \tilde{\Theta}_{E0}\|_F^2 + |\lambda_2 - \lambda_0|^2,$$

where the set $\mathcal{T}_E^{(r+1)}$ is defined as follows:


$$\mathcal{T}_E^{(r+1)} = \{ (\tilde{\Theta}_E, \lambda_2) : \\ \text{tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{B2}(\tilde{\Theta}_B^{(r+1)}, \tilde{\Theta}_E) + \lambda_2 (\bar{\mathbf{h}}_{B2}(\tilde{\Theta}_B^{(r+1)}) + 1)) = 1, \quad (16a)$$

$$\text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{E}}_n \tilde{\Theta}_E) = \lambda_2, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}_E, \tilde{\Theta}_E \succeq \mathbf{0}, \lambda_2 \geq 0 \}, \quad (16b)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F^2$ is the Frobenius norm, (16a) is from the CCT and (16b) is from the unit magnitude constraint. Then we can iteratively run the Steps 1 and 2 to solve the variables.

C. Game Theoretical Method

We review the strategic games in normal form where players choose their strategy once and simultaneously with all other players without knowing the others' actions. The game Γ can be described by the tuple $\Gamma = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{S}, \mathbf{u})$ with $\mathcal{N} = \{\text{Bob}, \text{Eve}\}$ denoting the set of players, \mathcal{S} the joint strategy space, and \mathbf{u} the utility function. As the players Bob's IRS and Eve's IRS have conflicting interests: Bob's and Eve's IRS aim to maximize and minimize the secrecy rate, respectively and this game can be modeled as a two-player zero-sum game. We represent the players' utilities in strategic form by a matrix, which is defined as $\mathbf{A} = [a_{ij}]$, $\forall i =$



(a) Network topology and placement of elements.

(b) Achievable rate vs. iteration index: The continuous domain for phase shifting elements.

(c) Achievable rate vs. iteration index: The discrete domain for phase shifting elements.

Fig. 2. The secrecy/receivers data rate over AO and GDA iterations.

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{E2}(\Theta_B) = \frac{1}{\sigma_E^2} \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_E,E}^*) \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^* \mathbf{w}^* \mathbf{w}^{*T} \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_E,E}) & \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_E,E}^*) \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^* \mathbf{w}^* \mathbf{w}^{*T} (\mathbf{h}_{A,E}^T + \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}^T \Theta_B \mathbf{h}_{I_B,E}^T) \\ (\mathbf{h}_{A,E}^* + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,E}^* \Theta_B^* \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}^*) \mathbf{w}^* \mathbf{w}^{*T} \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_E,E}) & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{B2}(\Theta_B) = \frac{1}{\sigma_B^2} \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_E,B}^*) \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^* \mathbf{w}^* \mathbf{w}^{*T} \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_E,B}) & \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_E,B}^*) \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^* \mathbf{w}^* \mathbf{w}^{*T} (\mathbf{h}_{A,B}^T + \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}^T \Theta_B \mathbf{h}_{I_B,B}^T) \\ (\mathbf{h}_{A,B}^* + \mathbf{h}_{I_B,B}^* \Theta_B^* \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}^*) \mathbf{w}^* \mathbf{w}^{*T} \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{I_E,B}) & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

