

# Achieving Distributed MIMO Performance with Repeater-Assisted Cellular Massive MIMO

Sara Willhammar, Hiroki Iimori, Joao Vieira, Lars Sundström, Fredrik Tufvesson, and Erik G. Larsson

**Abstract**—5G systems are being deployed all over the world and one key enabler of these systems is massive multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO). This technology has brought large performance gains in terms of serving many users. Despite the possibility to further exploit the spatial domain, there are situations where it is not possible to offer more than a single, or a few, data streams per user and where cell-edge coverage is an issue due to the lack of enough efficient channel scatterers. Looking ahead, distributed MIMO systems, where the antennas are spread over a larger area, are investigated for next generation systems. However, distributed MIMO comes with many practical deployment issues, making it a big challenge to adopt. As another way forward, we envision *repeater-assisted cellular massive MIMO*, where repeaters are deployed to act as channel scatterers to increase the rank of the channel and provide macro diversity for improved coverage and reliability. After elaborating on the requirements and hardware aspects of repeaters that enable this vision, we demonstrate through simulations the potential of repeater-assisted cellular massive MIMO to achieve distributed MIMO performance. Following this, we discuss open questions and future research directions.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Massive multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) has become the 5G technology and will continue to be one of the cornerstones in cellular systems for a long time. Considering a sub-6 GHz time division-duplex (TDD) multi-user massive MIMO system with reciprocity-based beamforming, there is an opportunity to serve many user devices in the same time-frequency resource, also in high mobility scenarios. By phase-coherent combining, an array gain is achieved, that can significantly improve the signal quality and link budget.

However, despite the array gain, there will be coverage holes, where especially the cell-edge coverage is an issue. In addition, with multiple-antennas users, it can be a challenge to offer more than a single (or perhaps a few) data streams per user if there are not enough independent scatters that can bring up the rank of the channel. To address these issues, distributed MIMO (D-MIMO) has emerged as a promising next step for 6G. In D-MIMO, access points (APs) are densely distributed over a large area and, hence, due to shorter distances between APs and user devices, the path loss decreases and coverage improves. Such D-MIMO deployment, enabled by densely deployed APs, is not to be confused with the D-MIMO deployment currently being considered in 3GPP Rel. 19 standardization, which performs coherent joint transmission between several macro base stations. Moreover,

shadow fading becomes less of a problem due to improved macro-diversity, and favorable propagation can be experienced for multi-antenna user devices even in line-of-sight (LoS).

Although the opportunities with D-MIMO systems are many, they impose deployment issues. Complex questions, such as how to get the data to the distributed units, where to perform the processing, how to synchronize the APs, how to distribute the clocks and phase references, among others, remain unsolved. Furthermore, the main concepts in the standards are designed for co-located MIMO (C-MIMO) and therefore, going to D-MIMO, would be a big step for industry to adopt. For example, the standards would need to change, but more importantly there would be a need for radical network architectural changes as well as large increase in site and maintenance costs (e.g., installation and maintenance of wired fronthaul in public areas). In industry there can be some reluctance to big changes and smaller steps, which each bring benefits, would be more likely to be implemented.

To make the transition for industry smoother, while still addressing the issue of controlling the number of effective scatterers in the channel, we envision *repeater-assisted massive MIMO (RA-MIMO)*. A similar vision was presented in [1], but extra delay, increased delay spread and compromised channel reciprocity were identified as obstacles; these issues are addressed in our vision. Repeaters have traditionally been deployed for the purpose of improving coverage. Coverage improvements and capacity scaling in MIMO systems aided by repeaters was studied in LoS environments [2] and full-duplex radio relays was investigated in order to improve outdoor-to-indoor communication [3]. Today, when massive MIMO base stations are being deployed, the improvements at the base station side enable multi-user MIMO operation. Now rethinking repeaters, could they also be deployed inside the cell to support massive C-MIMO systems with the purpose of increasing macro diversity, acting as scatterers in the environment, and potentially approach D-MIMO performance?

