

# Multiple Access Channel in Massive Multi-User MIMO Using Group Testing

George Vershinin<sup>1</sup>, Asaf Cohen<sup>1</sup>, and Omer Gurewitz<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Department of Communication Systems Engineering

**Abstract**—The number of wireless devices (e.g., cellular phones, IoT, laptops) connected to Wireless Local Area Networks (WLAN) grows each year exponentially. The orchestration of the connected devices becomes infeasible, especially when the number of resources available at the single access point (e.g., Base Station, Wireless Access Points) is limited. On the other hand, the number of antennas at each device grows too. We leverage the large number of antennas to suggest a massive multiple-user multiple-input-multiple-output (MU-MIMO) scheme using sparse coding based on Group Testing (GT) principles, which reduces overhead and complexity. We show that it is possible to jointly identify and decode up to  $K$  messages simultaneously out of  $N \cdot C$  messages (where  $N$  is the number of users and  $C$  is the number of messages per user) without any scheduling overhead or prior knowledge of the identity of the transmitting devices.

Our scheme is order-optimal in the number of users and messages, utilizing minimal knowledge of channel state and an efficient (in both run-time and space) decoding algorithm requiring  $O(K \log NC)$  antennas. We derive sufficient conditions for vanishing error probability and bound the minimal number of antennas necessary for our scheme.

## I. INTRODUCTION

MIMO systems have become ubiquitous for their increased reception and transmission quality without increasing other system resources (such as power or bandwidth). They are integrated into Cellular phones, Cellular Base Stations, IoT devices, WiFi, and many more. Recent years re-introduced the antennas' role in MIMO systems; they can be used as an additional source of information in addition to transmitting signals into the air (a technique dubbed "Index Modulation," [1, Chapter 1.2]). I.e., end-points can utilize several techniques to selectively activate some antennae at the receiver. The selected antenna's index is a piece of additional information (to the sent signal) sent by the terminal. This idea may allow multiple users to transmit simultaneously. Still, there is a limit to the number of users that can transmit simultaneously (due to large decoding times), and a resource-sharing mechanism

that distributes resources, such as time, frequency bands, and code, between the users is essential.

In large wireless networks, each end-point may interfere with the transmission of the other users via collisions. Common approaches to the problem include medium access protocols (e.g., CSMA) or clever collision resolution algorithms (like in [2, Chapter 4.2]). When dealing with MIMO systems, we add more degrees of freedom but with increased complexity. If the system is not well-designed (in terms of separable transmissions), each user equipped with multiple antennas may interfere with its transmissions. I.e., each user is exposed to self-interference, which can be avoided by correlating the transmitted signals (beamforming). A common approach to solve the interferences and collisions problem, better known as the Multiple Access Channel (MAC) problem, is scheduling, where all users agree that a relatively low number of users transmit simultaneously. Medium access protocols or collision resolution algorithms may become obsolete when introducing user scheduling to the system, but optimal user scheduling might be infeasible.

Recent works suggest codes and algorithms originated in GT to allow the joint decoding of many messages using a simple and local decoding algorithm. The GT-based solutions (like [3, 4]) combine mini-timeslots as bit times (or different frequency bands) and energy detection. This approach is extraordinarily more efficient in local resources at the receiver - it requires only the knowledge of the codebook and a simple threshold-based energy detection scheme like in [5, 6].

In our scheme, each user has their unique codebook generated using methods from GT. The users leverage their massive number of antennas to null their transmitted signals' energy in the antennas corresponding to zeros in their transmitted codeword (the opposite of Index Modulation). Any other antenna may read some energy. The receiver uses energy

detection to estimate which antenna is not targeted by any user or targeted by at least one. The energy detection returns a binary vector treated as the Result Vector of GT. The receiver uses Noisy CoMa to obtain the sent messages and, consequently, the identities of the transmitting users. Our solution needs no scheduling overhead (as users are identified without a header) and has very low complexity - the receiver only requires knowledge of the codebook, and the decoding algorithm is efficient in both run-time and space. We analyze the error probability of our scheme, find a lower bound and scaling laws of the number of antennas, and show it is order-optimal in codebook size (either in the number of users or the number of messages per user).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section II we elaborate more on related work. In Section III, we introduce our notations, model and assumptions. Section IV describes our scheme to solve the MAC problem using GT and discusses our results. We thoroughly analyze our scheme in Section V. In Section VI, we formulate a necessary lower bound (converse) on the number of antennas for vanishing error probability. In Section VII, we show simulation and numerical evaluations of our results, also comparing our scheme with simplified versions of existing technologies (MU-LTE and MU-Satellite Communication). Section VIII concludes our work.

## II. RELATED WORK

### A. Group Testing

The GT problem revolves around finding  $K$  items of interest, also known as the defective items, out of a large population of  $N$  items using as few as possible tests ([7]). In the Non-Adaptive GT (NAGT), the set of items participating in each test is determined *a-priori*. After conducting all tests, the test conductor observes the Result Vector and identifies the defective items accordingly.

The order of tests, or equivalently when each item is tested in which group-test, forms a matrix (dubbed as the "test matrix" or "test design") whose columns represent the items and rows represent tests. A component in the matrix is either zero (the corresponding item does not participate in the group test) or one. The Result Vector is, essentially, the Boolean sum (Logic OR operation) of the columns corresponding to the defective items. It is the input to an algorithm capable of *separating* the columns and obtaining their indices in the test design.

Most GT-related works have extensively researched the relationship between  $K$ ,  $N$ , and the number of tests,  $T$ . Notably, Atia et al. showed that  $T = \Theta(K \log N)$  is sufficient to find the  $K$  items (with arbitrarily small error probability) using Maximum Likelihood in [8, 9]. Atia has reduced the GT problem into a communication system in [10]. In Atia's communication model, the set of items is analogous to transmitting users. The defective items are the set of transmitting users. The codebook is the test matrix (each column is a codeword), and the channel sums transmissions using Boolean sum. Since GT deals with Boolean vectors, all discrete (memoryless) binary channels have been addressed in the literature. In their later work, [8], Atia et al. solved the GT problem for Reversed-Z Channel (RZ-Channel) and Z-Channel. Chan et al. addressed the Binary Symmetric Channel (BSC) in [11, 12] and solved the GT problem using Noisy Column Matching (Noisy CoMa) from [11]<sup>1</sup>. The Binary Asymmetric Channel (BAC) was addressed by Scarlett et al. in [14] and Sejdinovic et al. in [15].

Modern literature on GT engages in devising communication protocols using the same reduction, modified for well-known communication models. For example, Robin et al. recently proposed an energy-efficient sensor discovery in power-constrained clustered networks in [4]. Their work used a random test design from GT with the decoding algorithm from [12]. Cohen et al. introduced Physical Layer Security concepts to the noiseless GT problem in [3] (where an eavesdropper perceives a Binary Erasure Channel with parameter  $\delta$ ) and presented a TDMA-based protocol in [16]. [3, Supplementary Materials] was the starter for [16], where Cohen extended the GT-based communication from device discovery to a block code with  $M$  words for each user (a pivotal point in their secrecy proofs). In [13], Robin et al. have considered a Single-Input-Single-Output (SISO) Rayleigh Fading Channel. The main idea of their work was to reduce the continuous signal and noise models into discrete binary models using energy detection. Our work can be considered an extension of Robin's work for MIMO systems.

### B. MIMO

Most of the models for wireless channels are time-shifted Affine Transformations. The transmitted signal suffers from

<sup>1</sup>also known as "Noisy Combinatorial Orthogonal Matching Pursuit" (N-COMP) in [12, 13] or the noise-tolerant of the Definitely Not Defective (DND) Algorithm in [3].

multiplicative noise (attenuation or fading) and additive noise. The MIMO model extends these models by adding more antennas at the receiver and transmitter. These additions enable transmitting multi-dimensional symbols, but at the cost of possible interferences at the receiver. In this case, the attenuation parameter is replaced with a matrix (dubbed the channel matrix), and the noise becomes a noise vector.

When multiple users transmit simultaneously, the transmitted signals of the users are mixed, resulting in a sum of affine transformations. In MU-SISO, if the system is designed for this purpose, the receiver can decode the transmissions jointly (e.g., using GT codes like in [4]) or successively (like NOMA). These solutions are possible as each transmitted signal only interferes with the transmissions of other users. The decoder can be further optimized when the distributions of attenuation and noise are known, [17, Chapter 4].

Works related to MU-MIMO systems focus on user scheduling and analysis of the Ergodic Capacity (the average of the maximal rate based only on channel realizations) in different schemes. [18] and [19] are examples of such works. Particularly [20] uses a threshold-based scheduling algorithm on the energy detected at the antenna in a Multiple-Input-Single-Output system. This approach can easily fit into the GT problem with antennas as the test tubes (either energy is above the threshold or not). The ideas from GT can eliminate the need for these scheduling schemes, reducing the complexity of MIMO systems.

