

Near-Optimal Cell-Free Beamforming for Physical Layer Multigroup Multicasting

Mahmoud Zaher*, Emil Björnson*, and Marina Petrova*[†]
{mahmoudz, emilbjo, petrovam}@kth.se

*Department of Computer Science, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden

[†]Mobile Communications and Computing, RWTH Aachen University, Germany

Abstract—Physical layer multicasting is an efficient transmission technique that exploits the beamforming potential at the transmitting nodes and the broadcast nature of the wireless channel, together with the demand for the same content from several UEs. This paper addresses the max-min fair multigroup multicast beamforming optimization, which is an NP-hard problem. We propose a novel iterative elimination procedure coupled with semidefinite relaxation (SDR) to find the near-global optimum rank-1 beamforming vectors in a cell-free massive MIMO (multiple-input multiple-output) network setup. The proposed optimization procedure shows significant improvements in computational complexity and spectral efficiency performance compared to the SDR followed by the commonly used randomization procedure and the state-of-the-art difference-of-convex approximation algorithm. The significance of the proposed procedure is that it can be utilized as a rank reduction method for any problem in conjunction with SDR.

Index Terms—Multicast, downlink beamforming, convex optimization, semidefinite relaxation, cell-free massive MIMO.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the growing appetite for multimedia services and the surge in the number of user equipments (UEs), multimedia multicasting provides an efficient solution to transmit data to a group of UEs altogether. It has received considerable attention since it can support various applications such as television channels' broadcasting over mobile networks, videoconferencing and emergency broadcast systems. Due to the nature of multicasting, where the UEs are serviced using the same transmission and time-frequency resources, this technique mitigates the problem of co-channel interference within the UE group requesting the same data and provides a remarkable improvement in radio resource utilization [1]. The emergence of massive MIMO (multiple-input multiple-output) offers the opportunity for effective beamforming of a multitude of these multicast signals to different UE groups. However, the cell-centric design suffers from the intrinsic inter-cell interference and large pathloss variations of conventional networks [2]. Cell-free massive MIMO represents a post-cellular architecture to provide service for UEs with geographically distributed access points (APs) that cooperate in a joint transmission with no cell boundaries [3]–[5]. Such network infrastructure focuses on providing uniform coverage within the network area by boosting the poor cell-edge UEs' performance. This is particularly desirable for multicast transmissions as the minimum

signal-to-interference-and-noise ratio (SINR) determines the common information rate of a UE group [6].

To that end, quality of service (QoS) (guaranteeing a minimum received SNR to every UE) and max-min fair (MMF) (maximizing the smallest received SNR) designs were first introduced for a single-cell single-multicast group in [7]. The concept was later extended in [6] to consider multiple co-channel multicast groups. The core problem was shown to be NP-hard, and approximate solutions were obtained using relaxation techniques based on semidefinite programming (SDP). The works in [6], [7] suggested different randomization procedures to extract the sub-optimal rank-1 beamforming solutions from the higher rank solutions attained through SDP. However, this method does not scale well in terms of computational complexity and spectral efficiency (SE) performance. Particularly, in case of multigroup multicasting, a multigroup multicast power control (MMPC) optimization problem needs to be solved for each candidate set of beamforming vectors obtained through this method. Moreover, the approximation quality degrades considerably as the total number of transmit antennas increases [7], [8]. Note that a rank-1 beamforming solution where the cooperating APs transmit a single common independent signal to each group utilizing spatial multiplexing is deemed practical due to ease of implementation as compared to a higher rank transmission.

Recent works have suggested other iterative optimization procedures to solve the multigroup multicast QoS and MMF problems. In [8], a coordinated multicast MMF problem is formulated and solved using parametric manifold optimization in a multicell network, where each base station (BS) serves a single UE group. The authors in [1] develop three different algorithms to solve the MMF problem with per-cell power constraints and joint beamforming among the cooperating BSs. It is shown that the difference-of-convex approximation (DCA) algorithm yields the highest SE performance with improved computational complexity compared to the other SDR with randomization-based algorithms. The DCA algorithm relies on the successive convex approximation (SCA) technique, which represents the state-of-the-art in multicast beamforming optimization. A two-layer beamforming design has been proposed in [9], where the first layer is tailored to eliminate the multicast inter-group interference while the second layer is designed based on SCA to maximize the SNR of the decoupled multicast groups. The work in [10], [11] provide different

This work was supported by the FFL18-0277 grant from the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research.

formulations to the QoS and MMF problems based on the optimal multicast beamforming structure derived in [10].