Note the distinction between a repeater and a relay. A repeater *instantaneously* amplifies and re-transmits the signal, with a delay of at most a few hundred nanoseconds. A relay, in contrast, receives a signal of substantially longer duration (e.g., half a slot) and then either amplifies and forwards, or decodes and forwards that signal. Repeaters act as additional channel scatterers with amplification, but relays do not.

Other ways to enhance the performance, without having to create extra cells but rather by deploying extra components within existing cells, could be to either add extra APs or, use reflective intelligent surfaces (RISs). These solutions could in theory perform the work of a repeater. RISs has been a topic of pre-standardization discussions and network-controlled re-

Sara Willhammar and Fredrik Tufvesson are with the Department of Electrical and Information Technology, Lund University, Sweden. Hiroki Iimori is with Ericsson Japan. Joao Vieira and Lars Sundström are with Ericsson Sweden. Erik G. Larsson is with the Department of Electrical Engineering (ISY), Linköping University, Sweden.




Fig. 1: Envisioning repeater-assisted cellular massive MIMO: a massive MIMO base station is installed on the rooftop, and assisted by multiple repeaters. These could be deployed, for example, on rooftops or traffic lights.

TABLE I: Repeaters versus RISs versus extra APs for performance enhancement.

<i>Required \ Assisted by</i>	<b>Repeater</b>	<b>RIS</b>	<b>Extra AP</b>
Form factor	Small	Large	Small
Power consumption	$\sim 10$ W	$\sim 1$ W	$\sim 20$ W
Instantaneous CSI	No	Yes	Yes
Extra training	Little	Large	Little
Phase synchronization	No	No	Yes
Backhaul	No	No	Yes
Active radiated power	Yes	No	Yes
Noise source	Yes	No	Yes
Array gain	None	High	Some
Control overhead	Low	High	None
Deployment cost	Low	Medium	High
Deployment flexibility	High	Low	Medium
Band selectivity	Yes	Little	Yes

peaters (NCRs) are under consideration in standardization activities [4]. In Table I, a comparison between these three deployment options is presented. Benefits of deploying repeaters or RISs in comparison to extra APs are that no phase synchronization nor any backhaul is needed.

Comparing repeaters and RISs, repeaters are easy to deploy due to their small form factor. Training or significant control signaling is not required. While bringing the same benefits as the repeater, a RIS has a much larger form factor, requires significant control signaling, and incurs significant overhead for training and configuration. RISs are not designed to be deployed densely and are heavily dependent on the physical environment. As a first-order approximation, in order to achieve the same signal (power) amplification, say  $A$ , as a repeater, a RIS would require  $\sqrt{A}$  unit cells. For example, to replace a 60-dB gain repeater, a RIS would need in the order of  $31 \times 31 \approx 1000$  unit cells (for the sake of simplicity, we ignore the directivity of patch antenna patterns here). Furthermore, to get the macro diversity, one would need many distributed units, which appears challenging with RISs.

## II. ENVISIONING REPEATER-ASSISTED MASSIVE MIMO

Within a cell covered by a massive MIMO base station, the deployment of multiple repeaters could be simple and inexpensive: they have a small form factor and only require a power supply. The massive MIMO base station will remain

in control of all multi-antenna signal processing, enabling full backward compatibility and requiring no major system upgrades. Furthermore, the base station will control repeaters and configure their parameters (see, e.g., [5] for possible repeater configurations) via, e.g., a control channel. Fig. 1 shows an example of a city deployment. The massive MIMO array is placed on the rooftop of a building and the user is a handheld device. Four repeaters are deployed: three on rooftops and one on a traffic light. Due to the simplicity of repeaters, they could potentially be deployed in a wide variety of ways: on separate masts, on building facades or rooftops, on lamp posts and traffic lights, to mention some possibilities.

A great advantage is that the deployment does not need to be too carefully planned; rather, repeaters can be installed in a “plug-and-play” fashion. The coverage zone of different repeaters can overlap and the repeaters can pick up signals from each other, as long as care is taken to keep positive feedback effects under control [6].