Recent work by Bicais et al. in [5] suggested using energy detection in MIMO systems for sub-Terra Hertz bands, using On-Off Keying (OOK). Their work covered communication from one antenna to its parallel in the receiver and can be extended easily for any pair of antennas. Bicais' idea has used Paquelet's original idea in [6] but for multiple antennas. Paquelet showed that the energy detection scheme is optimal when using OOK, in addition to its low complexity. However, both works do not address the multi-user problem with their solutions. The optimal thresholds derived were optimal per pair of antennas (one at the transmitter and one at the receiver) utilizing the receiver's channel state information (CSI). Each user may have a different optimal threshold, so careful user-to-antenna assignment (alternatively, scheduling) is essential. Hence, their solutions are unscalable without the use of proper coding. Using GT coding, as we suggest, extends Bicais' work to multi-user settings.

### III. SYSTEM MODEL

#### A. Notation

Matrices will appear in bold (e.g.,  $\mathbf{H}$ ) and vectors are underlined (e.g.,  $\underline{x}$ ). We shall use subscript for user indices (e.g.,  $\mathbf{H}_i$ ), components of a vector or matrix are specified as a subscript after squared parentheses (e.g.,  $[\underline{y}]_m$  is  $\underline{y}$ 's  $m^{\text{th}}$  component,  $[\mathbf{H}_k]_{i,j}$  is  $\mathbf{H}_k$ 's component in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row and  $j^{\text{th}}$  column). All logarithms in this article are in base two. When they aren't, we will specify the log base explicitly or write  $\ln(\cdot)$  in the case of the natural logarithm. We write  $[n]$  (notice there is no subscript) as a shorthand notation for the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . We use  $(\cdot)^T$  for the transpose operation and  $(\cdot)^*$  for the Conjugate Transpose.

#### B. System Model

We assume a time-slotted network of  $N$  users where  $K \ll N$  of them simultaneously transmit to a single receiver. In each time slot, a different set of  $K$  users may transmit, and their identity is unknown a-priori. Every user wishes to send one out of  $C$  possible messages using a *single* time slot, and there is no a-priori knowledge about the distribution of which a message is sent. The  $k^{\text{th}}$  user's messages are  $\mathcal{W}_k = \{w_{k,1}, w_{k,2}, \dots, w_{k,C}\}$ . WLOG, the transmitting users are  $[K]$ , and each user wishes to transmit its first message,  $w_{k,1}$ .

Each transmitter has  $M_t$  antennas, whereas the receiver has  $M_r$  antennas. Each transmitter has complete knowledge of its channel state at any given time but has no channel state of other transmitters (CSIT model, as named in [21, Chapter 10]). The receiver, on the other hand, has no CSI. The channel matrix of the  $k^{\text{th}}$  user is  $\mathbf{H}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{M_r \times M_t}$ . Each entry in  $\mathbf{H}_k$  is a zero-mean Complex Gaussian Random Variable (CGRV). We also assume a zero-mean White Complex Gaussian Additive Noise,  $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{C}^{M_r \times 1}$ , where  $[\underline{n}]_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, N_0)$  for all  $i$ .

Since  $\mathbf{H}_k$  is known to the  $k^{\text{th}}$  transmitter, its encoder is a function that maps some  $w_k \in \mathcal{W}_k$  to a complex vector  $\underline{x}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{M_t \times 1}$ . The choice of  $\underline{x}_k$  also depends on the side information, for example, by beamforming. Mathematically:

$$\mathcal{E}_k : \mathcal{W}_k \times \mathbb{C}^{M_r \times M_t} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{M_t \times 1} \quad (1)$$

The transmission cannot exceed some power level,  $P$ . I.e.,  $\|\underline{x}_k\|^2 \leq P$ .

For convenience, we shall assume each component of  $\mathbf{H}_k$  has a unit variance<sup>2</sup>, that is,  $[\mathbf{H}_k]_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$  for all  $i, j, k$ . Finally, the receiver obtains:

$$\underline{y} = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{H}_k \underline{x}_k + \underline{n} \quad (2)$$

The decoder uses  $\underline{y}$  to obtain the messages sent and infer the identity of the  $K$  users. Hence, the decoder is a function:

$$\mathcal{D} : \mathbb{C}^{M_r \times 1} \rightarrow \prod_{k=1}^N \mathcal{W}_k \times [N]^N \quad (3)$$

The product taken in this case is the Cartesian Product. Messages and identities of silent users are defined as  $\emptyset$  and are omitted from the function output<sup>3</sup>.

For simplicity,  $M_r = M_t$ . We assume Massive MIMO settings, so  $1 \ll M_t, M_r$ . When a system has a minuscule number of antennas, one can use additional time slots/frequency bands to compensate for the difference. E.g., if our solution requires  $L = l \cdot M_r$  antennas, use  $l$  time slots. In each time slot save the channel output to obtain  $\{\underline{y}_i\}_{i=1}^l$ . Finally,  $\underline{y}$  can be obtained by concatenation:  $\underline{y} = (\underline{y}_1^T, \underline{y}_2^T, \dots, \underline{y}_l^T)^T$ .

We are interested in the finite-block length regime and asymptotic behavior when either  $N \rightarrow \infty$  or  $C \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $K$ .  $K$  is allowed to scale with  $N$  (increasing the number of simultaneously transmitting users) or  $C$  (allowing each user to send many messages in parallel). We say that the system is *message-user reliable* if:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}(\underline{y}) \neq (\underbrace{w_{1,1}, w_{2,1}, \dots, w_{K,1}}_{\text{The sent messages}}, \underbrace{[K]}_{\text{Identities}})) \xrightarrow{N, C \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad (4)$$

That is, the decoder obtains *exactly*  $K$  messages and the correct ones. Additionally, it must correctly identify the corresponding users.

### C. Rates

Each user has  $C$  codewords, meaning each user sends  $\log C$  bits per transmission. To identify the  $K$  users, the receiver needs additional  $\log \binom{N}{K}$  bits. Replacing  $\log \binom{N}{K}$  with its asymptotic value  $K \log N$ , we obtain the sum-rate of  $K \log C + K \log N = K \log NC$  bits per time slot.

We want to compare our rate with *Ergodic* sum-rates. The capacity is achieved using codes in increasing block length

<sup>2</sup>The assumption of unit variance at the channel matrix can be interpreted as the normalization of the power constraint with the fading power. I.e.,  $P$  is not the transmitted power per se, but the average SNR per antenna.

<sup>3</sup>This definition allows decoders to output *any* number of messages up to  $N$ , assuming each user sends up to one message per time slot.

(e.g., more time slots), whereas we use only a single time slot and a finite number of antennas. It is, however, convenient to compare the rate with famous quantities - especially when their approximations are functions of  $M_r$ . Rhee and Cioffi established the highest Ergodic sum-rate possible in [22]. Adapting their result to our system model:

$$\text{cap}(MAC) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_{M_r} + \rho \cdot \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{H}_i \mathbf{H}_i^* \right) \right] \quad (5)$$

$$\approx \log \det(\mathbf{I}_{M_r} + K \cdot \rho \cdot M_t \cdot \mathbf{I}_{M_r}) \quad (6)$$

$$= M_r \cdot \log(K \cdot \rho \cdot M_r + 1) \quad (7)$$

Where the approximation used the law of large numbers. Notably, the sum-rate Ergodic Capacity in CSIT-only is [22, Equation (40)]:

$$\text{cap}(MAC_{CSIT}) \approx M_r \cdot \mathbb{E}[\log(1 + \rho \cdot |[\mathbf{H}_1]_{1,1}|^2)] \quad (8)$$

$$+ O(\log(1 + K \cdot M_t - M_r)) \quad (9)$$

$$\leq M_r \cdot \log(1 + \rho) + O(\log(K \cdot M_r)) \quad (10)$$

The last transition follows from the fact the  $|[\mathbf{H}_k]_{i,j}|^2 \sim \text{Exp}(1)$  and Jensen's Inequality.

For comparison, we are also interested in the settings where all users are already scheduled. Namely, users are scheduled using Round Robin (RR). In RR, in each time slot, *exactly one* user transmits but may transmit at the highest rate possible (from [23]). Hence, the average Ergodic Rate (calculated similar to (5)) is:

$$\text{cap}(RR) \approx \frac{K}{N} \cdot M_r \cdot \log(\rho \cdot M_r + 1) \quad (11)$$

## IV. MY SCHEME

### A. MIMO-GT

In this section, we describe in depth our solution scheme. Our solution is comprised of three parts; codebook generation, transmission scheme, and receiver algorithm. First, we generate  $N \cdot C$  binary codewords and distribute each user  $C$  codewords. Each codeword has of length  $\beta K \log(N \cdot C)$  (where  $\beta \geq 1$  is some constant to be determined later). Each bit is generated using i.i.d. Bernoulli distribution with parameter  $p = \frac{\alpha}{K}$  ( $\alpha$  will be picked later).