In this paper, we propose a novel iterative optimization procedure to solve the multigroup multicast MMF problem in a cell-free network providing service to multiple multicast UE groups. The procedure utilizes the SDR technique along with a successive elimination procedure to the higher rank solutions produced by SDR to achieve the near-optimal rank-1 solution to the MMF problem. We highlight that the proposed procedure is straightforwardly applicable to any multigroup multicast problem and can provide a near-optimal solution, regardless of the network architecture and size. Throughout this paper, we assume perfect CSI acquisition at the transmitting APs to focus on the beamforming design. The algorithm shows significant improvements in terms of the minimum achievable SINR and computational time as compared to the state-of-the-art in multigroup multicast beamforming optimization.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

This paper considers a cell-free massive MIMO system with L APs, each equipped with N antennas. The APs jointly serve K single-antenna UEs that are arbitrarily distributed in a large service area. We assume that the UEs are divided into G multicast groups, such that for group g , $g = 1, \dots, G$, all K_g UEs belonging to the group are served with a single multicast transmission. Each UE is assumed to belong to only one multicast group, which entails that $\sum_{j=1}^G K_j = K$. We consider a standard block fading channel model where the time-varying wideband channels are divided into time-frequency coherence blocks, such that the channels are static and frequency-flat in each block [4]. The channel between UE k in group g and AP l is denoted as $\mathbf{h}_{kg,l} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$. The system model is depicted in Fig. 1.

We assume that the L APs serve all multicast groups on the same time-frequency resources. Consequently, the transmitted signal from AP l is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_l = \sum_{j=1}^G \mathbf{w}_{j,l} s_j, \quad (1)$$

where s_j denotes the zero-mean unit-variance multicast signal intended for all the UEs of group j and $\mathbf{w}_{j,l}$ represents the corresponding precoding vector. The precoding vectors satisfy short-term power constraints at each AP, which means that the power constraints are satisfied in each coherence block. Accordingly, $\sum_{j=1}^G \|\mathbf{w}_{j,l}\|^2 \leq P_{l,\max}$, $\forall l$, where $P_{l,\max}$ represents the maximum transmit power of AP l . The received signal at UE k in group g is computed as

$$\begin{aligned} y_{kg} &= \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{h}_{kg,l}^H \mathbf{x}_l + n_{kg} \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{h}_{kg,l}^H \mathbf{w}_{g,l} s_g + \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{h}_{kg,l}^H \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq g}}^G \mathbf{w}_{j,l} s_j + n_{kg}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$




Fig. 1: Cell-free massive MIMO multigroup multicasting.

where $n_{kg} \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, \sigma_{kg}^2)$ represents the noise at UE k in group g . As a result, an achievable SE of the k^{th} UE of group g under the perfect CSI assumption can be evaluated as

$$\text{SE}_{kg}^{\text{dl}} = \log_2 \left(1 + \text{SINR}_{kg}^{\text{dl}} \right), \quad (3)$$

where $\text{SINR}_{kg}^{\text{dl}}$ is the effective SINR of UE k in group g :

$$\text{SINR}_{kg}^{\text{dl}} = \frac{\left| \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{h}_{kg,l}^H \mathbf{w}_{g,l} \right|^2}{\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq g}}^G \left| \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{h}_{kg,l}^H \mathbf{w}_{j,l} \right|^2 + \sigma_{kg}^2}. \quad (4)$$