$1, \dots, L_B^{N_B}$, $j = 1, \dots, L_E^{N_E}$, a_{ij} and $-a_{ij}$ denote the utilities of Bob's and Eve's IRS, respectively. We can then compute the mixed Nash equilibrium (NE) strategy \mathbf{x}^* for Bob's IRS by using linear programming [21]. Similarly, Eve's IRS could also randomize her actions by the same procedure and obtain her mixed NE strategy \mathbf{y}^* such that none of the players would gain a higher payoff by deviating unilaterally from their Nash equilibrium strategy.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We evaluate the convergence and performance of AO and GDA. We set $M = 3$, $N_B = N_E = 4$, $P = 46$ dBm, 5 MHz wireless band, and AWGN power density -174 dBm/Hz. The path loss exponent for the direct and reflected channels is set to 4 and 2, respectively. We apply the MIMO channel correlation model in [22] for the channels between Alice to each IRS. In the following, we consider the case that these MIMO channels are full-rank. Fig. 2(b) shows the convergence behavior of AO and GDA for the continuous domain of phase-shifting strategies. Within each AO iteration, we observe that after optimizing \mathbf{w} and Θ_B , the secrecy rate is non-decreasing. On the other hand, the secrecy rate is non-increasing after optimizing Θ_E at each AO iteration, verifying the feasibility of our adopted SDR techniques. Although AO may achieve better performance than GDA in some iterations, it does not guarantee convergence in general. This is due to the fact that for any given \mathbf{w} and Θ_B , finding efficient Θ_E can effectively change the phase of Eve's equivalent channel $\mathbf{h}_E(\Theta_B, \Theta_E)$, specifically when the Eve's IRS channel dominates other channels, i.e., $\|\mathbf{h}_{I_E,E} \Theta_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}\| \gg \|\mathbf{h}_{A,E}\|$, and $\|\mathbf{h}_{I_E,E} \Theta_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}\| \gg \|\mathbf{h}_{I_B,E} \Theta_B \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}\|$. When Bob is close to Eve's IRS, Θ_E can effectively change the phase of Bob's equivalent channel $\mathbf{h}_B(\Theta_B, \Theta_E)$, such that it seriously degrades secrecy rate, due to the fixed \mathbf{w} . Hence, when $\|\mathbf{h}_{I_E,B} \Theta_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}\| \gg \|\mathbf{h}_{A,B}\|$, and $\|\mathbf{h}_{I_E,B} \Theta_E \mathbf{h}_{A,I_E}\| \gg \|\mathbf{h}_{I_B,B} \Theta_B \mathbf{h}_{A,I_B}\|$, we observe that Eve's IRS may act as a jammer to Bob by changing the phase of

$\mathbf{h}_B(\Theta_B, \Theta_E)$ rather than enhancing $\mathbf{h}_E(\Theta_B, \Theta_E)$. A similar effect can be observed at Bob's IRS. The convergence behavior of GDA is smoother than AO such that after few iterations, it converges to a stationary point. Fig. 2(b) shows the convergence behavior of AO and GDA for $L_B = L_E = 5$. Considering discrete Θ_B and Θ_E sometimes improves the convergence of AO. This effect is because Θ_E cannot be effectively chosen under a discrete domain. Although the same argument holds for Θ_B , the beamforming at Alice with a continuous domain can effectively compensate the inflexibility of choosing Θ_B . From numerical results we observed that AO with discrete domains for Θ_B and Θ_E has smoother convergence, although it does not always hold. In the game-theoretic approach, the game has a single mixed Nash equilibrium. In that mixed Nash equilibrium, it is interesting to note that only five phase shift combinations share the whole probability mass of the optimal strategy for Bob and Eve. Following that strategy yields a mixed secrecy capacity of 6.436 bps/Hz. By comparing this value to the results from GDA and AO, we can find that the latter results are sub-optimal for discrete phases with SDR.