To transmit the  $j^{\text{th}}$  codeword,  $\underline{c}_j$ , the  $i^{\text{th}}$  user takes a *normalized* vector from  $\mathbf{H}_i$ 's nullspace corresponding to the zeros in  $\underline{c}_j$  (a technique dubbed Zero-Forcing Beamforming, ZFBF) and amplifies it to hold the power constraint. I.e.,

each user beamforms their signals such that the receiver, when calculating  $|y|^2$ <sup>4</sup> will read non-zero values in the corresponding locations to the ones  $\underline{c}_j$ . In other words, the receiver reads the codewords from the antennas - '1' is read when the antenna is activated and '0' otherwise. Hence, the sum-rate of our scheme is:

$$R \approx K \cdot \log(N \cdot C) = M_r \cdot \frac{1}{\beta} \quad (12)$$

Similarly, the Spectral Efficiency of our scheme is:

$$\eta = \frac{K \log NC}{\beta K \log NC} = \beta^{-1} \quad (13)$$

The receiver obtains  $\underline{y}$  from (2), and compares each component in  $|y|^2$  with an energy threshold  $N_0 \cdot \gamma$  ( $\gamma$  will be selected later). The result of the comparison,  $\underline{Y}$ , is the Result Vector in the GT context. A hard decision using energy detection may introduce some "corrupt bits" in  $\underline{Y}$ . The corruption is characterized as crossover probabilities from '1' to '0' and vice-versa, denoted by  $q_{10}$  and  $q_{01}$ , respectively.

We then use  $\underline{Y}$  as an input to the Noisy CoMa algorithm to obtain the messages. Since the messages are unique per user (for long enough codewords), the decoder also infers the users' identities without a dedicated header. The decoding step is always perfect when no additive noise is present, so the solution may use Maximum-Likelihood (ML) decoder or (regular) CoMa like presented in [3, 16] to obtain vanishing error probability. In [8, 9], Atia et al. have bounded the error probability of the ML decoder by using the union bound and dividing the error events according to the number of missing true items. In Noisy CoMa, on the other hand, it is possible to obtain any number of codewords between 0 and  $N$ , so we also have to consider the excess words.

Let  $p_{MD}$  (Miss-Detection) be the probability that Noisy CoMa fails to find at least one transmitted codeword. Let  $p_{FA}$  (False Alarm) be the probability that Noisy CoMa declares at least one excess codeword (that was not transmitted).  $p_{FA}$  also covers the event of identical codewords by its definition. From the union bound, if  $p_e$  is the error probability of our scheme,  $p_e \leq p_{MD} + p_{FA}$ . Our main result is:

**Theorem IV.1.** Fix  $N$ ,  $K$ ,  $C$ . Let  $\delta > 0$ . Set  $M_r \geq \beta^* \cdot K \log NC$ , where  $\beta^*$  is the solution to the following

<sup>4</sup>This is a slight abuse of notation; This vector is the result of applying element-wise  $|\cdot|^2$  on  $\underline{y}$

optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{p, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{(1 + \delta) \ln 2}{K \cdot p \cdot (1 - \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{10}-q_{01})^2\})} \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} 0 \leq p \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \leq \gamma \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Then, MIMO-GT, as described in Subsection IV-A, achieves  $\max\{p_{FA}, p_{MD}\} \leq (NC)^{-\delta}$ . Consequently, MIMO-GT is message-user reliable.

## B. Discussion

We compare our system rate in (12) with (5), (8) and (11) by dividing them. The ratios are:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{cap}(MAC)}{R} & \approx \beta \cdot \log(\rho \cdot \beta K^2 \log NC + 1) \quad (14) \\ \frac{\text{cap}(MAC_{CSIT})}{R} & \lesssim \beta \cdot \log(1 + \rho) + O\left(\frac{\log(K^2 \log NC)}{K \log NC}\right) \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{\text{cap}(RR)}{R} \approx \frac{K}{N} \cdot \beta \cdot \log(\rho \cdot \beta K \log NC + 1) \quad (16)$$

We observe two kinds of losses; The first is SNR loss, where we analyze how the rate ratios scale with  $\rho$ . The other loss is the User-Codebook Loss, where we observe how the rate ratios scale with  $N$ ,  $C$ , and  $K \leq N \cdot C$ .

When  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ , all ratios tend to infinity by lemma V.10 - a direct result of Shannon's Power Efficiency Limit (SPEL); it is a lower bound on the energy per bit, equivalently on  $\rho$ , from which onward a communication system can achieve vanishing error rates. In the optimal solutions, in the Full CSI (both for RR and MIMO MAC) or complete CSIT settings, users cooperate to create dedicated virtual channels resulting in non-zero sum-rates. Cooperation is not possible in our scheme due to the lack of irrelevant CSI. Additionally, SPEL restricts the performance of energy detection in low SNRs. When  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , the SNR loss scales like  $O(\log \rho)$ . In both cases, our scheme is sub-optimal.

The User-Codebook Loss, however, scales differently. In (14), the User-Codebook Loss is  $O(\log(K^2 \log NC))$  (see how  $\beta$  scales with  $K$  in lemma V.9), which tends to infinity when  $N \cdot C \rightarrow \infty$  and  $K = O(N \cdot C)$ . In (15) the loss tends to zero, so our scheme is order-optimal when either the number of users or the number of messages grow. The User-Codebook Loss in (16) tends to infinity when  $N \cdot C \rightarrow \infty$ , but vanish when  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and  $K = o(N)$ . Despite the increase in loss due to the user identity knowledge, there are scenarios where

the ratio tends to zero. I.e., if  $K$  is small enough, scheduling is ineffective as it forces all users but one to idle.

## V. SCHEME ANALYSIS

This section analyzes our scheme's error probability and scaling laws. In Subsection V-A we define and calculate  $q_{10}$  and  $q_{01}$ . We elaborate on Noisy CoMa's performance analysis in Subsection V-B. We study  $\beta$ 's scaling laws in Subsection V-C.

### A. BER

Our solution scheme uses energy detectors to implement hard decisions at each antenna. If no additive noise exists, the Result Vector,  $\underline{Y}$ , is a Boolean Sum of the  $K$  transmitted messages. When the additive noise is present, we have to use some mechanism to differentiate between the noise and send signals. Since we are sampling  $y$  once, we use an energy threshold to convert  $|y|^2$  to  $\underline{Y}$ . Therefore, we are interested in the following random variable:

$$[\underline{Y}]_i = \begin{cases} 1 & |[y]_i|^2 > N_0 \cdot \gamma \\ 0 & |[y]_i|^2 \leq N_0 \cdot \gamma \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

$[\underline{Y}]_i$  estimates whether *at least one* user targets the  $i^{\text{th}}$  antenna or not. Due to symmetry, the  $[\underline{Y}]_i$  are i.i.d. Naturally, the estimation may err - either due to weak transmissions (caused by either deep fade or strong noise), denoted by  $q_{10}$ , or the additive noise overcomes the threshold when no user targets the antenna (denoted by  $q_{01}$ ). Calculating these probabilities is similar to the derivation of a non-coherent detector for i.i.d. Rayleigh fading channels in [24, Chapter 3.1.1], albeit adjusted for energy detection in an MU-MIMO environment. Our detection differs from Bica's work in [5] because our receiver has no CSI.

To calculate  $q_{01}$  and  $q_{10}$  by their definition, we have to calculate the distribution of  $|[y]_i|^2$  conditioned on the number of users targeting the  $i^{\text{th}}$  antenna. The calculations can be found in Appendix A-A. Due to brevity, we present the results of the calculations in the following theorems:

**Theorem V.1.** *For any  $\gamma$ , the crossover probability from '0' to '1' is:*

$$q_{01} = e^{-\gamma}$$

**Theorem V.2.** *For any  $\gamma$ , the crossover probability from '1' to '0' is:*

$$q_{10} = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1} \right\} \right)$$

Where  $\rho \triangleq \frac{P}{N_0}$ .

$\rho$  can be interpreted as the SNR of the *faded signal* against the additive noise, and  $\gamma$  is the normalization of threshold into units of  $N_0$ , rather than energy.

### B. Decoding Error Analysis

We shall follow the footsteps of [11, Chapter 5], which analyzes the Noisy CoMa algorithm for a BSC with parameter  $q$ . The steps are very similar, except for the different discrete channels in which a test tube ( $[\underline{Y}]_i$  in our case) is corrupt. Our relaxation criterion will be the same as in [13, Chapter IV], which analyzes Noisy CoMa for SISO Slow-Fading Rayleigh Channel.

For simplicity, we shall use  $N$  for the total number of codewords rather than the number of users. I.e.,  $N = N' \cdot C$ . Following Chan's footsteps in [12, Proof of Theorem 6], we consider the probability that some antenna reads '1',  $p_1$ . This probability is equivalent to some component of the transmitted codeword being "hidden" by other codewords or noise. Note that we can calculate this probability by calculating its complement,  $p_0 \triangleq \mathbb{P}([\underline{Y}]_i = 0)$ .

**Lemma V.3.** *The complement to the shadowing probability is:*

$$p_0 = (1-p)^K (1-q_{01}) + (1 - (1-p)^K) q_{10}$$

I.e.,  $p_1 = 1 - p_0$ .