We define the concatenated channel vector between all APs and UE k in group g as $\mathbf{h}_{kg} = [\mathbf{h}_{kg,1}^T, \mathbf{h}_{kg,2}^T, \dots, \mathbf{h}_{kg,L}^T]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{LN \times 1}$ and the precoding vector for group g as $\mathbf{w}_g = [\mathbf{w}_{g,1}^T, \mathbf{w}_{g,2}^T, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{g,L}^T]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{LN \times 1}$. The SINR expression can then be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SINR}_{kg}^{\text{dl}} &= \frac{\left| \mathbf{h}_{kg}^H \mathbf{w}_g \right|^2}{\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq g}}^G \left| \mathbf{h}_{kg}^H \mathbf{w}_j \right|^2 + \sigma_{kg}^2} \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{h}_{kg}^H \mathbf{w}_g \mathbf{w}_g^H \mathbf{h}_{kg}}{\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq g}}^G \mathbf{h}_{kg}^H \mathbf{w}_j \mathbf{w}_j^H \mathbf{h}_{kg} + \sigma_{kg}^2} \\ &= \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_g)}{\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq g}}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_j) + \sigma_{kg}^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{kg} = \mathbf{h}_{kg} \mathbf{h}_{kg}^H$ and $\mathbf{W}_g = \mathbf{w}_g \mathbf{w}_g^H$, $\forall g$. The above SINR formulation makes it suitable to construct the SDP of the multigroup multicast MMF problem.

III. MAX-MIN FAIR SINR PROBLEM

In this section, we formulate the multigroup multicast MMF problem. The goal is to find the transmit precoding vectors $\{\mathbf{w}_g : \forall g\}$ that maximize the minimum achievable SINR in (5) among all UEs in the system under per-AP power constraints. We highlight that the minimum SINR among the UEs in a multicast group determines what data rate can be utilized for that group since everyone must be able to decode. Hence,

maximizing the minimum achievable SINR is an appropriate design criterion for the multicast problem.

A. Problem Formulation

We define $\mathbf{D}_l = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{Z}_{l1}, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_{lL})$ as a block diagonal matrix with $\mathbf{Z}_{ll} = \mathbf{I}_N$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{li} = \mathbf{0}_{N \times N}, \forall i \neq l$. Hence, the multigroup multicast MMF problem can be written as

$$\text{maximize}_{\{\mathbf{W}_g\}_{g=1}^G} \min_{\substack{\forall k \in \{1, \dots, K_g\} \\ \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}}} \frac{1}{\tau_g \sum_{j=1, j \neq g}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_j) + \sigma_{kg}^2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_g) \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{W}_g \succeq \mathbf{0} \quad \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}, \quad (6b)$$

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{W}_g) = 1 \quad \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}, \quad (6c)$$

$$\sum_{g=1}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}_l \mathbf{W}_g) \leq P_{l, \max} \quad \forall l \in \{1, \dots, L\}, \quad (6d)$$

where τ_g represents the per-group normalized weight of the SINR target, such that $0 \leq \tau_g \leq 1, \forall g$, which allows for having different SINR targets among the different multicast groups. The above problem is non-convex due to the non-convex rank-1 constraint in (6c). A relaxation of the problem is devised by dropping the rank-1 constraint. Further, the problem is cast in epigraph form by introducing an auxiliary variable $t \geq 0$ to lower bound the worst-case SINR. Accordingly, the relaxed MMF problem is reformulated as

$$\text{maximize}_{\{\mathbf{W}_g\}_{g=1}^G, t} t \quad (7a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_g)}{\sum_{j=1, j \neq g}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_j) + \sigma_{kg}^2} \geq \tau_g t \quad (7b)$$

$$\forall k \in \{1, \dots, K_g\}, \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\} \quad (7c)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_g \succeq \mathbf{0} \quad \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\} \quad (7c)$$

$$\sum_{g=1}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}_l \mathbf{W}_g) \leq P_{l, \max} \quad \forall l \in \{1, \dots, L\}. \quad (7d)$$

The problem in (7) is quasi-convex, meaning that it cannot be directly solved by general-purpose solvers (since t is a variable). In the next subsection, we present a method to find the optimum solution to the relaxed MMF problem.

