Integrated Communication, Localization, and Sensing in 6G D-MIMO Networks

Hao Guo, Henk Wymeersch, Behrooz Makki, Hui Chen, Yibo Wu, Giuseppe Durisi, Musa Furkan Keskin, Mohammad H. Moghaddam, Charitha Madapatha, Han Yu, Peter Hammarberg, Hyowon Kim, and Tommy Svensson

Abstract—Future generations of mobile networks call for concurrent sensing and communication functionalities in the same hardware and/or spectrum. Compared to communication, sensing services often suffer from limited coverage, due to the high path loss of the reflected signal and the increased infrastructure requirements. To provide a more uniform quality of service, distributed multiple input multiple output (D-MIMO) systems deploy a large number of distributed nodes and efficiently control them, making distributed integrated sensing and communications (ISAC) possible. In this paper, we investigate ISAC in D-MIMO through the lens of different design architectures and deployments, revealing both conflicts and synergies. In addition, simulation and demonstration results reveal both opportunities and challenges towards the implementation of ISAC in D-MIMO.

Index Terms—6G, Integrated sensing and communication (ISAC), D-MIMO, testbed, sensing, MIMO, localization.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the success of multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO), it is expected that multi-antenna technologies will evolve in beyond-5G systems, either in a centralized or a distributed way. In the centralized case, the access points (APs) or user equipments (UEs) will be equipped with an even larger number of antennas. In the distributed case, also referred to as distributed MIMO (D-MIMO), multiple multi-antenna APs with potentially different capabilities will cooperate to serve the UEs [1]. D-MIMO is considered as a key element in the 6th generation of mobile communications [2]. Unlike conventional MIMO, where multiple antennas are concentrated at a single location, the distributed architecture of D-MIMO facilitates a new level of spatial diversity and cooperative communication with a degree of freedom that enables, e.g., blockage avoidance and increased link margin despite per node output power limitations, leading to high reliability and availability as well as uniform service over the coverage area [3]. Moreover, by spreading antennas across different locations, D-MIMO offers inherent advantages in terms of, e.g., coverage, spectrum efficiency, and energy efficiency. The cooperative nature of D-MIMO also enables the network to adapt more dynamically to channel variations, ensuring efficient use of resources and mitigating the impact of fading or other impairments, at the cost of more complicated backhaul/fronthaul structures [4].

With these promising features, D-MIMO can be an attractive solution for so-called integrated sensing and communication (ISAC), where the same hardware and/or frequency bands are used to perform these functionalities in a distributed and cooperative way [5]. Specifically, sensing includes mono-static and multi-static modes of operation, enabling services such as user localization, object detection and tracking, or gesture recognition, which build on these fundamental sensing modes.

Traditionally, radar sensing and communication have operated in separate frequency bands using dedicated hardware. However, with 5G and beyond, the wireless communication bands are merging with radar bands, such as millimeter-wave (mmWave) and the sub-THz bands foreseen for 6G. This merging has fueled the research on integrating communication, localization, and sensing functionalities within the same system, which can offer several benefits. One major advantage of ISAC is centralized resource allocation and interference management for all functionalities, leading to cost-efficient operations. With D-MIMO's distributed node characteristics, more flexibility is provided in resource allocation, including time, frequency, space, and energy, across sensing, localization, and communication signals. Additionally, integrating sensing into the existing communication infrastructure reduces the cost significantly compared to deploying a separate sensing network. Moreover, leveraging multiple multi-antenna nodes increases the likelihood of line-of-sight (LOS) links and provides the network with multiple perspectives on UEs/objects, thereby enhancing localization and sensing performance. The implementation of ISAC also brings benefits to D-MIMO networks. Specifically, localization and sensing (L&S) enhance the network's radio environment comprehension, such as detecting blockages [3]. This knowledge simplifies backhaul/fronthaul designs and reduces coordination overheads, as only APs with strong links to UEs/objects need to collaborate.

Despite a large body of research on D-MIMO communication and also on distributed radar, few studies on ISAC D-MIMO have been conducted. For instance, with proper optimization, ISAC beamforming can reach similar performance as sensing-prioritized and communication-prioritized systems [5]. It is also shown that one can deploy a cloud radio access network architecture to facilitate centralized ISAC processing of all APs [6]. In [7], a downlink D-MIMO system is studied from a positioning perspective. However, no previous study has provided a comprehensive vision of ISAC in D-MIMO systems and an analysis of the key challenges and opportunities of ISAC in D-MIMO.