The signal received at either the base station or the user side will be a superposition of signals that travel via a direct path, including LoS and/or multipath reflections, and signals that go via repeater(s). This means that the channels between a user and the base station can be a result of one or several of the following components: 1) the direct path between the user and base station, 2) paths between a user and a repeater, 3) paths between a repeater and a scatterer, 4) paths between repeaters, 5) paths between a repeater and the base station, and 6) paths between a scatterer and the base station. As this is only a concatenation of linear time-invariant (LTI) systems, the result will also be an LTI system. Its response is (in principle) the same in uplink and downlink, which enables reciprocity-based multiuser beamforming. In general, repeaters should act as any other channel scatterer, but with higher gain. The repeaters will naturally also introduce a delay, i.e. a frequency-dependent phase shift, which is typically not a problem as it effectively is comparable to the frequency response of a far-away scatterer.

## III. REPEATERS ENABLING THE VISION

### A. Requirements on the repeater

To support the vision of repeater-aided massive C-MIMO systems, where repeaters are deployed both to improve cov-

erage and to enhance the richness of the channel, repeaters must act as channel scatterers. This means that they must have the same properties as ordinary channel scatterers that are naturally present in the propagation environment. This makes the repeater a transparent part of the propagation environment, both from the perspective of the base station and from the perspective of the user. To act as a channel scatterer, the repeater must satisfy a number of requirements:

- 1) To mimic a channel scatterer, the repeater should have an **LTI response** and should hence not introduce nonlinearities and out-of-band radiation. This means that it should not have an automatic gain control circuit that introduces fast time-variations of the amplification gain.
- 2) For reciprocity-based transmission, the contribution of the repeater should be the same in uplink and downlink, meaning that the repeater should be **reciprocal**. From an implementation perspective, the forward gain of the repeater should, for each subcarrier, be equal to its reverse gain.
- 3) The excess delay of the channel collectively comprised by the ordinary channel scatterers and the repeaters must be smaller than the duration of the cyclic prefix. Hence, each repeater may only **introduce a much smaller delay than the duration of the cyclic prefix**, which requires an almost instantaneous processing and amplification.
- 4) The repeater should **be band selective**, i.e., only amplify signals within the desired band. This requires the use of sharp filters, which would have a long impulse response – but whose length still fits within the duration of the cyclic prefix.
- 5) Noise is unavoidable and stems from multiple sources: thermal noise, quantization noise, and phase noise. There is a limit on how noisy a repeater can be in order to **not act as a limiting noise source**.
- 6) Repeaters can be categorized into single-antenna and dual-antenna repeaters; for the latter, the repeater implementation should **align with the TDD pattern**.

### B. Single-antenna repeaters

Repeaters are generally defined as nodes that only amplify the received signals, and do not perform any processing beyond the physical layer for the signal to be retransmitted. In a single-antenna repeater, the same antenna is used simultaneously for reception and transmission; see Fig. 2a. This antenna is connected to an antenna-interface circuit (AIC) that forwards the received signal to a low-noise amplifier (LNA). The LNA may be followed by additional amplifying stages before finally being fed to a power amplifier (PA) to generate the signal to be transmitted. The AIC forwards the PA output signal to the antenna, while providing a high level of isolation between the PA and the LNA. Note that “single-antenna” here refers to an antenna that is shared with both the input and the output of the chain of amplifiers. Clearly the physical implementation of the antenna is not restricted to a single physical antenna, it could for example, be an antenna array with beamforming capabilities.

The level of PA-to-antenna and antenna-to-LNA loss as well as PA-to-LNA isolation are important parameters of the AIC.




Fig. 2: Principle (a) single-antenna and (b) dual-antenna repeater architectures, (c) with RF filters, and (d) with up- and down-conversion for baseband filtering.

The PA-to-LNA isolation dictates the maximum gain of the repeater, as the gain must be lower than the isolation to avoid the repeater self-oscillating. The antenna-to-LNA loss adds to the noise figure (NF) of the repeater and the PA-to-antenna loss reduces the power of the transmitted signal.