V. CONCLUSION

We consider a wiretap channel where both the legitimate receiver and the eavesdropper use their own IRSs. We formulate a max-min secrecy rate problem, to design the transmit beamforming and phase-shifting strategies of the IRSs by: gradient descent ascent, alternate optimization AO, and game theory. Simulation results show that, AO does not guarantee convergence for continuous phase shifting, although it may achieve better performance than GDA in some iterations. GDA usually converges to a stationary point. Discrete phase-shifting improves the convergence behavior of AO and GDA.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Di Renzo, M. Debbah, D.-T. Phan-Huy, A. Zappone, M.-S. Alouini, C. Yuen, V. Sciancalepore, G. C. Alexandropoulos, J. Hoydis, H. Gacanin, J. d. Rosny, A. Bounceur, G. Lerosey, and M. Fink, "Smart radio environments empowered by reconfigurable AI metasurfaces: an idea whose time has come," *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, May 2019.
- [2] M. Di Renzo, A. Zappone, M. Debbah, M.-S. Alouini, C. Yuen, J. de Rosny, and S. Tretyakov, "Smart radio environments empowered by reconfigurable intelligent surfaces: How it works, state of research, and the road ahead," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 2450–2525, 2020.
- [3] S. Zhang and R. Zhang, "Capacity characterization for intelligent reflecting surface aided MIMO communication," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 1823–1838, 2020.
- [4] Q. Wu and R. Zhang, "Beamforming optimization for wireless network aided by intelligent reflecting surface with discrete phase shifts," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 1838–1851, 2020.
- [5] Y. Wu, A. Khisti, C. Xiao, G. Caire, K.-K. Wong, and X. Gao, "A survey of physical layer security techniques for 5G wireless networks and challenges ahead," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 679–695, 2018.
- [6] H. Shen, W. Xu, S. Gong, Z. He, and C. Zhao, "Secrecy rate maximization for intelligent reflecting surface assisted multi-antenna communications," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 1488–1492, 2019.
- [7] M. Cui, G. Zhang, and R. Zhang, "Secure wireless communication via intelligent reflecting surface," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 1410–1414, 2019.
- [8] Z. Chu, W. Hao, P. Xiao, and J. Shi, "Intelligent reflecting surface aided multi-antenna secure transmission," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 108–112, 2020.
- [9] H.-M. Wang, J. Bai, and L. Dong, "Intelligent reflecting surfaces assisted secure transmission without eavesdropper's CSI," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 27, pp. 1300–1304, 2020.
- [10] L. Dong and H.-M. Wang, "Secure MIMO transmission via intelligent reflecting surface," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 787–790, 2020.
- [11] X. Yu, D. Xu, Y. Sun, D. W. K. Ng, and R. Schober, "Robust and secure wireless communications via intelligent reflecting surfaces," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 2637–2652, 2020.
- [12] S. Hong, C. Pan, H. Ren, K. Wang, and A. Nallanathan, "Artificial-noise-aided secure MIMO wireless communications via intelligent reflecting surface," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 7851–7866, 2020.
- [13] H. Niu, Z. Chu, F. Zhou, Z. Zhu, M. Zhang, and K.-K. Wong, "Weighted sum secrecy rate maximization using intelligent reflecting surface," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 69, no. 9, pp. 6170–6184, 2021.
- [14] B. Feng, Y. Wu, M. Zheng, X.-G. Xia, Y. Wang, and C. Xiao, "Large intelligent surface aided physical layer security transmission," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 5276–5291, 2020.
- [15] Z. Chu, W. Hao, P. Xiao, D. Mi, Z. Liu, M. Khalily, J. R. Kelly, and A. P. Feresidis, "Secrecy rate optimization for intelligent reflecting surface assisted MIMO system," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 16, pp. 1655–1669, 2021.
- [16] P. Staat, H. Elders-Boll, M. Heinrichs, C. Zenger, and C. Paar, "Mirror mirror on the wall: Wireless environment reconfiguration attacks based on fast software-controlled surfaces," <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.01709>.
- [17] B. Lyu, D. T. Hoang, S. Gong, D. Niyato, and D. I. Kim, "Irs-based wireless jamming attacks: When jammers can attack without power," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 9, no. 10, pp. 1663–1667, 2020.
- [18] L. Liu, R. Zhang, and K.-C. Chua, "Secrecy wireless information and power transfer with MISO beamforming," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 1850–1863, 2014.
- [19] A. Khisti and G. W. Wornell, "Secure transmission with multiple antennas I: The MISOME wiretap channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 3088–3104, 2010.
- [20] A. Hjørungnes, *Complex-Valued Matrix Derivatives: With Applications in Signal Processing and Communications*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [21] C. E. Lemke and J. T. Howson, Jr., "Equilibrium points of bimatrix games," *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 413–423, 1964. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0112033>
- [22] A. Sayeed, "Deconstructing multiantenna fading channels," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 2563–2579, 2002.