*Proof.* The proof is a result of a direct calculation using the sum rule.  $\square$

Now, we define how Noisy CoMa obtains messages from  $\underline{Y}$ :

**Definition 1** (Noisy CoMa Decision Criterion). *Fix  $\Delta > 0$ . Denote  $\text{supp}(\underline{x})$  as the set of indices where  $\underline{x}$  has non-zero components. Let  $\mathcal{T}_j \triangleq |\text{supp}(\underline{c}_j)|$  and  $\mathcal{S}_j \triangleq |\text{supp}(\underline{c}_j) \cap \text{supp}(\underline{Y})|$ . Noisy CoMa's declares that  $\underline{c}_j$  has been transmitted is if and only if  $\mathcal{S}_j \geq \mathcal{T}_j (1 - q_{10}(\Delta + 1))$ .*

Now we have the following theorems:

**Theorem V.4.** *The probability of missing at least one true codeword is bounded from above by:*

$$p_{MD} \leq K \cdot \exp \left\{ -M_r \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2}) \right\}$$

The proofs of this theorem and the following theorem are similar to Chan's derivation in [11, Proof of Theorem 5]. For completeness, the proof can be found in Appendix A-B. Similarly, we have:

**Theorem V.5.** *Assume  $\Delta < \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$ . The probability of declaring at least one false codeword is bounded from above by:*

$$p_{FA} \leq (N - K) \exp \left\{ -M_r \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2}) \right\}$$

The proof of this theorem can be found in Appendix A-C. Observe the simplification of the (additional) condition  $\Delta < \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$ :

$$\frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1 = \frac{(1-p)^K(1-q_{01}) + (1-(1-p)^K)q_{10}}{q_{10}} - 1 \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{(1-p)^K(1-q_{01})}{q_{10}} - (1-p)^K \quad (19)$$

$$= (1-p)^K \left( \frac{1-q_{01}}{q_{10}} - 1 \right) \quad (20)$$

$$= (1-p)^K \cdot \frac{1-q_{01}-q_{10}}{q_{10}} \quad (21)$$

The Noisy CoMa algorithm requires  $0 < \Delta$ . Notice that

$$0 < \Delta \Leftrightarrow q_{10} + q_{01} < 1 \quad (22)$$

We shall assume an appropriate  $\gamma$  is picked from this point onward.

**Theorem V.6.** *Set  $M_r = \beta_1 \cdot K \log N$ . If  $\beta_1$  satisfies:*

$$\beta_1 \geq \frac{(\ln K / \ln N + \delta) \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - \exp\{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2\})}$$

then  $p_{MD} \leq N^{-\delta}$  for any  $\delta \geq 0$  we like.

Likewise, we have a sufficient condition on  $p_{FA}$ :

**Theorem V.7.** *Set  $M_r = \beta_2 \cdot K \log N$ . If  $\beta_2$  satisfies:*

$$\beta_2 \geq \frac{(\ln(N-K) / \ln N + \delta) \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - \exp\{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2\})}$$

then  $p_{FA} \leq N^{-\delta}$  for any desired  $\delta \geq 0$ .

The proofs for both theorems are immediate by substituting  $M_r$  with  $\beta_i \cdot K \log N$  in their corresponding bounds (the calculations are in Appendices A-D and A-E respectively).

We are interested in a vanishing error probability for our scheme, so we would like to take  $\beta$  such that both  $p_{MD}$  and  $p_{FA}$  tend to zero. In other words, we are interested in  $\beta \geq \max\{\beta_1, \beta_2\}$ . Observe the following bounds on  $\beta_i$ :

$$\beta_1 = \frac{(1+\delta) \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - \exp\{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2\})} \quad (23)$$

$$\beta_2 = \frac{(1+\delta) \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - \exp\{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2\})} \quad (24)$$

Both  $\beta_i$  guarantee that the corresponding error probabilities tend to zero. Finally, we can minimize  $M_r = \max\{\beta_1, \beta_2\} \cdot K \log N$  as a function of  $\alpha, \Delta$  and  $\gamma$ .

Now, we can devise an optimization problem to minimize the number of antennas in our scheme:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\Delta, \alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \max \left\{ \frac{(1+\delta) \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2})}, \right. \\ \left. \frac{(1+\delta) \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - e^{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2})} \right\} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} 0 < \Delta < \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1 \\ 0 < \alpha \leq \frac{K}{2} \\ 0 < \gamma \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The problem in (25), at first glance, is complex because of three reasons; The problem is a minimax problem where the parameters affect each other in a non-direct way (e.g.,  $\Delta$ 's range defines  $\gamma$ 's actual range). Moreover, the constraints contain strong inequalities, meaning using numerical solutions requires careful examination of the solution. Finally, it is not clear whether the problem is convex or not - numerical solutions may converge to a local minimum rather than a global minimum.

The following theorem simplifies the optimization problem:

**Theorem V.8.** *The optimization problem in (25) is equivalent to the following optimization problem:*

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{p, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{(1+\delta) \ln 2}{K \cdot p \cdot (1 - \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{10}-q_{01})^2\})} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} 0 \leq p \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \leq \gamma \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Which has at least one solution.

The proof is rather tedious and is omitted due to brevity. We provide a *proof sketch* instead: The proof has four steps; The first step is eliminating the dependency on  $\Delta$  and converting the minimax problem into a minimization problem by noticing that  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  have opposing trends in  $\Delta$ , so the  $\Delta^*$  must be

their equalizer. The next step is annihilating the boundaries of the convex hull, which is a rectangle in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ; It is possible to show that each corner point is not a solution (either  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$  or a better solution exists in the interior), and so are any convex combination of them<sup>5</sup>. The third step shows that  $\beta$  is convex in  $\gamma$ , so at least one solution exists. The final step is invoking the KKT Conditions. Since the corner points are not solutions, their corresponding Lagrange Multipliers are canceled out, so it is possible to obtain the solution by comparing the gradient to zero. The complete proof can be found in Appendix A-F.

### C. Scaling

This subsection shows different scaling laws on  $\beta$  as a function of  $K$  and  $\rho$ . First, we shall show that when  $\beta$  converges to some constant (to be more precise, a function of  $\rho$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\alpha$  alone) when  $K \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Lemma V.9.** *Let  $\beta$  be the solution to the optimization problem in Theorem V.8. Then,  $\beta \rightarrow \text{const.}$  when  $K \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof Sketch:* Recalling that  $\alpha = K \cdot p$ , we can invoke the Poisson Limit Theorem on  $q_{10}$ . Any other term dependant on  $K$  tends to some exponent powered by  $\alpha$ , so  $\beta$  tends to some constant. Complete proof can be found in A-G.

For  $\beta$ 's scaling with  $\rho$ , we observe that the expression in Theorem V.8 is not a function of  $\rho$ , except for  $q_{10}$  (Theorem V.2). From this observation, we have the following (immediate) result:

**Lemma V.10.** *If  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  then  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$  then  $\beta \rightarrow \text{const.}$*

## VI. CONVERSE

In this section, we shall derive a lower bound on the number of antennas using Fano's Inequality and Data Processing Inequality, similar to [12, Section IV].

**Theorem VI.1.** *Assume  $N$  users,  $K$  of them wish to transmit simultaneously. Then, an asymptotic lower bound on the number of antennas,  $M_r$ , is required to identify the  $K$  users when using a hard-decision criterion at the receiver is:*

$$M_r \geq \frac{K \log \frac{N}{K}}{\text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))}$$

<sup>5</sup>converting the form of the objective function from  $\frac{1}{f(\gamma, p)}$  to  $-f(\gamma, p)$  might result in some feasible points on the boundary

$\text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))$  is the BAC capacity ([25]):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10})) = & \frac{q_{01}}{1 - q_{01} - q_{10}} \cdot H(q_{10}) \\ & - \frac{1 - q_{10}}{1 - q_{01} - q_{10}} \cdot H(q_{01}) \\ & + \log \left( 1 + 2^{\frac{H(q_{01}) - H(q_{10})}{1 - q_{01} - q_{10}}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Where  $H(\cdot)$  is the binary entropy function<sup>6</sup>.

The detailed proof can be found in A-I and is very similar to Chan's proof in [12, Chapter IV]. We also obtain the following result:

**Corollary VI.2.** *Assume  $N$  users, each with a  $C$ -sized codebook. Assume  $K$  of them wish to transmit a single codeword. Then, a lower bound on the number of antennas,  $M_r$ , is required to obtain the  $K$  messages when using a hard-decision criterion at the receiver is:*

$$M_r \geq \frac{K \log \frac{N \cdot C^K}{K}}{\text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))}$$

Whose proof is identical to the proof of Theorem VI.1, but replace  $\binom{N}{K}$  with  $\binom{N}{K} \cdot C^K$  (as there are  $\binom{N}{K}$  different options to choose the  $K$  users; each has  $C$  options to select a codeword).

## VII. SIMULATION & NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present simulation and numerical evaluation results. The simulation had a network of  $N = 100$  sensors with  $C = 1000$  codewords each.  $\rho$  is taken to be  $24_{\text{dB}}$ <sup>7</sup>,  $N_0 = 2$  and  $\delta = 0.33$ . We assumed  $K = \log_{10}(N \cdot C) = 5$  users wish to transmit simultaneously and solved the optimization problem in Theorem V.8 to obtain  $\gamma^* = 5.6583$ ,  $p^* = 0.0986$  (equivalently,  $\alpha^* = 0.4932$ ) and  $\beta^* = 9.048$ . The initial number of antennas at the receiver is the bound in Corollary VI.2.