In this paper, we investigate the potentials and challenges of D-MIMO networks providing ISAC operations, referred to as ISAC D-MIMO. As illustrated in Fig. 1, we assume that a set of cooperative multi-antenna APs with different

2



Fig. 1. Illustration of the ISAC functionalities in D-MIMO systems with key network components as well as different architectural options and characteristics of deployment scenarios. Acronyms: user equipment (UE), access point (AP), central unit (CU). Icons designed by Freepik.

capabilities perform communication, localization, and sensing jointly, possibly within the same spectrum resources. We introduce the architecture requirements of ISAC D-MIMO networks and present the key open problems to be addressed in such distributed multi-functional networks. Also, simulation results, as well as initial testbed evaluations, are presented. As demonstrated, the distributed and cooperative characteristics of D-MIMO networks enable efficient joint communication, localization, and sensing, with reduced coordination requirements. We reveal that there are still multiple open problems to be addressed before such systems can be implemented in practice.

II. DEPLOYMENTS AND ARCHITECTURES OF D-MIMO NETWORKS

In this section, we present the deployment and architecture options for D-MIMO networks. This also provides the basis for the architecture options of ISAC D-MIMO to be discussed in Section III.

Figure 1 illustrates ISAC functionalities in D-MIMO systems along the different architectural options and characteristics of deployment scenarios. A desirable D-MIMO architecture is scalable, adaptive, and compatible with the current network standards allowing for seamless addition/removal of APs¹ with minimal network impact. Compatibility with legacy macro sites is also crucial, enabling efficient resource use and interference management while ensuring minimal impact on legacy UEs. A further exploration into each deployment and architectural option follows.

First of all, D-MIMO is of interest in both indoor and outdoor deployments, with different use cases, objectives, and different kinds of connection options between the APs. A possible use case is critical communications for indoor scenarios, e.g., in factories, warehouses, and offices, with support for dense machine-type communication or extended reality applications. In dense urban area scenarios, e.g., in airports, stadiums, public squares, outdoor D-MIMO could still boost the capacity, where necessary, and provide coverage regardless of the site location and/or UE mobility. Additionally, a deployment with low visual footprints is desirable; radio stripes [8] are a candidate technology because they offer the possibility to hide the installation in existing infrastructure.

Second, taking different deployment options into account, D-MIMO is expected to support the spectrum ranging from sub-6 GHz to high bands. At low bands, e.g., frequency range 1 (FR1), D-MIMO can improve the spectral efficiency (SE) via, e.g., coherent joint transmission (CJT), which can also improve the sensing performance due to phase-coherent operation. At higher bands, e.g., frequency range 2 (FR2) and beyond, D-MIMO can be used to improve the reliability/availability of the access links to the UEs, thanks to macro-diversity against blockers and the large available bandwidth resulting in high data rates even with low SE. More specifically, the macro-diversity provided by D-MIMO makes it possible to provide LOS link(s) to the UEs and reduce the effect of high penetration loss especially at high bands. These LOS links are required for many L&S applications.

Third, for both centralized and distributed processing, the fronthaul (between the central unit (CU) and AP) and the backhaul (between CU and network) requirements depend on the number of UEs, the deployment of CUs/APs, their processing capabilities, and the supported operation modes of

¹The terminology AP in this paper may represent different levels of capability in the network implementation. For a more comprehensive terminology, please refer to [2]

the D-MIMO network. The goal is to reduce the required processing at the nodes close to the UEs, reducing their cost, complexity, and simplifying deployment, which in turn increases the fronthaul/backhaul traffic. Also, it is interesting to note that the processing at higher frequency bands, desirable for communications, makes the hardware (e.g., converters) more power-hungry. As a result, a large part of the processing functionalities may be moved to the CUs instead of the APs, at the cost of fronthaul/backhaul traffic. At low frequencies, on the other hand, processing can be performed at the APs, resulting in low fronthaul/backhaul requirements. The operation modes, ranging from CJT with centralized processing (having highest efficiency and fronthaul/backhaul requirement) to non-CJT with duplicated data in each AP (having lowest efficiency and fronthaul/backhaul requirement), depend on the considered use cases. Within fronthaul/backhaul transport, the focus is on different lower-layer split options balancing AP and fronthaul complexity, cost, and capacity, while achieving high performance.