The AIC may be implemented either as a circulator or as an electrical-balance duplexer. PA-to-LNA isolation in the range of 20–50 dB has been reported, with the highest levels only achieved with a relative bandwidth of up to 10% [7]. Thus, assuming an isolation of 50 dB, the single-antenna repeater may only allow for a gain up to some 40 dB (assuming a 10 dB margin to avoid self-oscillation). The PA-to-antenna loss introduced by the AIC is in most cases within 2–4 dB for the sub-6 GHz range, respectively and the NF contribution is within 2.5–6 dB [7].

While the single-antenna repeater has limited gain potential, it is recognized that it intrinsically supports reciprocity-based communication as any signal, irrespective of origin, will undergo the same processing.

### C. Dual-antenna repeaters

The dual-antenna repeater architecture is substantially more robust than its single-antenna counterpart, as it is much more resilient to self-oscillation. It is also the repeater architecture considered in the most recent standardization efforts on NCR [8]. One antenna is assigned for the base station side and another for the user device side; see Fig. 2b, with one amplification path for the uplink and another for the downlink with transmit-receive switches towards the antennas for selection of transmission direction. Such a repeater naturally provides high isolation between the PA output and the LNA, as the two antennas can be physically separated as well as oriented

and designed to provide nulls between them. Therefore, the dual-antenna repeater allows for substantially higher gain, compared to the single-antenna repeater. In addition, design compromises associated with the AIC of the single-antenna repeater are avoided. In particular, a dual-antenna repeater has a lower NF and a higher output power capability.

In contrast to the single-antenna repeater, the dual-antenna repeater does not support reciprocity-based communication unless the uplink and downlink signal paths are designed and operated to have matching transfer functions across the band. But even with the signal paths designed to be identical and co-integrated on the same chip for the best possible matching, also when temperature changes, there will still be a residual difference in the signal path gain and phase. This difference originates from chip manufacturing that leads to random variability and gradual shift of component parameters across the chip, calling for periodic reciprocity calibration [9].

Existing repeater requirements [4] include conventional metrics associated with both base stations and user devices such as error vector magnitude (EVM), adjacent channel leakage ratio (ACLR), and emission requirements. Although no maximum gain is specified for the targeted passband of the repeater, there are requirements on the maximum allowed gain outside the passband of the repeater, 60 dB up to 1 MHz from the passband edge, dropping to 35 dB at 10 MHz offset. There is also a requirement for the ratio of the gain of the target channel to the gain of an adjacent channel. It should be higher than either 33 dB or 45 dB, depending on, e.g., repeater class and carrier frequency.

Radio frequency (RF) band filters are introduced, see Fig. 2c, to attenuate out-of-band signals prior to amplification by the LNA, and to comply with out-of-band emission requirements. However, such filters may not be sufficient to fulfill gain requirements outside the repeater passband, as discussed above. A higher degree of selectivity can be achieved by introducing baseband filtering, as shown in Fig. 2d. The received signal is down-converted to baseband where the filtering is carried out. The filtered signal is then up-converted, using the same local oscillator (LO) signal as was used for down-conversion. This is finally followed by subsequent amplification for retransmission. Note that RF band filters and baseband filtering also can be used in a single-antenna repeater.

Baseband filtering may also be carried out in the digital domain, enabling even sharper filtering and more flexibility in filter characteristics over the analog counterparts. This comes at the expense of increased cost and complexity, due to the digital processing itself and due the addition of analog-to-digital and digital-to-analog converters.

#### D. Hardware performance and impairments

1) *Additive noise:* In the architecture shown in Fig. 2b, the received signal will first be filtered by the RF band filter and then directed by the antenna switch to the LNA. Both the filter and the switch introduce losses and thus an increase in NF for the repeater. The filter loss varies greatly depending on the type of filter technology and the target band. A typical user

device band filter at sub-6 GHz frequencies can have a loss of around 2 dB while the switch loss is much smaller, fractions of dB.

The NF for the remaining part of the signal chain should be dominated by the LNA with the level dependent on the semiconductor technology used for the implementation of the LNA and the target frequency. In [10] a survey of published LNAs is presented with a focus on CMOS, the predominant semiconductor technology for highly integrated circuits. CMOS LNAs operating in the sub-6 GHz range have a NF around 2–3 dB. Adding 2 dB of filter loss yields up to 5 dB of total NF for the repeater.

2) *Amplification, distortion, and power:* The LNA itself may provide a gain of some 20–30 dB for sub-6 GHz frequencies with additional amplifiers required prior to the final power amplifier to reach a total gain of 60 dB and beyond. As the level of the amplified signal increases, so does the non-linear distortion generated by the amplifiers. However, the distortion generated by the repeater should be dominated by the PA as there is most to gain in terms of power consumption by optimizing the efficiency of the PA.

In addition, a fully analog repeater cannot use advanced linearization techniques to reduce the PA distortion, as such methods are exclusively digital. However, limited improvements may be achieved using analog linearization techniques. What remains is the power backoff of a PA designed for a saturated output power much higher than the target power level. Unfortunately, backing off comes at the expense of rapidly decreasing efficiency. The degree of backoff needed is a function of both the targeted ACLR level and the non-linear characteristics of the PA. But an estimate may be calculated based on the assumption that the PA can be modeled by a third-order polynomial and is exercised by an OFDM signal. The output power in dBm for a desired ACLR in dB is approximately given by [11]

$$P_{\text{out}} = \text{CP} - \text{ACLR}/2 + 12,$$

where CP is the output-referred 1-dB gain compression point in dBm, often used as a reference point for the power capability of a PA. For example, with a target ACLR of 40 dB the output power equals CP–8 dBm.

The power capability of a PA depends strongly on both semiconductor technology and frequency [12]. For low-cost repeaters, targeting “local area class” specifications and operating in the sub-6 GHz range, it is reasonable to take advantage of user device grade components, thereby avoiding the more expensive technologies adopted on the network side. Therefore, an output power target for a modulated signal should be in the 20 dBm regime, similar to both cellular and WiFi user devices. Higher output power, and hence more expensive, repeaters targeting “wide area class” specifications need to fulfill more stringent emission requirements. For example, the ACLR requirements for wide-area and local-area repeaters are 45 dB and 31 dB, respectively [8].

Distortion also leads to EVM degradation. The maximum allowed EVM contribution by the repeater is 3.5% for support of 256 quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM), and 8% for lower-order modulation schemes. These requirements should

be fulfilled for input signal power levels up to the level that yields the maximum output power of the repeater. For small input signal levels, EVM will not be limited by distortion, but foremost by the additive noise from the repeater. Hence, the specification includes a minimum input signal power spectral density for which the EVM requirement should be fulfilled.

3) *Phase noise*: A repeater with baseband filtering needs to use a LO signal for up- and down-conversion. The LO signal exhibits phase noise and in conventional transceivers it leads to degradation of the EVM and increased emissions close to the transmitted carrier. However, in the baseband filtering repeater, the same LO signal may be used for both up- and down-conversion. This significantly reduces the impact of phase noise as the phase noise introduced in the down-conversion will be canceled in the up-conversion. However, the level of cancellation depends on the delay of the signal introduced between the up- and down-conversion [13]. This delay is dominated by the group delay of the baseband filter, and with filters having substantially larger bandwidth than the phase noise spectrum of the LO, the impact of phase noise will be low. For the same reason, LO phase noise will not cause any phase drift of the repeater.

4) *I/Q impairments*: To down-convert a signal to baseband (and back to RF), quadrature mixers are used to generate complex baseband equivalents of the RF signal. Quadrature mixers have impairments on their own, namely I/Q gain and phase mismatch as well as DC offset. If left uncorrected, an I/Q mismatch will degrade the EVM and a DC offset will lead to a transmitted signal with LO signal leakage. In sub-6 GHz bands, I/Q gain and phase errors around 1% and 1 degree, respectively, are typically achieved without correction. The same errors in both the up- and down-conversion result in an EVM contribution of 2%.

5) *Delay*: A repeater introduces delay to the signal. This delay is an accumulation of the various frequency-selective blocks inside the repeater, both the filters (RF and baseband filter) and the amplifiers with bandpass characteristics. One representative example is an analog 5th-order lowpass Butterworth filter with 10 MHz bandwidth that has a group delay of some 50 ns, with the group delay scaling inversely proportional to the bandwidth of the filter. In the case of digital filtering and associated conversion between analog and digital domains, the processing delay may reach 100's of ns. Clearly, it is still only a small fraction of the cyclic prefix and therefore insignificant.