Figure 1 shows that the calculations in theorems V.1 and V.2 coincide with the simulation results. Figure 2 shows that theorems V.6 and V.7 hold when taking  $M_r \geq \beta^* \cdot K \ln N$ <sup>8</sup>. We note that our results are asymptotically tight.

Figure 3 shows the evaluation of the rate ratios in Subsection IV-B, and the ratio between errorless multi-user LTE and satellite networks (as functions of  $N$ ). The blue line is the ratio between the optimal solution (with Full CSI) and our scheme,

<sup>6</sup>with a slight abuse of notation

<sup>7</sup>SNR required for MCS3 in 802.11ac, [26]

<sup>8</sup>Taking  $\ln$  instead of  $\log$  removes the  $\ln 2$  in the numerator of the optimization problem




Fig. 1. Simulation results when  $N = 100$ ,  $C = 1000$ ,  $K = 5$ ,  $\rho = 24_{\text{dB}}$ ,  $\delta = 0.33$ ,  $\gamma = 11.318$  and  $\alpha = 0.4932$ .




Fig. 2. Simulation results when  $N = 100$ ,  $C = 1000$ ,  $K = 5$ ,  $\rho = 24_{\text{dB}}$ ,  $\delta = 0.33$ ,  $\gamma = 11.318$  and  $\alpha = 0.4932$ .

given in (14). The orange line is (15), whereas the yellow line is (16). The purple line compares the ratio between  $K$ -to-1 LTE and our scheme, using information from the examples in [27, Chapters 6.3-6.5]<sup>9</sup>. The green line compares the sum-rate ratio between  $K$ -to-1 satellite communication and our scheme. In both bounds, we assumed raw transmissions using the biggest constellations available. Sum-rates are normalized by system bandwidths and multiplied by  $K$  to obtain a fair

<sup>9</sup>Each LTE resource block contains 12 sub-carriers, each sends 7 64-QAM symbols per slot (slot time is 0.5msec). In [27, Figure 6.11], each slot has (on average) 11 resource blocks, and we assume 8 MIMO spatial streams (release 9). Hence, the system has a rate of 88.704Mbps. Normalizing by the bandwidth,  $BW = 3_{\text{MHz}}$ , we obtain the rate of 29.568bps/Hz.




Fig. 3. Rate ratio as a function of  $N$  when  $\rho = 20_{\text{dB}}$ ,  $K = 5$ ,  $C = 1000$ ,  $\delta = 0.33$  and  $N_0 = 2$ .

comparison. Despite our simplifying assumptions, LTE's rate is less than ten times higher than our scheme. However, such rates come with significant overheads, unlike our simple scheme. Our scheme's order-optimality is evident from the slope of the orange line which represents the CSIT bound from (15). The blue line representing (14) is slowly increasing in  $N$ , like  $O(\log \log N)$ .

Figure 4 compares our scheme's Spectral Efficiency from (13) with SPEL, evaluated for different settings of  $K$ ,  $N$  and  $C$ . The SPEL is calculated as in [28, Chapter 3.5]. For our system, we have used  $\frac{E_b}{N_0} = \frac{K \cdot P}{N_0 \cdot M_r}$ . The bold dark line is SPEL, and its dashed counterpart is the *absolute* SPEL,  $\ln 2$ . The orange line is the limit of  $\beta^{-1}$  when  $K \rightarrow \infty$ .

Figures 5, 6 and 7 show how  $\alpha^*$ ,  $\gamma^*$ , and the BER<sup>10</sup> (respectively) scale as a function of  $\rho \in [-30, 60]_{\text{dB}}$ . When the SNR is low, the BER tends to 0.5, equivalent to the error when the receiver guesses whether the antenna is activated or not.  $\gamma^*$  tends to 1 when the SNR is low, unlike its proportion to  $\ln \rho$  in the high SNR region. Since  $\gamma$  can be independent of the code we use, choosing  $\gamma = \ln(1 + \rho)$  is an excellent *heuristic*. Additionally, we can adjust  $\alpha$ 's range to the interval  $[0, 1]$ , justifying the heuristic used in [8, 13].

## VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we studied a non-cooperative distributed MU-MIMO scheme using GT codes on the antennas at the receiver. The receiver used energy detection in each antenna

<sup>10</sup>evaluated as  $q_e \triangleq (1-p)^K q_{01} + (1 - (1-p)^K) q_{10}$




Fig. 4. Spectral Efficiency as a function of  $\rho$  (in dB) when  $\delta = 0.33$  and  $N_0 = 2$ . The mentioned probabilities,  $q_e$ , are the BER of the blue line at the corresponding SNR.




Fig. 5.  $\alpha^*$ 's value as a function of  $\rho$  when  $N = 100$ ,  $K = 5$ ,  $C = 1000$ ,  $\delta = 0.33$  and  $N_0 = 2$ .

and a simple decoding algorithm to obtain numerous messages simultaneously. Our approach is not only simple to implement (compared to LTE, for example) but also order-optimal in the number of users or messages. We also presented a universal upper bound on the error probability of the decoding algorithm, which requires only characterizing the transition probabilities of the channel when using energy detection at each resource. We have expressed and determined the scaling laws of the antennas when the SNR and number of sent messages grow large. Our work also showed a converse bound, simulations to support our analysis, and simplifying heuristics.




Fig. 6.  $\gamma$ 's value as a function of  $\rho$  when  $N = 100$ ,  $K = 5$ ,  $C = 1000$ ,  $\delta = 0.33$  and  $N_0 = 2$ .




Fig. 7. BER as a function of  $\rho$  when  $N = 100$ ,  $K = 5$ ,  $C = 1000$ ,  $\delta = 0.33$  and  $N_0 = 2$ .

Our scheme relies heavily on the reliability of the channel estimation at *each* transmitter; If a user errs in their estimation, the communication will undoubtedly fail, and the receiver will read a vector of ones from the energy detectors. Future research may address this issue by either using a special deterministic codebook (with a constant number of intersections between every  $K$  codewords) or by devising a scheme non-reliant on CSIT (e.g., utilizing multi-user/antenna diversity). The codebooks of the first approach are hard to find, and the second approach might suffer from a reduced sum-rate (with possibly different scaling laws in the number of users).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank AYECKA for providing information about possible satellite rates.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Wen, X. Cheng, and L. Yang, *Index Modulation for 5G Wireless Communications*, 1st ed. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2017.
- [2] G. Longo, *Multi-user communication systems*. Springer, 1981.
- [3] A. Cohen, A. Cohen, and O. Gurewitz, "Secure group testing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, pp. 1–1, 2020.
- [4] J. Robin and E. Erkip, "Sparse activity discovery in energy constrained multi-cluster iot networks using group testing," in *ICC 2021 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [5] S. Bicaïs, J.-B. Dore, and V. Savin, "Design of mimo systems using energy detectors for sub-terahertz applications," in *2020 IEEE 31st Annual International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [6] S. Paquelet, L.-M. Aubert, and B. Uguen, "An impulse radio asynchronous transceiver for high data rates," in *2004 International Workshop on Ultra Wideband Systems Joint with Conference on Ultra Wideband Systems and Technologies. Joint UWBS IWUWBS 2004 (IEEE Cat. No.04EX812)*, 2004, pp. 1–5.
- [7] M. Aldridge, O. Johnson, and J. Scarlett, "Group testing: an information theory perspective," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.06002*, 2019.
- [8] G. K. Atia and V. Saligrama, "Boolean compressed sensing and noisy group testing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1880–1901, 2012.
- [9] G. K. Atia, V. Saligrama, and C. Aksoylar, "Correction to "boolean compressed sensing and noisy group testing" [mar 12 1880-1901]," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 1507–1507, 2015.
- [10] G. Atia and V. Saligrama, "Noisy group testing: An information theoretic perspective," in *2009 47th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, 2009, pp. 355–362.
- [11] C. L. Chan, S. Jaggi, V. Saligrama, and S. Agnihotri, "Non-adaptive group testing: Explicit bounds and novel algorithms," in *2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings*, 2012, pp. 1837–1841.
- [12] C. Chan, P. H. Che, S. Jaggi, and V. Saligrama, "Non-adaptive probabilistic group testing with noisy measurements: Near-optimal bounds with efficient algorithms," *2011 49th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing, Allerton 2011*, 07 2011.
- [13] J. Robin and E. Erkip, "Capacity bounds and user identification costs in rayleigh-fading many-access channel," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 2477–2482.
- [14] J. Scarlett and O. Johnson, "Noisy non-adaptive group testing: A (near-)definite defectives approach," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 3775–3797, 2020.
- [15] D. Sejdinovic and O. Johnson, "Note on noisy group testing: Asymptotic bounds and belief propagation reconstruction," in *2010 48th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 998–1003.
- [16] A. Cohen, A. Cohen, and O. Gurewitz, "Efficient data collection over multiple access wireless sensors network," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 491–504, 2020.
- [17] Proakis, *Digital Communications 5th Edition*. McGraw Hill, 2007.
- [18] T. Yoo and A. Goldsmith, "On the optimality of multi-antenna broadcast scheduling using zero-forcing beamforming," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 528–541, 2006.
- [19] J. Kampeas, A. Cohen, and O. Gurewitz, "The ergodic capacity of the multiple access channel under distributed scheduling - order optimality of linear receivers," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 5898–5919, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2018.2807484>
- [20] —, "The capacity of the multiple access channel under distributed scheduling and mmse decoding," in *2014 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW 2014)*, 2014, pp. 491–495.
- [21] A. Goldsmith, *Wireless Communications*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [22] W. Rhee and J. Cioffi, "On the capacity of multiuser wireless channels with multiple antennas," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 2580–

- [23] I. E. Telatar, "Capacity of multi-antenna gaussian channels," *European Transactions on Telecommunications*, vol. 10, pp. 585–595, 1999.
- [24] D. Tse and P. Viswanath, *Fundamentals of Wireless Communication*. USA: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [25] S. M. Moser, P.-N. Chen, and H.-Y. Lin, "Error probability analysis of binary asymmetric channels," *Dept. El. & Comp. Eng., Nat. Chiao Tung Univ*, 2009.
- [26] D. M. Heath, "Wi-fi setup guide: What is a good signal level or signal-to-noise ratio (snr) for wi-fi?" Increase Broadband Speed — Tips to improve and speed up your broadband, July 18, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.increasebroadbandspeed.co.uk/what-is-a-good-signal-level-or-signal-to-noise-ratio-snr-for-wi-fi>
- [27] C. Cox, *Architecture of the LTE Air Interface*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2014, ch. 6, pp. 105–123. [Online]. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/97811188180>
- [28] V. Srinivasan and M. Viswanathan, *Wireless Communication Systems in Matlab: Second Edition (Black & White Print)*. Independently Published, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.co.il/books?id=2jrAzQEACAAJ>

### A. Proof of Theorems V.1 and V.2

Denote the number of users targeting the  $i^{\text{th}}$  antenna  $J_i$ . When each transmitter has a random codebook generated by i.i.d. coin tosses with probability  $p$  for '1',  $J_i \sim \text{Bin}(K, p)$ . By their definition,

$$q_{01} = \mathbb{P}(|[y]_i|^2 \geq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i = 0) \quad (27)$$

$$q_{10} = \mathbb{P}(|[y]_i|^2 \leq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i \geq 1) \quad (28)$$

Before calculating the error probabilities, we would like to introduce a helpful lemma about the distribution of  $|[y]_i|^2 | J_i$ :

**Lemma A.1.** *Assume each transmitter uses ZFBF with no optimizations to the power allocation. Then:*

$$|[y]_i|^2 | J_i \sim \text{Exp}\left(\frac{1}{J_i \cdot P + N_0}\right)$$

*Proof.* Each transmitter uses ZFBF by taking an arbitrary normalized vector from the nullspace of their channel matrix, corresponding to the zeros in their codeword. Afterward, the vector is amplified by  $\sqrt{P}$ . Hence, from the rotational invariance of the CGRVs, each user contributes a zero-mean  $P$ -variance CGRV. Since all users are independent and  $J_i$  users target the  $i^{\text{th}}$  antenna, these RVs are i.i.d. and summed with the additive noise. As a result,  $[y]_i$  is a CGRV as a linear combination of CGRVs. I.e.,  $[y]_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, J_i \cdot P + N_0)$ . By the Random Variable Transformation Theorem, we obtain the desired result.

For completeness, we attach the full calculation; Denote  $\sigma^2 = \frac{J_i \cdot P + N_0}{2}$ .  $[y]_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 2\sigma^2)$ , so  $\Re([y]_i) \stackrel{d}{=} \Im([y]_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ . We are interested in the distribution of  $W \triangleq |[y]_i|^2 = \Re([y]_i)^2 + \Im([y]_i)^2$ . The proof has two steps - first, we calculate  $Z \triangleq \sqrt{W}$ 's CDF. Then, we show that  $W \sim \text{Exp}(\frac{1}{2\sigma^2})$  by the Random Variable Transformation Theorem:

$$F_Z(z) = \mathbb{P}(Z \leq z) \quad (29)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{\Re([y]_i)^2 + \Im([y]_i)^2} \leq z\right) \quad (30)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \iint_{\sqrt{x^2+y^2} \leq z} \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2} \exp\left\{-\frac{x^2+y^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} dx dy \quad (31)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \int_0^z \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{r}{2\pi\sigma^2} \exp\left\{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} d\theta dr \quad (32)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \int_0^z \frac{r}{\sigma^2} \exp\left\{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} dr \quad (33)$$

In (a), we recalled that  $\Re([y]_i)$  and  $\Im([y]_i)$  are independent from the definition of CGRV, so they are jointly Gaussian. In (b), we changed the integration variables from  $x$  and  $y$  to  $r \cos \theta$  and  $r \sin \theta$ , respectively. The Jacobian, in this case, is  $r$ . Step (c) is justified by noticing that the integrand is not a function of  $\theta$ .

By deriving the CDF, we obtain that  $Z$ 's PDF is:

$$f_Z(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{z}{\sigma^2} \cdot e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\sigma^2}} & z \geq 0 \\ 0 & z < 0 \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

When  $w < 0$ , there is no solution to  $w = z^2$  (as a function of  $z$ ). Hence,  $f_W(w) = 0$  for any  $w < 0$ . In any other case,  $z = \pm\sqrt{w}$ . Now we are ready to calculate  $W$ 's PDF:

$$f_W(w) \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{f_Z(-\sqrt{w})}{\left|\frac{\partial w}{\partial z}\right|} + \frac{f_Z(\sqrt{w})}{\left|\frac{\partial w}{\partial z}\right|} \quad (35)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{w}} (f_Z(-\sqrt{w}) + f_Z(\sqrt{w})) \quad (36)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{w}} \left( \frac{\sqrt{w}}{\sigma^2} \cdot e^{-\frac{w}{2\sigma^2}} + 0 \right) \quad (37)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \cdot e^{-\frac{w}{2\sigma^2}} \quad (38)$$

Step (a) is the Random Variable Transformation Theorem. In step (b), we calculate  $\left|\frac{\partial w}{\partial z}\right| = 2|z| = 2\sqrt{w}$ . We substituted (34) in step (c). Finally,  $W$ 's PDF is given by:

$$f_W(w) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \cdot e^{-\frac{w}{2\sigma^2}} & w \geq 0 \\ 0 & w < 0 \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

Which is the PDF of an exponentially distributed random variable with parameter  $\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}$ . I.e.,  $[y]_i^2 \sim \text{Exp}\left(\frac{1}{J_i \cdot P + N_0}\right)$ .  $\square$

Now, we can straightforwardly calculate the crossover probabilities, starting with  $q_{01}$ :

$$q_{01} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{P}(|[y]_i|^2 \geq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i = 0) \quad (40)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \int_{N_0 \cdot \gamma}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N_0} e^{-\frac{t}{N_0}} dt \quad (41)$$

$$= e^{-\gamma} \quad (42)$$

Transition (a) used (27), whereas (b) used lemma A.1. Calculating  $q_{10}$ :

lating  $q_{10}$ :

$$q_{10} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{P}(|[y]_i|^2 \leq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i \geq 1) \quad (43)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{J_i \geq 1} [\mathbb{P}(|[y]_i|^2 \leq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i) \mid J_i] \quad (44)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \cdot \mathbb{P}(|y_i|^2 \leq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i = j) \quad (45)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ -\frac{N_0 \cdot \gamma}{j \cdot P + N_0} \right\} \right) \quad (46)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1} \right\} \right) \quad (47)$$

In (a), we used (28) and (b) used the Smoothing Theorem. In (c), we write the conditional expectation explicitly. Note that the term  $\frac{1}{1 - (1-p)^K}$  is used to convert the event  $J_i \geq 1$  into a proper probability measure. Step (d) used lemma A.1. The last step normalized the term inside the exponent by  $N_0$  defining  $\rho \triangleq \frac{P}{N_0}$ .

## B. Proof of Theorem V.4

$$p_{MD} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} K \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_1 = i) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_1 < \mathcal{T}_1(1 - q_{10}(\Delta + 1))) \quad (48)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} K \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_1 < i(1 - q_{10}(\Delta + 1))) \quad (49)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} K \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} \quad (50)$$

$$\cdot \sum_{l=i-i(1-q_{10}(\Delta+1))}^i \binom{i}{l} q_{10}^l (1-q_{10})^{i-l} \leq K \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} \cdot e^{-2i(q_{10}\Delta)^2} \quad (51)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} K \cdot (1-p + pe^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2})^{M_r} \quad (52)$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{=} K \cdot \exp \left\{ -p(1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2}) \right\}^{M_r} \quad (53)$$

$$= K \cdot \exp \left\{ -M_r \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2}) \right\} \quad (54)$$

In (a), we used the union bound. (b) is derived from the random codebook construction where  $\mathcal{S}_1 \sim \text{Bin}(M_r, p)$ . In

(c), we used the fact that the local decision rule is identical among the antennas, so the probability for bit flips is symmetric (the number of flipped bits is binomially distributed with parameters  $M_r, q_{10}$ ). Additionally, we used the binomial distribution's symmetry<sup>11</sup>. We used Hoeffding bound<sup>12</sup>,  $F(k; n, p) \leq \exp\{-2n(p - \frac{k}{n})^2\}$  and  $p - \frac{k}{n} > 0$ , in (d). (e) used the binomial theorem to combine the sum of products into a power of a sum. In (f) we used the Taylor Expansion of  $\exp\{-x(1-a)\}$  at  $x_0 = 0$ .

### C. Proof of Theorem V.5

$$p_{FA} \leq (N - K) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_1 = i) \quad (55)$$

$$\cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_1 \geq \mathcal{T}_1(1 - q_{10}(\Delta + 1)))$$

$$= (N - K) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} \quad (56)$$

$$\cdot \sum_{l=i(1-q_{10}(\Delta+1))}^i \binom{i}{l} p_l^i (1-p_1)^{i-l}$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} (N - K) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} \quad (57)$$

$$\cdot e^{-2i(1-p_1-q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2}$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} (N - K) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} e^{-2i(p_0-q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2} \quad (58)$$

$$= (N - K) \cdot (1 - p + pe^{-2(p_0-q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2})^{M_r} \quad (59)$$

$$\leq (N - K) \cdot \exp\left\{-M_r \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(p_0-q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2})\right\} \quad (60)$$

In (a) we used Hoeffding bound like in the proof of Theorem V.4, which is applicable due to  $\Delta < \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$ . We replace  $1 - p_1 = p_0$  in (b). Any other transition is identical to the proof of Theorem V.4.

<sup>11</sup>  $F(k; n, p) = F(n - k; n, 1 - p)$

<sup>12</sup> often called Chernoff bound

### D. Proof of Theorem V.6

$$p_{MD} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} K \cdot \exp\left\{-M_r \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2})\right\} \quad (61)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} K \cdot \exp\left\{-\beta_1 \cdot K \log N \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2})\right\} \quad (62)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} K \exp\left\{-\frac{(\frac{\ln K}{\ln N} + \delta)K \log N \cdot p(1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2})}{\alpha(1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2}) \log e}\right\} \quad (63)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} K \exp\left\{-\frac{(\frac{\ln K}{\ln N} + \delta) \cdot K \log N \cdot \frac{\alpha}{K}}{\alpha \log e}\right\} \quad (64)$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{=} K \exp\{-\ln K - \delta \cdot \ln N\} \quad (65)$$

$$\stackrel{(f)}{=} K \cdot K^{-1} \cdot N^{-\delta} = N^{-\delta} \quad (66)$$

(a) used Theorem V.4. In (b), we utilized Theorem V.6's conditions. (c) replaced  $\beta_1$  with its lower bound (from the theorem's conditions), and in (d), we reduced the fraction and replaced  $p = \frac{\alpha}{K}$ . (e) used algebraic manipulation using logarithmic identities, and (f) used the logarithm's definition.

### E. Proof of Theorem V.7

$$p_{FA} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} (N - K) \exp\left\{-M_r \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(p_0-q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2})\right\} \quad (67)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} (N - K) \exp\left\{-\beta_2 K \log N \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(p_0-q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2})\right\} \quad (68)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} (N - K) \exp\left\{-\frac{(\frac{\ln(N-K)}{\ln N} + \delta)K \log N \cdot p}{\alpha(1 - e^{-2(p_0-q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2}) \log e}\right\} \quad (69)$$

$$\cdot (1 - e^{-2(p_0-q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2}) \quad (70)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} (N - K) \cdot \exp\{-\ln(N - K) - \delta \ln N\} = N^{-\delta}$$

In (a) we used theorem V.5. In both (b) and (c) we used theorem V.7's conditions. The rest is similar to the proof of theorem V.6.

### F. Proof of Theorem V.8

First, we will convert the problem in (25) to a minimization problem by removing the dependence on  $\Delta$ :

**Lemma A.2.** *The objective function in (25) can be re-written as follows:*

$$\frac{(1 + \delta) \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{10}-q_{01})^2\})}$$

*Proof.* Derive  $\beta_i$  by  $\Delta$ :

$$\frac{\partial \beta_1}{\partial \Delta} = -\frac{4q_{10}^2 e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2} \Delta}{(\cdot)^2} \leq 0 \quad \forall \Delta \geq 0 \quad (71)$$

$$\frac{\partial \beta_2}{\partial \Delta} = \frac{4q_{10} e^{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2} (p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))}{(\cdot)^2} \quad (72)$$

The last term is non-negative as long as  $\Delta \leq \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$ . Hence,  $\beta_1$  decrease with  $\Delta$  whereas  $\beta_2$  increase in  $\Delta$ . In other words, the minimax problem would pick the equalizer:

$$\Delta^* = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1 \right) \quad (73)$$

Putting  $\Delta^*$  back into  $\beta_1 = \beta_2$  results in the following:

$$q_{10} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1 \right) = \frac{1}{2} (p_0 - q_{10}) \quad (74)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} (1-p)^K (1 - q_{01} - q_{10}) \quad (75)$$

The last transition used lemma V.3.  $\square$

We shall henceforth name the objective function  $\beta = (1 + \delta) \cdot \beta(\gamma, \alpha)$ . Now, we shall prove that the solution must be an interior point of the rectangle  $[0, \frac{K}{2}] \times [0, \infty)$ :

**Lemma A.3.** *All strong inequalities in (25) can be written with weak inequalities.*

*Proof.* We'll show that each time some variable meets its strong inequality then either  $\beta_1 \rightarrow \infty$  or  $\beta_2 \rightarrow \infty$ . When  $\gamma = 0$ ,  $q_{10} = 0$  and  $\beta_1 \rightarrow \infty$ . The same occurs when  $\Delta = 0$ . When  $\Delta = \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$  then  $\beta_2 \rightarrow \infty$ . When  $\alpha = 0$  both  $\beta_i \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, we can replace the strong inequalities with weak inequalities as we do not introduce new solutions to the optimization problem.  $\square$

We are left with proving that  $\alpha = \frac{K}{2}$  is not a solution to the optimization problem. To do this, we show that there always is an interior point with a lower objective value. Hence, we define the following two quantities:

**Definition 2.** *For any fixed  $p$ , we define  $\gamma_1$  to be the solution to:*

$$e^{-\gamma} = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1}$$

**Definition 3.** *Let  $\gamma_2$  be the solution to:*

$$e^{-\gamma} = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1}$$

We want to show that  $\gamma_1$ , as an interior point, has a lower objective function than  $\gamma_2$ , a point on the boundary.

**Lemma A.4.**  *$\beta(\gamma_1)$  is increasing in  $\gamma_1$ , where  $\gamma_1$  is as defined in definition 2.*

*Proof.* Putting  $\gamma_1$  in  $g(\gamma, p) \triangleq (1 - q_{01} - q_{10})$  yields:

$$g(\gamma_1, p) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \cdot \left( \quad (76)$$

$$\frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} + 1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\} \right) \\ = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{j\rho \cdot \exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (77)$$

$g(\gamma_1(p), p)$  is a sum of non-negative numbers, so  $g(\gamma_1, p) \geq 0$ . Furthermore,  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \gamma_1} \leq 0$ . Observe  $\beta$ 's derivative with respect to  $\gamma_1$ :

$$\frac{\partial \beta(\gamma_1)}{\partial \gamma_1} = -\frac{(1-p)^{2K} e^{(\cdot)} g(\gamma_1) \cdot \frac{\partial g}{\partial \gamma_1}}{\alpha \cdot (\cdot)^2} \geq 0 \quad \forall \alpha > 0 \quad (78)$$

$\square$

**Lemma A.5.**

$$e^{-\gamma_1} \geq \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (79)$$

*With equality if and only if  $p = 0.5$ .*

*Proof.* Observing  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(p)$ , we have  $\gamma_2 = \gamma_1(0.5)$ .

$$e^{-\gamma_1} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (80)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor} \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (81)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor - 1} \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1}$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor} \binom{K}{j} \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (82)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor - 1} \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1}$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor} \binom{K}{j} \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (83)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor - 1} \binom{K}{j} \left( \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} - \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \right)$$

$$\cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1}$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{\geq} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor} \binom{K}{j} \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (84)$$

In (a) we used definition 2. We separated the sum in (b), and used  $p$ 's limited range ( $p \in [0, 1]$ ) in (c). We have added and subtracted the same term in (d), whereas in (e), we discarded non-negative terms due to  $p$ 's range. If  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ , then we have equality from definition 3.  $\square$

**Corollary A.6.**  $\beta(\gamma_2) \geq \beta(\gamma_1)$

*Proof.*  $\gamma_2$  is the maximizer of the lower bound in lemma A.5. In other words:

$$e^{-\gamma_1} \geq e^{-\gamma_2} \quad (85)$$

By taking  $\ln(\cdot)$  from both sides we have  $\gamma_2 \geq \gamma_1$ . Using lemma A.4 gives us the desired result.  $\square$