Fourth, the fronthaul/backhaul transport medium is expected to be based on a combination of fiber and wireless for both communication and L&S. Fiber is preferred, when feasible, while wireless fronthaul/backhaul provides increased flexibility and short time-to-market. Here, the so-called integrated access and backhaul (IAB) [9], with the access and backhaul connections provided in the same node, is a candidate solution with flexible access/fronthaul/backhaul resource allocation capability.

Fifth, full-duplex operations may improve communication performance, compared to half-duplex systems using, e.g., dynamic time division duplex. Full-duplex also enables monostatic sensing, similar to some conventional radars. To integrate sensing, localization, and communication, full-duplex operation, or very short downlink (DL)/uplink (UL) switching delays, could potentially be beneficial. However, in practice, self-interference cancellation is challenging, since, in general, more than 100 dB isolation may be required, which imposes strict hardware capability requirements. However, proper deployment of antenna panels and/or beamforming can partly reduce the effect of self-interference, and dense deployment of D-MIMO APs will substantially lower the power difference of the transmitted/received signals.

The sixth and final architectural option relates to phase synchronization in D-MIMO, which enables the alignment of signal phases across multiple distributed antennas, i.e., establishing *phase coherence*. This ensures that signals combine constructively at the APs and UEs to achieve the desired array gain. Phase synchronization is essential for CJT and it is easier to achieve at low frequencies. It is likely that, at least in the early roll-outs of D-MIMO, non-coherent transmission will be considered at high frequencies for both communication and L&S. On the other hand, at low frequencies, over-the-air calibration methods can be applied to enable phase-aligned reciprocity-based beamforming across APs.

III. A MULTI-FUNCTIONAL VIEW OF D-MIMO

Based on the D-MIMO architectures and deployments described in Section II, in this section, we discuss how communication, localization, and sensing tasks can be accomplished and how these services can benefit from D-MIMO.

A. D-MIMO from a Communication Perspective

Some of the opportunities and challenges of D-MIMO for communications are as follows:

- *Indoor and outdoor considerations:* With the key idea of planning the network around the user rather than the cell, D-MIMO is more desired for indoor communications with high-quality performance requirements from a high density of UEs. In contrast to deploying massive MIMO APs outdoors and boosting the performance with spatial multiplexing and beamforming, indoor D-MIMO is applied to realize a logical "array" with APs equipped with a small number of antennas to improve the capacity and throughput.
- Operational bands: One opportunity for D-MIMO is multiband operations where, for instance, depending on the traffic model, service requirement, etc., some APs may operate at low or high bands for different purposes. For instance, assume a highway scenario with a large number of vehicles at low speeds in the morning, and few vehicles at high speeds during the night. In this situation, the network experiences diverse quality-of-service requirements, sensing/communication priorities, etc., during the day. Here, the presence of multiple nodes gives flexibility for multi-band operation.
- *Centralized and distributed processing:* Distributed or centralized processing is based on the APs capabilities. For instance, depending on the operational frequency, their associated processing can be in the CUs or APs. Distributed antenna deployment provides broader resource trade-off options based on local data traffic and nodes' deployment. Moreover, the existence of multiple nodes opens opportunities for preventing service outages and reducing self-interference, through optimized deployment and coordinated beamforming techniques.
- Fronthaul and backhaul: Wireless fronthaul/backhaul is preferred outdoors with low cost and fast deployment, whereas wired fronthaul/backhaul could be more beneficial indoors with improved reliability and capacity. Also, at higher operation bands, wireless deployment is preferred with less restricted synchronization requirements. Moreover, some benefits provided by the architecture of fronthaul/backhaul in D-MIMO networks include:
 - Cooperative communications. Here, the presence of fronthaul/backhaul helps the nodes to have multiple views on the UE/object which improves the channel state information (CSI) quality significantly; see Fig. 3 as an example.
 - Multi-band operation. Here, the nodes can operate in different bands, obtain information, and then share them via fronthaul/backhaul. This is advantageous in terms of interference mitigation and resource allocation.
 - Scalability. Different protocol layers should support the scalability requirements where, similarly as in IAB networks [9], as long as a node is properly connected to its "parent" node(s), it does not need to be connected (in terms of management) to the rest of the network, since

the parent node implements the control functions. Also, while some long-term management may be handled by the CU(s), a large part of the dynamic decisions of each UE can be handled by its serving AP(s).