B. Relation-Based Algorithm

Inspired by the work in [1], [6], we devise the following QoS problem with a given minimum SINR target to achieve the MMF SINR optimum solution of the relaxed problem. In [6], it was assumed that each BS serves a single multicast group, whereas [1] considers the more general multigroup multicast problem. In this paper, we use a different formulation to directly consider the per-AP power constraints in the optimization objective rather than the approach of [1], which utilizes the less stringent total power constraint at all the APs, and then include the per-AP powers as separate constraints.

The corresponding QoS problem to the MMF problem is formulated in terms of the normalized per-AP powers as

$$\text{minimize}_{\{\mathbf{W}_g\}_{g=1}^G} \max_{\forall l \in \{1, \dots, L\}} \frac{1}{P_{l, \max}} \sum_{g=1}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}_l \mathbf{W}_g) \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \frac{1}{\tau_g \sum_{j=1, j \neq g}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_j) + \sigma_{kg}^2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_g) \geq \gamma \quad (8b)$$

$$\forall k \in \{1, \dots, K_g\}, \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}, \quad (8c)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_g \succeq \mathbf{0} \quad \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}, \quad (8c)$$

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{W}_g) = 1 \quad \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}, \quad (8d)$$

where γ represents the SINR target. As in the case of the MMF problem, we drop the non-convex rank-1 constraint to obtain the relaxed convex QoS problem. Subsequently, through the introduction of the auxiliary variable $x \geq 0$ to upper bound the maximum allowable normalized per-AP power, the problem is cast in epigraph form as

$$\text{minimize}_{\{\mathbf{W}_g\}_{g=1}^G, x} x \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_g)}{\sum_{j=1, j \neq g}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_j) + \sigma_{kg}^2} \geq \tau_g \gamma \quad (9b)$$

$$\forall k \in \{1, \dots, K_g\}, \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}, \quad (9c)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_g \succeq \mathbf{0} \quad \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}, \quad (9c)$$

$$\sum_{g=1}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}_l \mathbf{W}_g) \leq P_{l, \max} x \quad \forall l \in \{1, \dots, L\}. \quad (9d)$$

Problem (9) is a standard SDP problem that can be solved with an optimization tool, such as CVX [12]. That being said, we utilize the relation between the relaxed QoS and MMF problems to solve the relaxed MMF problem. The idea is based on the fact that the optimum objective values of the relaxed MMF and QoS problems are monotonically non-decreasing in the per-AP power budgets and the SINR target, respectively [1], [6]. Let problem (7) be denoted as \mathcal{F} with an optimum objective value of t^* , and problem (9) as \mathcal{Q} . Further, we define $\mathbf{p} = [P_{1, \max}, \dots, P_{L, \max}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^L$ as the per-AP power constraints vector, and $\mathbf{g} = [\tau_1, \dots, \tau_G] \in \mathbb{R}^G$ as the normalized weight vector for the per-group SINR target. The relation between the QoS and MMF problems is provided in the following claim.

Claim 1: Problems \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{F} are inverse related as

$$1 = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{p}), \quad (10)$$

$$t^* = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{g}, \mathcal{Q}(t^* \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{p}). \quad (11)$$

The logic here is that if the minimum power that can be achieved for a given QoS problem is equal to the power budget at the APs, then the target SINR of the QoS problem is the MMF SINR that can be achieved for that power budget. The above problem is likely to result in optimum solution matrices $\{\mathbf{W}_g\}_{g=1}^G$ that do not satisfy the rank-1 constraint of the original problem (6). In fact, standard interior-point

algorithms for solving SDPs will always return the solution with maximum rank among all optimum solutions [13].

Previous works have generally used a randomization procedure [6] to extract a rank-1 beamforming solution. Particularly for the multigroup case, an MMPC problem needs to be solved for each set of candidate beamforming vectors produced using randomization. In addition, an increasingly large number of candidate sets must be tested when increasing the network size and number of UEs for a satisfactory SE performance.

IV. PROPOSED SUCCESSIVE ELIMINATION ALGORITHM

As discussed in Section III-B, when applying SDR to the multigroup multicast MMF problem, the resulting solution matrices will most likely have a high rank. Moreover, the randomization procedures in the literature to find an approximate rank-1 solution are particularly unsuitable in the case of multigroup multicasting and do not scale well with the total number of transmit antennas and UEs. This necessitates the development of an efficient procedure to extract a near-optimal rank-1 solution from the higher-rank solution obtained via SDR. In this section, we propose a novel *Successive Elimination Algorithm*, that is able to find the near-optimal rank-1 solution to the multigroup multicast MMF problem.

A. Penalized QoS Problem Formulation

The reformulated multigroup multicast QoS problem in (9), along with the bisection search over the different SINR targets, represent the first step of the proposed algorithm. In this way, we are able to achieve a higher-rank solution for the MMF problem by solving a sequence of QoS problems with different SINR targets, until convergence to the SINR target that results in utilizing the available power budget at the APs. Afterwards, an iterative procedure to eliminate the higher-rank solutions is performed. The elimination is done through the successive penalization of the directions of the eigenvectors corresponding to the second largest eigenvalues of the higher-rank solution matrices for each of the multicast UE groups. At each iteration, the following optimization problem is solved:

$$\text{minimize } x \quad (12a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kg} \mathbf{W}_g)}{\sum_{j=1, j \neq g}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_{kj} \mathbf{W}_j) + \sigma_{kg}^2} \geq \tau_g \gamma \quad (12b)$$

$$\forall k \in \{1, \dots, K_g\}, \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}, \quad (12c)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_g \succeq \mathbf{0} \quad \forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\},$$

$$\sum_{g=1}^G \left(\text{tr}(\mathbf{D}_l \mathbf{W}_g) + \zeta \sum_{i_g} (\mathbf{u}_{i_g}^g)^H \mathbf{W}_g \mathbf{u}_{i_g}^g \right) \leq P_{l,\max} x \quad (12d)$$

$$\forall l \in \{1, \dots, L\},$$

where ζ represents the penalty factor and the $\mathbf{u}_{i_g}^g$, $\forall i_g, \forall g$, represent the eigenvectors corresponding to the second largest eigenvalues that are determined from the higher rank solutions $\{\mathbf{W}_g\}_{g=1}^G$ of the previous iterations.

B. Successive Elimination Algorithm

In general, a lower-rank solution to an SDP problem lies on the boundary of the feasible set. As a result, standard SDP solvers will always favor a higher-rank solution over its lower-rank counterpart, even if both can achieve the same objective value. Since we are interested in achieving the optimum rank-1 beamforming solution, we develop an iterative procedure to eliminate all higher-rank solutions that result in an optimum objective value that is greater than or equal to that achieved with the optimum rank-1 solution. The procedure is summarized in Algorithm 1. Note that P_T represents the sum of all AP power budgets; that is $P_T = \sum_{l=1}^L P_{l,\max}$, $\mathcal{B}(1)$ denotes the first member in the set \mathcal{B} and κ denotes the elimination interval width.

Algorithm 1 Successive Elimination Algorithm

Input: Specify the interval $[\gamma_{lo}, \gamma_{up}]$ that contains the optimum objective value of (7), $\gamma_{lo} = 0$ and $\gamma_{up} = \min_{k,g} \frac{P_T \|\mathbf{h}_{kg}\|^2}{\sigma_{kg}^2}$. Set the solution tolerance to ϵ .

- 1: **repeat**
- 2: Set $\gamma \leftarrow (\gamma_{lo} + \gamma_{up}) / 2$.
- 3: Solve problem (9) using the value of γ .
- 4: **if** $x > 1$ **or** problem (9) is infeasible **then**
- 5: Set $\gamma_{up} \leftarrow \gamma$.
- 6: **else**
- 7: Set $\gamma_{lo} \leftarrow \gamma$.
- 8: **end if**
- 9: **until** $\gamma_{up} - \gamma_{lo} < \epsilon$
- 10: Set $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{W}_g \mid \text{rank}(\mathbf{W}_g) \neq 1\}$.
- 11: Set $i_g \leftarrow 1, \forall g$.
- 12: **while** $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$ **do**
- 13: Set $\mathbf{u}_{i_g}^g \leftarrow$ Eigenvector corresponding to second largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{B}(1)$, where g is the group index of $\mathcal{B}(1)$.
- 14: Set $\gamma_{lo} \leftarrow \gamma - \kappa$.
- 15: **repeat**
- 16: Set $\gamma \leftarrow (\gamma_{lo} + \gamma_{up}) / 2$.
- 17: Solve problem (12) using the value of γ .
- 18: **if** $x > 1$ **or** problem (12) is infeasible **then**
- 19: Set $\gamma_{up} \leftarrow \gamma$.
- 20: **else**
- 21: Set $\gamma_{lo} \leftarrow \gamma$.
- 22: **end if**
- 23: **until** $\gamma_{up} - \gamma_{lo} < \epsilon$
- 24: Set $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{W}_g \mid \text{rank}(\mathbf{W}_g) \neq 1\}$.
- 25: Set $i_g \leftarrow i_g + 1$.
- 26: **end while**

Output: The near-optimal rank-1 solution matrices.

Algorithm 1 starts by specifying the search interval, which contains the optimum objective value of the relaxed MMF problem in (7). Subsequently, a bisection search is performed, where at each iteration, the relaxed QoS problem in (9) is solved at the midpoint of the search interval. These steps are repeated until convergence; that is $\gamma_{up} - \gamma_{lo} < \epsilon$. Now we arrive

at a solution to the relaxed MMF problem where the solution matrices have a rank that is most likely higher than 1. Next, the elimination procedure of the higher-rank solutions is done such that at each iteration, a higher-rank solution matrix to a given multicast group is penalized in all subsequent iterations. The penalty is in the form of the quadratic matrix product in (12d), alongside the penalty factor ζ , which ensures the elimination of that solution, i.e., generates enough penalty to push the solver away from that solution. The procedure is repeated until all higher-rank solutions that are produced as output by the SDP are eliminated, yielding the desired near-optimal rank-1 solution to the MMF problem.

We highlight two fundamental advantages of the proposed algorithm that are worth noting. The first advantage is that it does not require an initialization with a feasible solution, which is necessary for algorithms that rely on the SCA technique (the state-of-the-art in multicast beamforming optimization). Specifically, when the number of UEs grows large, it might be hard to find an effective low-complexity solution to use as initialization. The second advantage is that the proposed elimination procedure to extract the rank-1 solution can perform the bisection search over possible SINR targets within a relatively small interval. This allows for a significant reduction in the computational time of the elimination procedure iterations as compared to the first solution (the conventional higher-rank SDP solution). The reason is that the upper bound of the interval will be the optimum γ achieved in the previous iteration, whereas the lower bound can be chosen only a small separation away from it (Step 14).

V. NUMERICAL EVALUATION

In this section, we use Monte Carlo simulations to evaluate the performance of the proposed optimization procedure to solve the multigroup multicast MMF problem. We consider a cell-free network with $L = 9$ APs deployed on a square grid in an area of $750 \text{ m} \times 750 \text{ m}$. A wrap-around topology is employed to mitigate boundary effects. Each AP is equipped with a half-wavelength-spaced uniform linear array of $N = 4$ antennas. We assume $G = 3$ multicast groups, each comprising the same number of $K_g = K_G$ UEs, $\forall g$ that are randomly and uniformly distributed within the area of interest. The simulation parameters are summarized in Table I. The channel between an arbitrary UE k in group g and AP l is modelled by correlated Rayleigh fading as $\mathbf{h}_{kg,l} \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{R}_{kg,l})$, where $\mathbf{R}_{kg,l} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ represents the spatial correlation matrix, generated as in [4]. The average channel gain, $\beta_{kg,l} = \frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\mathbf{R}_{kg,l})$, is calculated using the 3GPP Urban Microcell model for generating large-scale fading coefficients with correlated shadowing among the UEs. The large-scale fading coefficients are thus given by

$$\beta_{kg,l} = -30.5 - 36.7 \log_{10} \left(\frac{d_{kg,l}}{1 \text{ m}} \right) + F_{kg,l} \text{ dB}, \quad (13)$$

where $d_{kg,l}$ denotes the distance between UE k in group g and AP l and $F_{kg,l} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 4^2)$ corresponds to the shadow

TABLE I: Network simulation parameters.

Area of interest	$750 \text{ m} \times 750 \text{ m}$
Bandwidth	20 MHz
Number of APs	$L = 9$
Number of antennas per AP	$N = 4$
Number of multicast groups	$G = 3$
Number of UEs per group	$K_G = [10, 30]$
Maximum AP transmit power	$P_{l,\max} = 1 \text{ W}$
Pathloss exponent	$\alpha = 3.67$
DL noise power	-94 dBm

fading. The shadowing is correlated between a single AP and different UEs as

$$\mathbb{E}\{F_{kg,l} F_{ij,n}\} = \begin{cases} 4^2 2^{-\delta_{kgij}/9 \text{ m}} & \text{for } l = n, \\ 0 & \text{for } l \neq n, \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where δ_{kgij} is the distance between UE k of group g and UE i of group j . Note that the correlation between the shadowing at different APs, which is the second case in (14), will be negligible because of the relatively larger inter-AP distances compared to the distances between the UEs.

In the following, the proposed successive elimination algorithm will be referred to as ‘‘SEA’’, SDR followed by choosing the dominant eigenvector or Gaussian randomization as ‘‘SDR-D’’ and ‘‘SDR-G’’, respectively. The stopping criterion for both SDR-based algorithms as well as the DCA algorithm is chosen to be $\epsilon = 0.1$. The elimination interval width for the SEA is set to $\kappa = 3$ for $K = 30$ UEs and $\kappa = 1$ for $K = 90$ UEs. The penalty factor is adjusted to $\zeta = 10\sqrt{LN}$. The number of randomization vectors utilized for SDR-G is 300. We assume all groups have the same SINR target, that is $\tau_g = 1$, $\forall g$. We use the same platform for performing all simulations, a 4 core Intel(R) Core i5-10310U CPU with 1.7 GHz base frequency and 4.4 GHz turbo frequency. All programs are written in Matlab and utilize CVX [12] to solve the optimization problems.

Figs. 2 and 3 plot the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the max-min SE for the proposed optimization procedure for $K = 30$ and $K = 90$ UEs, respectively. The state-of-the-art DCA algorithm [1] and previous SDR-based rank-1 solutions [6] as well as the SDR upper bound representing the higher-rank solution are shown for comparison. It is clear that the proposed SEA significantly outperforms previous rank-1 solutions based on SDR. For $K = 30$ UEs, both the SEA and DCA algorithms are able to achieve almost the same SE as that of the SDR upper bound. For the dense $K = 90$ UEs case, the proposed procedure achieves about 10 bit/s/Hz increase in the sum-SE delivered to all UEs compared to the DCA algorithm. The CDF curves are generated using 2000 simulation samples.

The intuition behind the SE improvement is that the DCA algorithm follows a gradient descent concept that can only guarantee convergence to a stationary point of the original non-convex MMF problem. On the other hand, the proposed procedure starts with the optimum higher-rank solution that is delivered by SDR and then iteratively eliminates the higher-rank solutions by penalizing the directions of the eigenvectors corresponding to the second largest eigenvalues of these solu-




Fig. 2: CDF of the max-min SE for $K = 30$ UEs.




Fig. 3: CDF of the max-min SE for $K = 90$ UEs.

tion matrices. In this way, the algorithm iterates until reaching the near-optimal rank-1 solution that lies in the orthogonal subspace to the directions of the eigenvectors corresponding to the second largest eigenvalues of all the higher-rank solutions of the previous iterations. For each iteration, the solution matrices $\{\mathbf{W}_g\}_{g=1}^G$ are Hermitian positive semidefinite with distinct non-zero eigenvalues, which results in the eigenvectors of each matrix being orthogonal to each other. Consequently, the effect of the elimination procedure where we penalize the second strongest eigenvectors is minimal on subsequent iterations and thus produces a near-global optimum rank-1 solution to the NP-hard multigroup multicast MMF problem.

Table II shows the average computational time of the proposed optimization procedure as compared to the benchmarks. For the case of $K = 30$ UEs, the proposed algorithm is able to achieve about 37% reduction as compared to the state-of-the-art DCA algorithm while achieving the same SE performance. As for the dense scenario of $K = 90$ UEs, the proposed algorithm requires more computations to achieve the near-optimal rank-1 solution surpassing the DCA algorithm, which can only guarantee convergence to a stationary point. Note that

TABLE II: Average computational time in seconds.

K	SEA	DCA	SDR-D	SDR-G
30	33.04	52.15	16.53	445.05
90	191.52	87.53	33.0	–

SDR-G requires prohibitively long execution time for $K = 90$ UEs, which is why it is omitted from the numerical evaluation.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper addresses the multigroup multicast MMF optimization problem in a cell-free massive MIMO network setup. We devise a novel SDR-based successive elimination algorithm capable of obtaining a near-global optimum rank-1 beamforming solution to this NP-hard problem. The proposed algorithm is compared against state-of-the-art SDR-based and SCA-based algorithms in multicast beamforming optimization. The numerical results show significant improvements in terms of SE performance and computational complexity while utilizing the same platform and software to solve optimization problems. The significance of the proposed algorithm is that it can be adopted for any type of problem where SDR is utilized and a low-rank solution is desirable.

REFERENCES

- [1] G.-W. Hsu, B. Liu, H.-H. Wang, and H.-J. Su, "Joint beamforming for multicell multigroup multicast with per-cell power constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 4044–4058, 2016.
- [2] M. Zaher, E. Björnson, and M. Petrova, "Soft handover procedures in mmWave cell-free massive MIMO networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2023.
- [3] J. Zhang, S. Chen, Y. Lin, J. Zheng, B. Ai, and L. Hanzo, "Cell-free massive MIMO: A new next-generation paradigm," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 99878–99888, 2019.
- [4] Ö. T. Demir, E. Björnson, and L. Sanguinetti, "Foundations of user-centric cell-free massive MIMO," *Foundations and Trends® in Signal Processing*, vol. 14, no. 3-4, pp. 162–472, 2021.
- [5] M. Zaher, Ö. T. Demir, E. Björnson, and M. Petrova, "Learning-based downlink power allocation in cell-free massive MIMO systems," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 174–188, 2023.
- [6] E. Karipidis, N. D. Sidiropoulos, and Z.-Q. Luo, "Quality of service and max-min fair transmit beamforming to multiple cochannel multicast groups," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 1268–1279, 2008.
- [7] N. D. Sidiropoulos, T. N. Davidson, and Z.-Q. Luo, "Transmit beamforming for physical-layer multicasting," *IEEE transactions on signal processing*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 2239–2251, 2006.
- [8] L. Zhou, L. Zheng, X. Wang, W. Jiang, and W. Luo, "Coordinated multicell multicast beamforming based on manifold optimization," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 1673–1676, 2017.
- [9] M. Sadeghi, L. Sanguinetti, R. Couillet, and C. Yuen, "Reducing the computational complexity of multicasting in large-scale antenna systems," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 2963–2975, 2017.
- [10] M. Dong and Q. Wang, "Multi-group multicast beamforming: Optimal structure and efficient algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 3738–3753, 2020.
- [11] C. Zhang, M. Dong, and B. Liang, "Ultra-low-complexity algorithms with structurally optimal multi-group multicast beamforming in large-scale systems," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 2023.
- [12] M. Grant and S. Boyd, "CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.1." <https://cvxr.com/cvx>, Mar. 2014.
- [13] Z.-Q. Luo, W.-K. Ma, A. M.-C. So, Y. Ye, and S. Zhang, "Semidefinite relaxation of quadratic optimization problems," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 20–34, 2010.