Now, after showing that the solution must be an interior point, we are ready to show that a solution exists:

**Lemma A.7.** *The objective function in lemma A.2 is convex in  $\gamma$ .*

*Proof.*  $\beta(\gamma)$  is convex in  $\gamma$  if and only if:

$$2 \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \gamma} \right)^2 - f(\gamma) \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \gamma^2} \geq 0 \quad (86)$$

By dividing by non-zero positive quantities, the above condition is simplified to:

$$\left( e^{\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2} + 1 \right) \cdot (1-p)^{2K} \cdot (1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2 \quad (87)$$

$$\cdot \left( \frac{\partial q_{01}}{\partial \gamma} + \frac{\partial q_{10}}{\partial \gamma} \right)^2 + \left( e^{\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2} - 1 \right)$$

$$\cdot \left[ (1-q_{01}-q_{10}) \left( \frac{\partial^2 q_{01}}{\partial \gamma^2} + \frac{\partial^2 q_{10}}{\partial \gamma^2} \right) - \left( \frac{\partial q_{01}}{\partial \gamma} + \frac{\partial q_{10}}{\partial \gamma} \right)^2 \right] \geq 0$$

Rearranging both sides results in:

$$\left( \frac{\partial q_{01}}{\partial \gamma} + \frac{\partial q_{10}}{\partial \gamma} \right)^2 \cdot \left[ \frac{e^{\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2} + 1}{e^{\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2} - 1} \right. \quad (88)$$

$$\cdot (1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2 - 1 \left. \right] \geq$$

$$(1-q_{01}-q_{10}) \left( -\frac{\partial^2 q_{10}}{\partial \gamma^2} - \frac{\partial^2 q_{01}}{\partial \gamma^2} \right)$$

The LHS of (88) is non-negative (as  $\frac{e^{0.5x} + 1}{e^{0.5x} - 1} \cdot x \geq 4$ ). The RHS is a multiplication of a non-negative term with a non-positive one:

$$-\frac{\partial^2 q_{10}}{\partial \gamma^2} = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{(j\rho+1)^2} \quad (89)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 q_{01}}{\partial \gamma^2} = e^{-\gamma} = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot e^{-\gamma} \quad (90)$$

Hence:

$$\left( -\frac{\partial^2 q_{10}}{\partial \gamma^2} - \frac{\partial^2 q_{01}}{\partial \gamma^2} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \quad (91)$$

$$\cdot \left( \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{(j\rho+1)^2} - e^{-\gamma} \right)$$

This is a weighted sum of elements of the forms:

$$\frac{e^{-\frac{a}{x+1}}}{(x+1)^2} - e^{-a} \quad (92)$$

$$\frac{e^{-\frac{x}{a+1}}}{(a+1)^2} - e^{-x} \quad (93)$$

Where (92) describes the difference as a function of  $\rho$  and (93) describes it as a function of  $\gamma$ . In both cases, if  $a \geq 0$ , the terms are non-positive. In other words, (88) is always true so the objective function is convex in  $\gamma$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem V.8.* We shall invoke the KKT conditions. Lemma A.3 proves that all Lagrange Multipliers are nulled except for the multiplier of the constraint  $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , or equivalently

$\alpha \leq \frac{K}{2}$  (Complementary Slackness). Hence, the Lagrangian's gradient is:

$$\nabla L(\gamma, p, \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial \gamma} \\ \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial p} + \lambda \end{bmatrix} = \underline{0} \quad (94)$$

If  $\lambda \neq 0$ , then  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\gamma^* = \gamma_2$ . If  $\lambda = 0$ , then  $p \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . According to corollary A.6  $\lambda = 0$ , so  $(\gamma^*, p^*)$  must be an interior point. Lemma A.7 shows that  $\gamma^*$  is unique, so the optimization problem becomes one-dimensional in  $p$ . The interval  $[0, 0.5]$  is closed and  $\beta$  is continuous, so a global minimum  $p^*$  exists.  $\square$

### G. Proof of Lemma V.9

We note that by the famous limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \frac{x}{n})^n = e^{-x}$  we have:

$$\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{K}\right)^{2K} \rightarrow e^{-2\alpha} \quad (95)$$

We remind that  $K \cdot p = \alpha$ . Therefore, whether  $\beta$  tends to a constant depends on the limit:

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} q_{10} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \quad (96)$$

$$\cdot \left(1 - \exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1}\right\}\right) \stackrel{(b)}{=} 1 - \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \quad (97)$$

$$\cdot \exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1}\right\} \stackrel{(c)}{=} 1 - \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1 - (1-p)^K} \quad (98)$$

$$\cdot \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} p^j (1-p)^{K-j} \exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1}\right\} \stackrel{(d)}{=} 1 - \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\alpha}} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha} \frac{\alpha^j}{j!} \exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1}\right\} \quad (99)$$

Where step (a) replaced  $q_{10}$  with its exact expression from Theorem V.2. Steps (b) and (c) used the Limit Sum and Product Laws, respectively. The final step, (d), used Poisson Limit Theorem and the famous limit.

Combining (95) and (99) with Theorem V.8 when  $K \rightarrow \infty$  results in an optimization problem independent of  $K$  (or  $N$ ), completing the proof.

### H. Proof of Lemma V.10

When  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ , the exponents in Theorem V.2 tend to  $e^{-\gamma}$ . Hence,  $q_{10} \rightarrow 1 - q_{01}$  when  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ , resulting in  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ .

When  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , the exponents in Theorem V.2 tend to 1, so  $q_{10} \rightarrow 0$ . Since the rest of the parameters are unaffected by  $\rho$ ,  $\beta$ 's limit is a constant (with respect to  $\rho$ ).

### I. Proof of Theorem VI.1

Denote  $\tilde{\underline{Y}}$  as the noiseless  $\underline{Y}$ . It is the column-wise Boolean sum of the  $K$  transmitted codewords. Let  $\mathcal{W} \in \{1, 2, \dots, \binom{N}{K}\}$  be the index of the set corresponding to the  $K$  users. The codewords corresponding to  $\mathcal{W}$  are  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{W})$ . Observe that we can treat  $\underline{Y}$  as an output of some discrete channel whose input is  $\tilde{\underline{Y}}$ . The characteristics of said discrete channel depend on the continuous channel (in the original MIMO settings). Notice the following Markov Chain:

$$\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{W}) \rightarrow \tilde{\underline{Y}} \rightarrow \underline{Y} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{\mathcal{W}}) \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{W}} \quad (100)$$

I.e., the  $K$  users, their corresponding codewords, the "clean" Boolean sum, the noisy output vector, the estimated codewords, and estimated users form a Markov Chain. Using the definition of mutual information, we have:

$$H(\mathcal{W}) = H(\mathcal{W}|\hat{\mathcal{W}}) + I(\mathcal{W}; \hat{\mathcal{W}}) \quad (101)$$

We assume we have no prior information on the  $K$  users, so  $\mathcal{W}$  is uniform on  $\{1, 2, \dots, \binom{N}{K}\}$ . This is equivalent to  $H(\mathcal{W}) = \log \binom{N}{K}$ . Using Fano's Inequality, we have:

$$H(\mathcal{W}|\hat{\mathcal{W}}) \leq 1 + p_e \cdot \log \binom{N}{K} \quad (102)$$

We have the following chain of inequalities:

$$I(\mathcal{W}; \hat{\mathcal{W}}) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I(\tilde{\underline{Y}}; \underline{Y}) \quad (103)$$

$$= H(\underline{Y}) - H(\underline{Y}|\tilde{\underline{Y}}) \quad (104)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} H(\underline{Y}) - \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} H([\underline{Y}]_m | [\underline{Y}]_1, \dots, [\underline{Y}]_{m-1}, \tilde{\underline{Y}}) \quad (105)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} H([\underline{Y}]_m) - \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} H([\underline{Y}]_m | [\tilde{\underline{Y}}]_m) \quad (106)$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} [H([\underline{Y}]_m) - H([\underline{Y}]_m | [\tilde{\underline{Y}}]_m)] \quad (107)$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} I([\tilde{\underline{Y}}]_m; [\underline{Y}]_m) \quad (108)$$

$$\leq M_r \cdot \text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10})) \quad (109)$$

(a) is valid due to the Data Processing Inequality. In (b), we have used the Entropy Chain Rule, whereas in (c), we used

the fact that  $[\tilde{Y}]_m$  ( $[Y]_m$ ) is independent of  $[\tilde{Y}]_k$  ( $[Y]_k$ ) for all  $m \neq k$ . Now, we can put (109) and (102) into (101):

$$\log \binom{N}{K} \leq 1 + p_e \cdot \log \binom{N}{K} + M_r \cdot \text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10})) \quad (110)$$

Rearranging both sides results in:

$$M_r \geq \frac{(1 - p_e) \cdot \log \binom{N}{K} - 1}{\text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))} \quad (111)$$

Using Stirling's Approximation, we can write:

$$M_r \geq \frac{(1 - p_e) \cdot K \log \frac{N}{K}}{\text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))} \quad (112)$$