- *Half- and Full-duplex:* Theoretically, full-duplex is preferred for communication because it almost doubles the SE; however, the existing problem with self-interference at the AP, i.e., the interference between the transmit and receive antenna arrays, could reduce the expected SE gains significantly. In D-MIMO systems, full-duplex could provide more flexibility in terms of, e.g., channel estimation and interference coordination.
- Coherent and non-coherent processing: Coherent-phase synchronization refers to the process of aligning the phase of the signals transmitted or received by different APs. This alignment is crucial in coherent D-MIMO systems because it ensures that the signals from different APs interfere constructively, maximizing the signal strength at the receiver. Time synchronization, on the other hand, ensures that the signal arrivals from different antennas are synchronized in time, which is essential for decoding the signals correctly, especially in systems employing advanced signal processing techniques like beamforming. Non-coherent processing has a lower cost and might be sufficient for narrow beams and spatial multiflow, while coherent processing could improve the reliability at the cost of increased complexity.

B. D-MIMO from a Localization and Sensing Perspective

In the D-MIMO context, sensing can rely on DL or UL pilots. UL pilots are more compatible with standard D-MIMO processing, as they are used for channel estimation and reciprocity-based DL precoding. On the other hand, orthogonal DL pilots are preferred since they can allow the same pilots to be reused efficiently for all UEs. APs can receive and process DL transmissions from other APs, (providing opportunities for bi- and multi-static sensing) or from themselves (for monostatic sensing). In terms of localization, both UEs and APs may need to be localized, where the latter type can be seen as a calibration (e.g., when a new AP is added to an existing system).

With this background, we can now consider the architectural dimensions.

- *Indoor and outdoor considerations:* Indoor scenarios are challenging as they have more clutter, which causes more multipath that affects localization accuracy and missed detection of the wanted target in sensing, while the high pathloss and high mobility may limit outdoor performance. To remove or suppress the interference of clutter, either more bandwidth or novel signal processing is needed, while novel waveforms and/or processing are needed to support high mobility. The indoor and outdoor deployments are likely to differ. For instance, from a localization perspective, it is desirable to have APs distributed at different heights to estimate the elevation of the UE, which could be seen as more important for outdoor use cases.
- Operational bands: The low-frequency ranges, i.e., in frequency range (FR)1, have a rich multipath profile, which

makes it harder to perform L&S due to multipath interference. On the other hand, the possibility of phase-coherent processing provides a means to resolve multipath and attain high accuracy. A promising alternative is the use of machine learning at lower frequencies in the form of fingerprinting. Higher frequency ranges have a more sparse multipath profile and larger available bandwidth, providing a direct way to reject multipath interference. However, at FR2 and above, phase synchronization may not be attainable, so we revert to classical L&S methods. To some extent in FR1, but especially in FR2, LOS blockage detection will play an important role, as each receiver may be associated with a large number of transmitters but only a subset of which will have a LOS condition.

- Centralized and distributed processing: Three important scalability aspects should be considered, namely update rate, transmission, and processing. L&S are low-rate services, requiring periodic activation at a low rate of 10 or 100 Hz, depending on the application and mobility. This means that they allow flexible scaling with the number of users or objects to be tracked. In terms of transmission, the transmitters should apply orthogonal waveforms, which require coordination in time and frequency. Consequently, L&S pilot transmissions scale with the number of transmitters (e.g., UL localization scales with the number of UEs, and multi-static sensing scales with the number of transmitting APs). In terms of processing, DL localization can be performed decentralized at each UE, while data fusion from each receiver is needed for sensing and UL localization, causing processing delays. Under non-coherent processing, it is sufficient to perform fusion based on the locally processed information (e.g., delay estimation for localization or locally detected objects for sensing), with a data requirement that scales with the number of objects. Under phase coherent fusion, the fusion is based on the raw in-phase and quadrature (IQ) data, which may correspond to a large amount of data. For sensing, it will also be important to separate the moving objects from the static background clutter, which requires extended integration times for Doppler estimation.
- *Fronthaul and backhaul:* Precise time synchronization and/or phase synchronization between the APs place additional demands on the fronthaul or backhaul, as wired links to a master clock must be installed or continuous operation over an over-the-air synchronization protocol must be provided. Similarly, sensing also requires time or phase synchronization for improved performance.
- *Half- and full-duplex:* Localization does not require fullduplex devices. However, sensing with full-duplex capability could help localization with reduced beam training overhead. In the case of mono-static sensing, each AP should be able to operate in full-duplex mode or be equipped with a well-isolated transmitter and receiver that share a common clock. For multi-static sensing, full-duplex is not a requirement, but the transmission of orthogonal signals should be well-coordinated.
- Coherent and non-coherent processing: For delay-based positioning, precise time synchronization (sub ns-level) be-