#### IV. PERFORMANCE OF REPEATER-ASSISTED CELLULAR MASSIVE MIMO

To assess the potential of RA-MIMO systems, we show performance comparisons between RA-MIMO, ordinary massive C-MIMO, and densely deployed D-MIMO systems. We here consider uplink multi-user MIMO transmission, where either a massive MIMO array located at the base station (as in the first two cases) or distributed APs (in the last case) receive uplink data from multiple users, whereas the repeaters are located at the same positions as the D-MIMO APs. For simplicity, the numerical results herein disregard interactions between

TABLE II: Simulation setup and descriptions

General setup		Description
Simulation area		A square of 400 m side
Scenario		Uplink MU-MIMO
Number of terminals		8
Terminal distribution		Uniform (100% outdoor)
Carrier frequency		3.6 GHz
Terminal/repeater	output power	Up to 20 dBm
Temperature		290 Kelvin
NF		5 dB
Bandwidth		20 MHz
Repeater/APs height		10 m above terminal height
Pathloss models		3GPP UMi TS 36.814
LoS probability		3GPP UMi TS 36.814
Fading		Ricean if LoS exists, Rayleigh otherwise
K-Factor		10 dB
Repeater/D-MIMO setup		Description
# of APs/Repeaters		64
Repeater/APs antenna		Single antenna
Repeaters/APs position		Equally distanced square mesh
Repeaters activation		Active when input power level higher than a threshold, idle otherwise
NF at the repeaters		5 dB
C-MIMO setup		Description
Base station position		Located at the center with 10 m height
Base station antennas		Uniform linear array with 64 elements




Fig. 3: Illustration of the deployment in the simulations.

the repeaters. Furthermore, the uplink signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) after the uplink combiner is used as the performance metric, and unless otherwise stated, conventional minimum mean square error (MMSE) combining with perfect channel state information (CSI) is assumed. Table II summarizes the assumptions used in the simulation setup, and Fig. 3 illustrates the deployment. Only a single snapshot of the terminal positions is depicted for the sake of illustration.

The RA-MIMO systems were configured and optimized as follows. Considering the additive noise at the base station and at the repeaters with the NF described in Table II, we point out that the combination of 1) received signal power variations across repeaters with 2) additive noise power at the repeaters may result in low-quality repeated signals that may deteriorate system performance (i.e., some repeaters act as






Fig. 4: Simulated distributions of the signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio for D-MIMO, C-MIMO, ideal-hardware RA-MIMO (NF = 0 dB) and realistic RA-MIMO (NF = 5 dB) with different amplification caps.

noise sources for the most part). We address these challenges with two empirical methods. The first method is repeater activation masking, in which repeaters are activated only when the incoming signal power exceeds a certain threshold. By setting the threshold sufficiently high, this method can ensure a target signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) at the repeaters with high probability. The second method applies adaptive power control to each activated repeater. Consider the ratio between 1) the power of the intrinsic thermal noise in the base station and 2) the power of the (amplified) noise from the repeater, received at the base station; this noise has propagated over the repeater-base station channel. We control the amplification factor at each repeater so that this ratio exceeds a predetermined threshold  $\tau$ . These repeater activation and power control methods are empirical solutions (to the two previously described problems) to demonstrate the performance gains provided by RA-MIMO in comparison to C-MIMO. There is significant potential for further optimization and for the development of other solutions. On a different note, the simulation employs a modified MMSE combiner for RA-MIMO systems to incorporate the amplified repeater noise into the matrix inversion. Note that this modification is not needed in the cases of C-MIMO and D-MIMO as no amplified repeater noise reaches the base station.

Fig. 4 compares simulated cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) of the SINR for different system architectures, where different amplification gain caps are compared for RA-MIMO systems for a fixed  $\tau = 40$  dB, highlighting the importance of tuning the amplification factor in activated repeaters. In the simulations, the 8 users are randomly located in the simulation area.

For reference, the performance of RA-MIMO systems with a NF of 0 dB in activated repeaters, and with a 45 dB amplification cap, is also included. Despite noise amplification, the deployment of dozens of carefully tuned repeaters to assist C-MIMO systems results in notable improvements, especially at relatively low SINR, providing a noticeably more uniform




Fig. 5: Simulated distributions of the signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio for different target ratios ( $\tau$ ) between the power of the additive noise at the base station and the power of the amplified noise stemming from the repeater.

quality-of-service compared to C-MIMO. It is worth noting that there is a tradeoff between the maximum amplification cap and the accumulation of amplified noise. Although an amplification cap of around 45 dB strikes as an optimum balance among ones tested in the simulated environment, this parameter must be optimized according to the deployment of interest.

To further investigate the importance of appropriately tuning the amplification while taking into account repeater noise, Fig. 5 depicts the CDFs of the SINR for RA-MIMO systems for different target ratios  $\tau$ . The performances of C-MIMO and D-MIMO are kept for reference. As shown, there exists an optimum ratio  $\tau$ , because 1) setting  $\tau$  too small leads to inadequate suppression of the amplified noise received at the base station, and 2) setting  $\tau$  too large results in insufficient amplification of the desired signals from the users. Note that the latter case ultimately reduces to C-MIMO systems when  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ ; in the limit, all repeater amplification gains become zero. This can be seen in Fig. 5 by comparing the lines corresponding to  $\tau = 60$  dB and  $\tau = 40$  dB, where  $\tau = 60$  dB already tends to give a performance almost equivalent to C-MIMO at high SINR.

## V. OPEN QUESTIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We have shown that RA-MIMO is an easily deployable and potentially cost-effective solution to improve the performance of already-deployed C-MIMO systems. Here we discuss some aspects that we believe are important for future work.

**System design and adaptations:** Although being an easy-to-deploy solution, some minor adaptations of the network operation might be needed for even further improved performance. Inter-cell interference is, for example, something that has not been considered in this work.

**Repeater design:** Many of the performance metrics associated with repeaters are common with both base stations and terminals, such as linearity, noise, and frequency selectivity –

all of which continue to be important research topics. But for the repeaters considered here, one important research question is how well a repeater can be made reciprocal by design and by means of calibration. Further, the best choice of antennas and antenna patterns is also an opportunity for exploration. This may vary depending on the scenario and deployment.

**Multi-antenna repeaters and beamforming:** In general, performance gains are possible with more antennas. In the case of RA-MIMO, this opens up questions such as how to beamform in presence of repeater impairments and how to compute the beamforming weights with minimal signaling overhead.

**Repeater deployment options:** One of the benefits of the deployment of repeaters is that it does not need to be carefully planned, although there are optimizations that can be done. Aspects to consider are the distribution of repeaters, areas in the cell in need of improved coverage, and areas with few scatterers.

**Repeater configuration:** Some configuration of the repeaters is required and configuration strategies need to be assessed. Questions here are how to jointly optimize repeater amplification and activation settings, for which we have presented a first empirical example.

**Frequency-division duplex:** The focus here has been on TDD-based systems but the solution could potentially also be used in frequency-division duplex-based systems. The opportunities and challenges regarding that are left as an open research problem.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We have presented our vision for repeater-assisted cellular massive MIMO systems, where repeaters are deployed inside the cell with the purpose of acting as channel scatterers, but with amplification. This is to increase the rank of the channel so that more data streams could be supported and to improve the reliability through macro-diversity. Our investigation shows that there are significant performance gains of this approach, in comparison to the C-MIMO baseline, and that it is approaching the D-MIMO case. In conclusion, RA-MIMO can provide similar benefits as D-MIMO in terms of macro-diversity, uniform coverage, and channel richness, but with a much smaller upgrade required for the network infrastructure. However, the system needs to be properly designed and tuned. There are many open questions to be investigated in future work in order for this vision to reach its full potential.

## VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been enabled by funding from the strategic research area ELLIIT, the KAW foundation, the Swedish Research Council, and H2020-REINDEER.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Ma, D. Zhu, B. Li *et al.*, “Channel estimation error and beamforming performance in repeater-enhanced massive MIMO systems,” in *Proc. of IEEE PIMRC*, 2015, pp. 672–677.
- [2] L.-S. Tsai and D.-s. Shiu, “Capacity scaling and coverage for repeater-aided MIMO systems in line-of-sight environments,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 1617–1627, 2010.
- [3] K. Haneda, E. Kahra, S. Wyne *et al.*, “Measurement of loop-back interference channels for outdoor-to-indoor full-duplex radio relays,” in *Proceedings of the Fourth European Conference on Antennas and Propagation*, 2010, pp. 1–5.
- [4] C.-K. Wen, L.-S. Tsai, A. Shojaeifard *et al.*, “Shaping a smarter electromagnetic landscape: IAB, NCR, and RIS in 5G standard and future 6G,” *IEEE Commun. Stand. Mag.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 72–78, 2024.
- [5] G. Liu, F. R. Yu, H. Ji *et al.*, “In-band full-duplex relaying: A survey, research issues and challenges,” *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 500–524, 2015.
- [6] E. G. Larsson and J. Bai, “Stability analysis of interacting wireless repeaters,” arXiv:2405.01074.
- [7] T. Chen, S. Garikapati, A. Nagulu *et al.*, “A survey and quantitative evaluation of integrated circuit-based antenna interfaces and self-interference cancellers for full-duplex,” *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, vol. 2, pp. 1753–1776, 2021.
- [8] *3GPP TS 38.106 version 18.3.0, NR repeater radio transmission and reception (Release 18)*, Std.
- [9] E. G. Larsson, J. Vieira, and P. Frenger, “Reciprocity calibration of dual-antenna repeaters,” *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, 2024.
- [10] L. Belostotski and S. Jagtap, “Down with noise: An introduction to a low-noise amplifier survey,” *IEEE Solid-State Circuits Magazine*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 23–29, 2020.
- [11] *3GPP TR 38.820 version 16.1.0, 7 - 24 GHz frequency range (Release 16)*, Std.
- [12] H. Wang, K. Choi, B. Abdelaziz *et al.*, “Power amplifiers performance survey 2000-present,” Available at <https://ideas.ethz.ch/Surveys/pa-survey.html>, accessed: 2024-05-28.
- [13] T. Riihonen, P. Mathecken, and R. Wichman, “Effect of oscillator phase noise and processing delay in full-duplex OFDM repeaters,” in *Proc. of Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, 2012, pp. 1947–1951.

**SARA WILLHAMMAR** received her dual Ph.D. degree from Lund University, Sweden, and KU Leuven, Belgium, in 2023. Now she is a postdoctoral fellow at Lund University, Sweden. Main research interests are channel measurements, characterization and modeling for massive MIMO systems.

**HIROKI IIMORI** (Member, IEEE) earned his Ph.D. with special distinction from Jacobs University Bremen in Germany in 2022. He is currently with Ericsson Research, focusing on signal processing and wireless communications.

**JOAO VIEIRA** received the Bachelor degree from University of Madeira, Portugal, in 2011, and the PhD degree from Lund University, Sweden, in 2017. Since then, he is with Ericsson Research investigating different 6G candidate technologies, especially those comprising large antenna arrays.

**LARS SUNDSTRÖM** (Senior Member, IEEE) Lars Sundström is with Ericsson Research as a Principal Researcher with interests ranging from wideband direct-RF data converters to radio architectures for cellular systems.

**FREDRIK TUFVESSON** (Fellow, IEEE) received his Ph.D. in 2000 from Lund University in Sweden, where he now is a Professor of Radio Systems. His main research interest is the interplay between the radio channel and the rest of the communication system with various applications in 5G/B5G systems such as massive MIMO, mmWave communication, vehicular communication and radio-based positioning.

**ERIK G. LARSSON** (Fellow, IEEE) is Professor at Linköping University, Sweden. His interests are in wireless communications, statistical signal processing, decentralized machine learning, and network science.