Fig. 2. Impact of the number of APs on PEB and positioning RMSE, comparing conventional time-coherent positioning with phase-coherent D-MIMO positioning. The system operates at 28 GHz with 6 MHz of bandwidth, under pure LOS conditions.

tween the APs is needed to relate the delay measurements to/from different APs. If such synchronization is not possible, round-trip-time protocols can be used for positioning, while for sensing, LOS paths can provide a timing reference. For phase-coherent processing in both L&S tasks, even precise phase synchronization between the APs must be attained, meaning that the signal phase at one AP can be related to the UE location and the signal phase at another AP. This means that the phases should not only be fixed but also be perfectly known. The reason is that in L&S, phase measurements are exploited to extract geometric information (delay and position) as opposed to communications where channel estimation inherently compensates for fixed phase offsets and thus circumvents the need for knowing the exact phase values. Hence, the phase center of each AP must be determined and phase offsets, e.g., due to cables, must be calibrated.

As an example, Fig. 2 shows the impact of the number of APs on position error bound (PEB) and positioning root-meansquare error (RMSE), comparing conventional time-coherent positioning with phase-coherent D-MIMO positioning. This shows the theoretical benefits of a D-MIMO solution for accurate positioning. In terms of PEB, D-MIMO performance outperforms the corresponding conventional PEB by several orders of magnitude. In terms of RMSE, the gap would disappear when a sufficient number of connected APs are present. Otherwise, the ambiguities due to the use of carrier phase limit the performance.

IV. TOWARD ISAC IN D-MIMO: POTENTIALS AND IMPLEMENTATIONS

In this section, we consider a converged ISAC D-MIMO system, from four perspectives: i) the architecture and deployment; ii) standardization; iii) quantitative benefits of ISAC D-MIMO; and iv) implementation challenges.

A. ISAC D-MIMO Architectures

Based on the discussions from Sections II and III, and with specific focus on the indoor vs. outdoor and higher vs. lower bandwidth options, we summarize in Table I the main implications of the different architectural options. Green blocks indicate that both scenarios are possible/feasible, while blue blocks show that there is a preferred deployment. Each block assesses the suitability for communication and L&S. It is evident that for D-MIMO communication, the favored architecture encompasses phase-coherent distributed processing, half-duplex, and wired fronthaul and backhaul, particularly for outdoor environments in the FR1. For L&S, while half-duplex and wired connections are favored, interest also extends to both distributed non-coherent FR2 and centralized coherent FR1 operations across indoor and outdoor settings. Hence, a preferred ISAC D-MIMO architecture mirrors the preferred communication architecture but incorporates centralized processing, such as phase-coherent IQ samples sharing for L&S.

B. ISAC D-MIMO Standardization

Communication networks primarily rely on standardized operations, while sensing signal processing methods are based on proprietary, i.e., non-standardized solutions. On the other hand, with ISAC, the transmitted signals for ISAC, supporting both communication and sensing functions (either simultaneously or time/frequency/space multiplexed) require standardization, as well as the associated control signaling. In some sense, these considerations are general for all 6G ISAC technologies. What sets D-MIMO apart is the multi-static sensing perspective, considering several concurrent AP transmitters and/or several concurrent AP receivers. Again, processing will be proprietary, but signal design and coordination will rely on standardized solutions. This necessitates extensive standardization efforts to incorporate sensing into D-MIMO. For instance, the current 3GPP standardization on multi-APs concentrates mainly on the case of ideal backhaul/synchronization, but work on enhancements for non-ideal operation has started in 3GPP Rel-19. 3GPP started preliminary discussions on ISAC from Rel-19 in early 2024.

C. ISAC D-MIMO Quantitative Benefits—A Case Study

Communication, localization, and sensing can operate harmoniously in ISAC D-MIMO. As an example, we consider a scalable D-MIMO simulation scenario, assuming perfect time and phase synchronization between UEs and APs. Fig. 3 shows the sum UL SEs as a function of transmit signal-tonoise ratio (SNR) averaged over different UE locations and shadow fading realizations. With the setups shown in the caption, maximum ratio combining (MRC) is used to leverage channel estimations in various scenarios where sensing is used to detect blockage status, while localization is used for CSI estimation (assuming a prior radio map exists): (i) with ISAC: Having both blockage status information and CSI, the UEs are assigned to APs without AP-UE blockage with perfect CSI; (ii) with localization: The UEs have perfect CSI but without the information of blockage from sensing, they are still served by the default APs; (iii) with sensing: The UEs are assigned to the back-up APs but with no CSI from localization; (iv) without ISAC: The UEs are served by default APs without CSI. As shown in Fig. 3, L&S improves the UL SE considerably. For instance, consider the parameter settings of Fig. 3 and SNR 10 dB. Then, compared to the cases without ISAC, adding localization (i.e., providing CSI), sensing (i.e.,

TABLE I

SUITABILITY MATRIX OF ARCHITECTURAL OPTIONS COMBINATIONS WITH IMPLEMENTATION COMMENTS: EVALUATING COMMUNICATION AND LOCALIZATION & SENSING.

: Both options are feasible/possible : One of the options is preferable

	Indoor vs. Outdoor	Higher bands vs. Lower bands
	Both options are <i>feasible</i>	Higher bands preferred (dense APs and low cost)
Centralized	Com.: improves spectral efficiency/dynamic blocking mitigation	Com.: fast control of narrow beams,
	L&S: suitable for time- and phase-coherent processing,	but high requirements on backhaul/fronthaul
	only lower mobility	L&S: phase-coherent capability
Distributed	Both options are <i>possible</i> Com.: improves scalability (less reliability for indoor) L&S: suitable for time-coherent processing	Lower bands <i>preferred</i> (less dense APs/high resolution converters) Com.: Lower data rates allow for more advanced APs, resulting in low backhaul requirements, but interference might limit spectral efficiency L&S: suitable for time-coherent processing
Wireless	Outdoor preferred (less blockers)	Higher bands preferred, (IAB feasible,
front- and	Com. : low cost and fast deployment, but less reliability	less restricted sync requirements)
backhaul	L&S: time-coherent processing	Com. : low cost and fast deployment, but less reliability
		L&S: time-coherent processing
Wired front- and	Indoor <i>preferred</i> (might be costly for outdoors) Com. : improves reliability and backhaul fronthaul capacity L&S : supports tight sync requirements for	Both options are <i>feasible</i>
		Com. : improves reliability and backhaul fronthaul capacity,
		important especially in higher bands
расклаш	phase-coherent processing	Las: not needed for higher bands, except for certain challenging
		Path options are possible
Half	Both options are <i>possible</i>	Com : lower cost but increased delays
Dupley	Com.: lower cost, but increased delays	$\mathbf{L} \otimes \mathbf{S}$: suitable for time-coherent processing (higher hands)
Dupics	L&S: suitable for time- and phase-coherent processing	phase-coherent processing (lower hands)
		Higher hands <i>preferred</i> (due to beam-based spatial
Full- Duplex	Com. : lower latency L&S: enables monostatic sensing, severe leakage challenges	transceiver isolation and short hops)
		Com. : flexible time division duplex (TDD) deployment
		L&S: enables monostatic sensing, severe leakage challenges
		Higher bands preferred (low spectral efficiency and resolution
Non	Both options are <i>possible</i>	in Lower bands)
Noll-	Com.: lower cost but might result in insufficient reliability	Com.: lower cost and might be sufficient
conerent	L&S: suitable for time-coherent processing	for narrow beams and spatial multiflow
		L&S: suitable for time-coherent processing
	Indoor <i>preferred</i> (due to short inter-AP distances)	Lower bands preferred (due to lower carrier frequency)
Coherent	Com.: improves reliability	Com.: improves reliability
	L&S: suitable for time- and phase-coherent processing	L&S: suitable for time- and phase-coherent processing



Fig. 3. Impact of L&S on the UL SEs in a simulated phase-coherent D-MIMO system. We consider the setup from [4] with 5 UEs served by nearby APs (in total 200) according to the dynamic cooperation clustering framework. The APs and UEs are uniformly distributed in a 1×1 km square area and the UEs are initially served by several APs (default APs) where the links are blocked. Rician fading channel model is used with the same parameter setup as in [10].

providing knowledge about blockage), and both L&S, improve the UL SE by $8\times$, $12\times$, and $16\times$, respectively.

D. ISAC D-MIMO—Implementation Opportunities and Challenges

So far, only limited testbed activities exist involving D-MIMO in general [11], ISAC in general [12], and ISAC in

D-MIMO, in particular, [13]–[15]. There is currently an urgent need to validate D-MIMO, especially in conjunction with ISAC. Two of the main technical challenges are scalability and synchronization [14]. Scalability issues may arise because of fronthaul limitations, which may put a constraint on deployment configurations. Time and frequency synchronization is typically difficult to achieve, because of the distributed nature of the APs, as elaborated on in Section II and Section III. In D-MIMO demonstrators, synchronization is typically achieved over the Ethernet or via dedicated cables; both solutions, however, result typically in non-scalable architectures [14]. A natural alternative is to perform synchronization over the air. However, this may result in significant overhead for certain deployment scenarios. A completely different approach for solving the synchronization problem is put forward in our testbed described in [15] (see Fig. 4), where phase synchronization issues are avoided by letting the APs transfer to the CU a 1-bit quantized version of the analog radiofrequency signal via an optical cable. The advantage of this approach, which we refer to as 1-bit radio-over-fiber fronthaul, is that no local oscillators (which need to be synchronized for coherent transmission and reception) are present at the APs. Furthermore, such a D-MIMO architecture involves low cost APs that can be built out of off-the-shelf components. The disadvantage of this architecture is its limited scalability.



Fig. 4. A D-MIMO testbed used for ISAC demonstrations (right), the geometric configuration of the APs and the UE (upper left), and the experimental results for localization and communications (lower left). Localization RMSE and communication SNR performances are shown for different orders of deployment of APs (Order-1: 1 2 3 10 9 8 7 6 5 4, Order-2: 1 7 4 10 5 2 8 3 9 6).

Fig. 4 demonstrates a setup and the results of ISAC experiments with the D-MIMO 1-bit radio-over-fiber testbed [7]. The goal is to localize the UE in DL using known pilot signals from the fully synchronized APs. We investigate the impact of AP deployments on the performance of localization and communication, quantified by RMSE and SNR, respectively. Fig. 4 shows the RMSEs and cumulative SNRs as the number of APs increases sequentially, considering two different orders for adding APs to the D-MIMO network, as stated in the figure caption. As expected, the geometric arrangement of the APs (and the resulting geometric dilution of precision (GDOP)) plays a key role in localization accuracy, while it has a negligible impact on communication performance. Specifically, decreasing the number of APs increases the sensitivity to the AP locations for localization purposes, whereas its effect on location sensitivity in communication remains minimal. Thus, network planning can be simplified and flexible deployment can reduce the costs in D-MIMO networks.

V. DISCUSSIONS AND OUTLOOK

D-MIMO and ISAC are set to be among the key enablers for 6G. This paper analyzed how the integration of ISAC in D-MIMO affects the underlying architecture. This analysis revealed both synergies and conflicts, while pointing towards D-MIMO architectures that can support all ISAC functionalities. We highlight preferred embodiments for communication and L&S. Specifically, for communication, i) indoor, lower bands: coherent, wired backhaul, distributed processing, half duplex, and ii) higher bands: noncoherent, centralized processing, half duplex (no wired/wireless backhaul preference, no indoor/outdoor preference) are preferred. For L&S, i) lower bands: coherent, wired backhaul, centralized processing, full duplex (no indoor/outdoor preference), and ii) higher bands: noncoherent, distributed processing, full duplex (no wired/wireless backhaul preference, no indoor/outdoor preference) are desired.

The paper also delved deeper into the quantitative performance benefits of ISAC in D-MIMO, from both L&S and communication perspectives. These studies reveal significant synergies between communication and L&S. Finally, the practical challenges of ISAC in D-MIMO implementation were considered, in particular, related to synchronization and scalability, highlighting the need for continued development in this area.

Overall, ISAC in D-MIMO seems promising to enhance system performance. However, there are still several open questions in D-MIMO that become further enriched by ISAC, especially related to scalability and adaptation in dynamic environments and efficient support of fast-moving users. Thus, ISAC in D-MIMO leads to a rich variety of D-MIMO and ISAC research problems, from both theoretical and practical perspectives.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported, in part, by the Gigahertz-ChaseOn Bridge Center at Chalmers in a project financed by Chalmers, Ericsson, and Qamcom. This work was also supported by the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research (SSF), grants no. ID19-0021, ID19-0036, and FUS21-0004, the Swedish Research Council (VR grant 2022-03007, 2023-00272), the Chalmers Area of Advance Transport 6G-Cities project, and the MSCA-IF grant 101065422 (6G-ISLAC). We would like to thank Dr. Yigeng Zhang for his help with the illustrations.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Q. Ngo et al., "Cell-free massive MIMO versus small cells," IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun., vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 1834-1850, Mar. 2017.
- [2] O. Haliloglu et al., "Distributed MIMO systems for 6G," in Proc. EuCNC/6G Summit, Gothenburg, Sweden, 2023.
- [3] H. Guo et al., "High-rate uninterrupted internet-of-vehicle communications in highways: Dynamic blockage avoidance and CSIT acquisition," IEEE Commun. Mag., vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 44-50, Jul. 2022.
- [4] E. Björnson et al., "Scalable cell-free massive MIMO systems," IEEE Trans. Commun., vol. 68, no. 7, pp. 4247-4261, Jul. 2020.
- [5] U. Demirhan et al., "Cell-free ISAC MIMO systems: Joint sensing and communication beamforming," Feb. 2024, [Online]. Available: https:// arxiv.org/pdf/2301.11328.pdf.
- [6] Z. Behdad et al., "Power allocation for joint communication and sensing in cell-free massive MIMO," in Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2022, pp. 4081-4086.
- [7] M. F. Keskin et al., "Localization with distributed MIMO using a highspeed sigma-delta-over-fiber testbed," IEEE Microw. Wireless Compon. Lett., vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 923–926, Jul. 2022. [8] G. Interdonato *et al.*, "Ubiquitous cell-free Massive MIMO communi-
- cations," EURASIP J. Wirel. Commun. Netw., vol. 197, Aug. 2019.
- [9] C. Madapatha et al., "On integrated access and backhaul networks: Current status and potentials," IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc., vol. 1, pp. 1374–1389, Sept. 2020.
- [10] Ö. Özdogan et al., "Massive MIMO with spatially correlated Rician fading channels," IEEE Trans. Commun., vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 3234-3250, May 2019.
- [11] D. Löschenbrand et al., "Towards cell-free massive MIMO: A measurement-based analysis," IEEE Access, vol. 10, pp. 89232-89247, Aug. 2022.
- [12] K. Ji et al., "Networking based ISAC hardware testbed and performance evaluation," IEEE Commun. Mag., vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 76-82, May 2023.
- [13] C. Nelson et al., "Distributed MIMO measurements for integrated communication and sensing in an industrial environment," Mar. 2024. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2403.02430.pdf
- [14] G. Callebaut et al., "Techtile-Open 6G R&D testbed for communication, positioning, sensing, WPT and federated learning," in Proc. EuCNC/6G Summit, Grenoble, France, 2022.
- [15] C. S. Ibrahim et al., "All-digital, radio-over-fiber, communication link architecture for time-division duplex distributed antenna system," J. Lightw. Technol., vol. 39, no. 9, pp. 2769-2779, Feb. 2021.

Hao Guo is a Postdoc with the Department of Electrical Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden.

Henk Wymeersch is a Professor with the Department of Electrical Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden.

Hui Chen is a Research Specialist with the Department of Electrical Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden.

Yibo Wu is a PhD Candidate with the Department of Electrical Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology, and a Researcher at Ericsson, Sweden.

Giuseppe Durisi is a Professor with the Department of Electrical Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden.

Musa Furkan Keskin is a Research Specialist with the Department of Electrical Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden.

Mohammad H. Moghaddam is a R&D Specialist at Qamcom Research and Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden.

Charitha Madapatha is a PhD Student with the Department of Electrical Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden.

Han Yu is a Postdoc with the Department of Electrical Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden.

Peter Hammarberg is a Senior Researcher at Ericsson, Sweden.

Hyowon Kim is an Assistant Professor with the Department of Electronics Engineering at Chungnam National University, Daejeon, South Korea.

Tommy Svensson is a Professor with the Department of Electrical Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden.