

A Selective Secure Precoding Framework for MU-MIMO Rate-Splitting Multiple Access Networks Under Limited CSIT

Sangmin Lee, *Student Member, IEEE*, Seokjun Park, *Student Member, IEEE*, Jeonghun Park, *Member, IEEE*, and Jinseok Choi, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we propose a robust and adaptable secure precoding framework designed to encapsulate a intricate scenario where legitimate users have different information security: secure private or normal public information. Leveraging rate-splitting multiple access (RSMA), we formulate the sum secrecy spectral efficiency (SE) maximization problem in downlink multi-user multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems with multi-eavesdropper. To resolve the challenges including the heterogeneity of security, non-convexity, and non-smoothness of the problem, we initially approximate the problem using a LogSumExp technique. Subsequently, we derive the first-order optimality condition in the form of a generalized eigenvalue problem. We utilize a power iteration-based method to solve the condition, thereby achieving a superior local optimal solution. The proposed algorithm is further extended to a more realistic scenario involving limited channel state information at the transmitter (CSIT). To effectively utilize the limited channel information, we employ a conditional average rate approach. Handling the conditional average by deriving useful bounds, we establish a lower bound for the objective function under the conditional average. Then we apply the similar optimization method as for the perfect CSIT case. In simulations, we validate the proposed algorithm in terms of the sum secrecy SE.

Index Terms—Rate-splitting multiple access, physical layer security, precoding, and generalized power iteration.

I. INTRODUCTION

The shift from the era of 5G to 6G marks a significant leap in the technological evolution of wireless communication, requiring careful consideration of various complex factors, not just increased transmission capacity [2], [3]. With the increasing complexity of wireless communication networks, the current era has seen a notable rise in the risks related to unauthorized access, eavesdropping, and data breaches [4]. This highlights the urgent need for new solutions that not only meet the growing demands for faster data transmission but also strengthen the security of wireless systems. In this regard, rate-splitting multiple access (RSMA) can be adopted to increase spectral efficiency (SE) by reducing inter-user interference

[5]. Concurrently, physical layer security techniques are used to enhance the security measures essential for safeguarding communications [6]. Together, these strategies play a key role in building a strong framework that ensures both efficient and secure wireless communications.

A. Prior Work

Improving SE is a key focus in wireless communications research, driven by the growing need for more data bandwidth and better connectivity. To manage the inter-user interference, the non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) methodology stands out for its effectiveness [7]. Moreover, RSMA as represented in [8], has shown promise in effectively handling inter-user interference. RSMA systems with low-resolution quantizers have shown to be a versatile and promising technology for future 6G networks [9]. More importantly, RSMA has demonstrated its superiority over conventional multiple access methods by bridging spatial-division multiple access (SDMA), orthogonal multiple access (OMA), and NOMA [10]. RSMA was highlighted in [11] for its theoretical superiority in maximizing channel degree-of-freedom under imperfect channel state information (CSI) by mitigating interference. A principle of RSMA involves the division of each user's transmission into two parts: the common and private messages [8]. The common stream is decodable by all users through successive interference cancellation (SIC) when decoding private streams, thereby reducing interference and enhancing SE [10].

The advantages of RSMA have drawn substantial research endeavors on RSMA beamforming design. The potential of RSMA for boosting sum SE in multiple-input single-output (MISO) channels was examined by using a precoding strategy [12]. To further elevate the SE, a linear precoding approach for the downlink MISO system predicated on weighted minimum mean square error (WMMSE) was proposed in [11]. Additionally, the design of RSMA precoders was articulated by casting the optimization problem into a convex form [13]. The optimization of rate allocation and power control within RSMA which aimed at maximizing the sum rate was explored in [14]. A hierarchical RSMA architecture, facilitating the decoding of more than one common stream based on hierarchy, was introduced for downlink massive multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems [15]. An RSMA precoder design algorithm, leveraging the generalized power iteration (GPI) method for sum SE maximization in the downlink multi-user

S. Lee is with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology (UNIST), Ulsan, 44919, South Korea (e-mail: sangminlee@unist.ac.kr).

S. Park and J. Choi are with the School of Electrical Engineering, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), Daejeon, 34141, South Korea (e-mail: {sj.park, jinseok}@kaist.ac.kr).

J. Park is with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Yonsei University, Seoul, 03722, South Korea (e-mail: jhpark@yonsei.ac.kr).

This work was presented in part at the *IEEE Vehicular Technology Conference (IEEE VTC) Workshop*, Florence, Italy, 2023 [1].

MIMO (MU-MIMO) system considering channel estimation errors, was developed in [16].

In addition to the SE performance, it has been important to guarantee the information security. For instance, as an exemplar among 6G applications, Internet-of-Things (IoT) systems encounter a pronounced vulnerability to the pervasive issue of wiretapping [17]. While cryptography was initially introduced as a method to ensure secure communication [18], its applicability encounters limitations in physically constrained environments, such as those prevalent in IoT scenarios. In this regard, physical layer security has been receiving great attention thanks to its low computational complexity [19]. Starting with the proposal of Wyner [19], physical layer security has received constant attention, and many studies have been conducted [20], [21]. Physical layer security stands out by ensuring a positive transmission rate for authorized or legitimate users [22], [23]. Building on prior research, several precoding schemes have been proposed to enhance the secrecy SE. The cases of a single eavesdropper were explored to evaluate the achievable secrecy rate in MISO channels [24], [25]. Additionally, the scenario of multiple antennas eavesdropper was introduced in the context of MIMO system [26], and a colluding-eavesdropper scenario was considered in [27]. Security in device-to-device systems was also studied [28]. In more complex systems, the study in [29] investigated the secrecy rate in scenarios where multiple users and multiple eavesdroppers coexist within the network. For a multi-user multi-eavesdropper network, the use of artificial noise (AN)-aided secure precoding was proposed in [30], [31] to enhance secure communication.

Recently, there has been collaborative research focusing on the development of secure wireless communication techniques considering the RSMA approach. The RSMA-based algorithm introduced in [32] considered the secure beamforming optimization for MISO networks under both perfect and imperfect channel state information at the transmitter (CSIT). In [33], the secure RSMA scheme was suggested in a two-user MISO system with imperfect CSIT. A cooperative rate-splitting technique to maximize the sum secrecy rate in the MISO broadcast channel system was suggested specifically for two legitimate users and one eavesdropper [34]. A novel RSMA-based secure transmission scheme with AN was further proposed in [35].

Although many studies have offered valuable contributions in beamforming optimization for physical layer security, an adaptive secure beamforming for a comprehensive network scenario has not been tackled yet. For instance, the works in [32], [33] did not assume any eavesdropper, only considering legitimate users as potential eavesdroppers. In addition, the considered systems in [34], [35] were restricted to a single eavesdropper. Besides the existence of the eavesdropper, there can be different conditions for required security among legitimate users, depending on the type of messages. This needs a selective secure precoding approach to guarantee an optimal communication performance. Accordingly, it is important to consider both legitimate users with different security requirements and explicit eavesdroppers for optimizing secure beamforming.

When considering such a comprehensive network, it is

essential to account for limitations of CSIT: imperfect CSIT for legitimate users and partial CSIT for eavesdroppers. In this regard, the fore-mentioned works [34], [35] developed secure beamforming methods considering a perfect CSIT scenario, which implies the necessity of investigating RSMA secure beamforming under a limited CSIT scenario. Therefore, it is desirable to develop an optimization framework encompassing not only a general scenario of multi-user and multi-eavesdropper MIMO systems with different security priorities but also a limited CSIT assumption.

B. Contributions

This paper presents a secure precoding optimization framework with selectively applicable physical layer security for MIMO-RSMA systems where multiple users and eavesdroppers coexist under limited CSIT. Our primary contributions are summarized as follows:

- To present a comprehensive precoding optimization framework concerning physical layer security in RSMA systems, we consider three distinct groups in the network: the secret user group which requires information security in their private stream; the normal user group which operates without security concerns; and the eavesdroppers who are not a legitimate users and wiretap secret users' private stream. Each secret user assumes all the other users to be potential eavesdroppers as well as the actual eavesdroppers. In the considered system, our focus lies in maximizing the sum secrecy SE while enforcing secure precoding for the secret user group and regular precoding for the normal user group.
- We first propose a selective secure precoding framework to maximize the sum secrecy SE under perfect CSIT, addressing several key challenges such as the non-convexity and non-smoothness. In particular, the common rate of RSMA involves a min function for decodability, and the secrecy SE is determined by selecting the maximum wiretap SE among eavesdroppers. To overcome these issues, we approximate the non-smooth objective function to obtain a smooth sum secrecy SE expression. Subsequently, we reformulate the problem into a more tractable non-convex form, expanding it into a higher-dimensional space. We derive the first-order optimality condition, interpreting it as a generalized eigenvalue problem, and employ a power iteration-based algorithm to find the superior stationary point.
- We extend the proposed algorithm to the case of limited CSIT for both the legitimate users and eavesdroppers. To take advantage of the limited CSIT, we adopt the concept of the ergodic SEs. Given that only the estimated legitimate channel and long-term channel statistics are accessible at the access point (AP), we then employ a conditional averaged secrecy SE approach and derive a lower bound of the objective function as a function of the available channel knowledge. For the derived objective function, we apply a similar optimization framework as proposed in the case of perfect CSIT. Consequently, fully exploiting the available channel information through

TABLE I
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS WITH PRIOR RESEARCH ENDEAVORS

Prior Work	Multiple		Partial CSIT		Potential Wiretappers		AN	RSMA
	Users	Eavesdroppers	Users	Eavesdroppers	Users	Eavesdroppers		
Sum Rate Maximization WMMSE [11]	✓	N/A	✓	N/A		N/A		✓
Max-Min Fairness GPI [36]	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		
Max-Min Fairness SCA [33]	✓	N/A	✓	N/A	✓	N/A		✓
Sum Secrecy Rate Maximization GPI [31]	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	
Sum Secrecy Rate Maximization SCA [32]	✓	N/A	✓	N/A	✓	N/A		✓
Energy Efficiency SWIPT SCA [37]	✓	N/A	✓	N/A	✓	N/A		✓
Proposed	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓

the reformulation and lower bounding, the proposed algorithm becomes more robust to the limited CSIT. Table I summarizes our contributions comparing with the state-of-the-art methods. Based on the comparison, our algorithm demonstrates greater generality, making it highly adaptable to a wide range of physical layer security systems, surpassing the flexibility of existing methods.

- Via simulations, we validate the performance of the proposed robust and selective secure precoding method within RSMA networks. By adjusting the three groups, the algorithm demonstrates improved generalization, resulting in superior performance compared to the benchmark methods. In particular, it is observed that accommodating different security priorities among users can achieve a significant gain in the sum secrecy SE. Therefore, we conclude that the algorithm effectively provides a comprehensive framework that accommodates a wide range of scenarios in multi-user and multi-eavesdropper MIMO systems under both perfect and limited CSIT.

Notation: \mathbf{A} is a matrix and \mathbf{a} is a column vector. $(\cdot)^T$, $(\cdot)^H$, and $(\cdot)^{-1}$ denote transpose, Hermitian, and matrix inversion, respectively. \mathbb{C} denotes the complex domain. \mathbf{I}_N is the identity matrix with size $N \times N$, and $\mathbf{0}$ represents a matrix or column vector with a proper size. For $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K}$, $\mathbf{A} = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N) \in \mathbb{C}^{KN \times KN}$ is a block diagonal matrix. $\|\mathbf{A}\|$ represents L2 norm. $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$, $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$, and \otimes represent expectation operator, trace operator, and Kronecker product, respectively. The vector \mathbf{e}_i is defined as a column vector with a single 1 element at the i th position and all other elements set to 0. We use $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ for vectorization. $\mathcal{CN}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ indicates a complex Gaussian distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2 . $[\cdot]^+$ represents $\max[\cdot, 0]$.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider a single-cell downlink MU-MIMO system where an AP equipped with N antennas serves K users with a single antenna. In the considered system, we assume the existence of two distinct legitimate user classes: one is the secret user group whose information security needs to be guaranteed, and the other is the normal user group whose information security is not required, e.g., public information. Our system also accommodates multiple eavesdroppers, each equipped with a single antenna. An example scenario of our system model is shown in Fig. 1. Let us define the total user




Fig. 1. An example scenario of a multiuser MIMO downlink system employing RSMA with multiple eavesdroppers.

set, secret user set, normal user set, and eavesdropper set as $\mathcal{K} = \{1, \dots, K\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{1, \dots, S\}$, $\mathcal{M} = \{S + 1, \dots, S + M\}$, and $\mathcal{E} = \{1, \dots, E\}$, respectively. We assume $K = S + M$.

A. Signal Model

We consider the single-layer RSMA method [8]. The RSMA-encoded message consists of the common stream s_c and private stream s_k , $\forall k \in \mathcal{K}$. We consider $s_c \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, P)$ and $s_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, P)$. Our approach entails the design of the common stream s_c to ensure decoding feasibility for all K users, while the private stream s_s , $s \in \mathcal{S}$ intended for secret users is crafted with a focus on information security considerations. As established earlier, the private stream s_m , $m \in \mathcal{M}$ designated for normal users operates without necessitating security considerations. We operate under the assumption that only the private stream of the secret user carries critical information, while the common stream is comprised of less sensitive data that does not necessitate stringent security measures as discussed in [32]. Consequently, our objective revolves around safeguarding the confidentiality of the private streams belonging to the secret users by preventing any information leakage.

We represent the transmit signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ using linear precoding as follows:

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{f}_c s_c + \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{f}_i s_i, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{F} = [\mathbf{f}_c, \mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_K]$ with $\mathbf{f}_c \in \mathbb{C}^N$ and $\mathbf{f}_i \in \mathbb{C}^N$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{K}$ are the $N \times 1$ precoding vectors for the common and private streams, respectively. The transmit power constraint is defined as $\|\mathbf{f}_c\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^K \|\mathbf{f}_i\|^2 \leq 1$. The received signal of user k is

$$y_k = \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_c s_c + \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_k s_k + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^K \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_i s_i + z_k, \quad (2)$$

where $z_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ is additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN), and the channel vector connecting the AP and user k is represented as $\mathbf{h}_k \in \mathbb{C}^N$ where $k \in \mathcal{K}$. Similarly, the received signal of eavesdropper \mathbf{e} is

$$y_e = \mathbf{g}_e^H \mathbf{f}_c s_c + \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{g}_e^H \mathbf{f}_i s_i + z_e, \quad (3)$$

where $z_e \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_e^2)$ is AWGN at eavesdropper \mathbf{e} , and a channel vector between the AP and the eavesdropper \mathbf{e} is denoted as $\mathbf{g}_e \in \mathbb{C}^N$ where $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Initially, each user undertakes the decoding of the common stream s_c , treating all remaining private streams s_k , $k \in \mathcal{K}$ as interference. Subsequently, upon the successful decoding of the common stream, employing SIC, users eliminate the common stream from the received signal. This enables them to decode the private streams with reduced interference levels.

To evaluate the performance metrics associated with RSMA, we formulate the SE of the common stream s_c using the received signal y_k in (2). All legitimate users should completely decode the common stream part without any error for perfect SIC. Consequently, the SE of the common stream is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} R_c(\mathbf{F}) &= \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_c|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}} |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{P}} \right) \right\} \\ &= \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \{R_{c,k}(\mathbf{F})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

After perfectly decoding and cancelling the common stream at each user using SIC, the SE of the private stream s_k is

$$R_k(\mathbf{F}) = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_k|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{k\}} |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{P}} \right). \quad (5)$$

We note that the interference of the common stream term does not exist in the interference term of the formulated SE of the private stream in (5) due to SIC.

Next, we proceed with computing the leakage SE denoted as $R^{(s)}(\mathbf{F})$ pertaining to the private stream of secret users. The leakage stems not only from eavesdroppers but also from other users. To expound on several scenarios, with some abuse of notations, we introduce the concept of the leakage set $\mathcal{L}(s) = \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}$. Then, we formulate the maximum achievable leakage SE for secret user $s \in \mathcal{S}$ which is defined as the maximum SE of the symbol of user s among the eavesdroppers and the other legitimate users:

$$R^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) = \max_{l \in \mathcal{L}(s)} \{R_l^{(s)}(\mathbf{F})\} = \max_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}, u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \left\{ R_e^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}), R_u^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) \right\}, \quad (6)$$

where $R_e^{(s)}(\mathbf{F})$ is the wiretap SE for user s from eavesdropper \mathbf{e} and $R_u^{(s)}(\mathbf{F})$ is the wiretap SE for user s from the other legitimate user u . The wiretap SE from eavesdropper \mathbf{e} is

$$R_e^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{g}_e^H \mathbf{f}_s|^2}{|\mathbf{g}_e^H \mathbf{f}_c|^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} |\mathbf{g}_e^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \frac{\sigma_e^2}{P}} \right). \quad (7)$$

Subsequently, we present the wiretap SE from legitimate user u as

$$R_u^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) = \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_u^H \mathbf{f}_s|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{u,s\}} |\mathbf{h}_u^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \frac{\sigma_u^2}{P}} \right). \quad (8)$$

Base on (4), (5), and (6), we formulate the sum SE maximization problem as

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize}_{\mathbf{f}_c, \mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_K} R_c(\mathbf{F}) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left[R_s(\mathbf{F}) - R^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) \right]^+ + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} R_m(\mathbf{F}) \quad (9) \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \|\mathbf{f}_c\|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{f}_k\|^2 \leq 1, \quad (10) \end{aligned}$$

where (10) is the transmit power constraint. It is observed that $R_k(\mathbf{F})$ in (5) is segregated into distinct components: $R_s(\mathbf{F})$ for secret users and $R_m(\mathbf{F})$ for normal users, where $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$. We note that the secrecy SE in (9) involves the leakage SE due to the legitimate users themselves as well as the eavesdroppers, which requires more careful optimization of the precoder. In addition, the problem also includes a non-smooth function due to the rate of the common stream of RSMA and is inherently non-convex with respect to the precoder. In the subsequent sections, addressing the challenges, we solve the problem in (9) with the assumptions of the perfect CSIT and limited CSIT where the AP has the imperfect CSIT of legitimate users and partial CSIT of eavesdroppers.

IV. SELECTIVE SECURE RATE-SPLITTING PRECODING WITH PERFECT CSIT

In this section, we develop selective secure rate-splitting precoding method with perfect CSIT by resolving the fore-mentioned challenges in the formulated problem. We reformulate both the SE of the common stream $R_{c,k}$ in (4) and private stream R_k in (5) to adopt the GPI approach [38]. To this end, let us first define the stacked precoding vector as $\bar{\mathbf{f}} = [\mathbf{f}_c^T, \mathbf{f}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{f}_K^T]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N(K+1) \times 1}$. Then we assume the maximum transmit power, i.e., $\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}\|^2 = 1$ as increasing the transmit power in general increases the secrecy SE [39], [40]. Under this transmit power assumption, we reformulate the derived SEs in (4) and (5) as

$$R_{c,k}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right), R_k(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_k \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_k \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right), \quad (11)$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}_{c,k} = \mathbf{I}_{K+1} \otimes \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{h}_k^H + \mathbf{I}_{N(K+1)} \frac{\sigma^2}{P}, \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_{c,k} = \mathbf{A}_{c,k} - \text{diag} \{ \mathbf{e}_1 \} \otimes \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{h}_k^H, \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_k = (\mathbf{I}_{K+1} - \text{diag} \{ \mathbf{e}_1 \}) \otimes \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{h}_k^H + \mathbf{I}_{N(K+1)} \frac{\sigma^2}{P}, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_k = \mathbf{A}_k - \text{diag} \{ \mathbf{e}_{k+1} \} \otimes \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{h}_k^H. \quad (15)$$

Likewise, the wiretap SE for user $s \in \mathcal{S}$ from eavesdropper \mathbf{e} can be redefined as

$$R_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right), \quad (16)$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} = \mathbf{I}_{K+1} \otimes \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{e}}^H + \mathbf{I}_{N(K+1)} \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{e}}^2}{P}, \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} = \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} - \text{diag} \{ \mathbf{e}_{s+1} \} \otimes \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{e}}^H, \quad (18)$$

and the wiretap SE for user $s \in \mathcal{S}$ from legitimate user $u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}$ is reformulated as

$$R_u^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{C}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{D}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right), \quad (19)$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}_u^{(s)} = (\mathbf{I}_{K+1} - \text{diag} \{ \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_{u+1} \}) \otimes \mathbf{h}_u \mathbf{h}_u^H + \mathbf{I}_{N(K+1)} \frac{\sigma^2}{P}, \quad (20)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_u^{(s)} = \mathbf{C}_u^{(s)} - \text{diag} \{ \mathbf{e}_{s+1} \} \otimes \mathbf{h}_u \mathbf{h}_u^H. \quad (21)$$

Now, to address the non-smoothness challenge, we employ a LogSumExp approach [41] for smooth approximation of non-smooth functions:

$$\min_{i=1, \dots, N} \{x_i\} \approx -\alpha \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \exp \left(\frac{x_i}{-\alpha} \right) \right), \quad (22)$$

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, N} \{x_i\} \approx \alpha \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \exp \left(\frac{x_i}{\alpha} \right) \right), \quad (23)$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and the approximation becomes tight as $\alpha \rightarrow +0$.

Based on (11), (16), (19), (22), and (23), the original problem in (9) is reformulated with relaxing $[\cdot]^+$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize}_{\mathbf{f}_c, \mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_K} \quad & \ln \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha \ln 2}} \right)^{-\alpha} + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \ln \left(\sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha \ln 2}} + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{C}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{D}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha \ln 2}} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \\ & + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \|\bar{\mathbf{f}}\|^2 = 1. \quad (25)$$

We note that the reformulated optimization problem in (24) remains non-convex with respect to the stacked precoding vector, making the search for a global optimal solution still NP-hard. Instead, we present an approach to obtain a superior local optimal solution for the reformulated optimization problem. To delve into this investigation, we first note that the reformulated problem in (24) is scale-invariant for the precoder $\bar{\mathbf{f}}$. Accordingly, we derive the first-order optimality condition of (24) by ignoring the power constraint to make the problem more tractable, as outlined in the following lemma:

Lemma 1. *With perfect CSIT, the first-order optimality condition of problem (24) without the power constraint is satisfied if the following condition holds:*

$$\mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \mathbf{A}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \bar{\mathbf{f}} = \lambda(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \bar{\mathbf{f}}, \quad (26)$$

where

$$\lambda(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \left[\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} w_{c,k}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \right]^{-\alpha} \left[\prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\ln 2}} \right] \quad (27)$$

$$- \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}} w_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_u^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \right)^{\alpha} \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\ln 2}},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = & \lambda_{\text{num}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left[\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{w_{c,k}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{K}} w_{c,l}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \frac{\mathbf{A}_{c,k}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\mathbf{A}_s}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\frac{\sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}} \left(w_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left(\frac{\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right) + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \left(w_u^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left(\frac{\mathbf{D}_u^{(s)}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{D}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right)}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} w_i^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_i^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{\mathbf{A}_m}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = & \lambda_{\text{den}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left[\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{w_{c,k}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{K}} w_{c,l}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \frac{\mathbf{B}_{c,k}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\mathbf{B}_s}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\frac{\sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}} \left(w_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left(\frac{\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right) + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \left(w_u^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left(\frac{\mathbf{C}_u^{(s)}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{C}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right)}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} w_i^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_i^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{\mathbf{B}_m}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

with $w_{c,k}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha \ln 2}}$, $w_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha \ln 2}}$, and $w_u^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{C}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{D}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha \ln 2}}$. Here, $\lambda_{\text{num}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ and $\lambda_{\text{den}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ can be any functions of $\bar{\mathbf{f}}$ which satisfies $\lambda(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \lambda_{\text{num}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) / \lambda_{\text{den}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$.

Proof. See Appendix A. \blacksquare

We treat (26) as an eigenvector-dependent nonlinear eigenvalue problem (NEPv) [42]. We remark that the Lagrangian function $L(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ is also reformulated as $L(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \ln \lambda(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ where $\lambda(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ is defined in (27). From this relationship, this problem is essentially about finding the principal eigenvector $\bar{\mathbf{f}}^*$ that maximizes $\lambda(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$. In order to tackle this, we adopt the GPI method [38], leading to the development of the proposed algorithm. The process, referred to as selective secure SE RSMA precoding based on GPI (SSSE-GPI-RSMA), is described in Algorithm 1. It iteratively updates $\bar{\mathbf{f}}$ using simple projection and normalization until convergence. We note that the feasibility can be guaranteed via normalization.

V. EXTENSION TO LIMITED CSIT: ROBUST AND SELECTIVE SECURE RATE-SPLITTING PRECODING

In this section, we introduce the consideration of imperfect and partial CSIT to broaden the applicability of our proposed algorithm towards more realistic scenarios. Specifically, the

Algorithm 1: SSSE-GPI-RSMA

```

1 initialize:  $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_0$ 
2 Set the iteration count  $t = 0$ .
3 while  $\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{t+1} - \bar{\mathbf{f}}_t\| > \epsilon$  &  $t \leq t_{\max}$  do
4   Matrix construction  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}_t)$  in (28)
5   Matrix construction  $\mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}_t)$  in (29)
6   Projection  $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{t+1} = \mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}_t) \mathbf{A}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}_t) \bar{\mathbf{f}}_t$ .
7   Normalization  $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{t+1} = \bar{\mathbf{f}}_{t+1} / \|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{t+1}\|$ .
8    $t \leftarrow t + 1$ .
9 return  $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_t$ .

```

AP is restricted to having limited access solely to the estimated channel for each user k , defined as

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k = \mathbf{h}_k - \boldsymbol{\phi}_k, \quad (30)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k$ is the estimated channel vector of user k and $\boldsymbol{\phi}_k$ is the CSIT estimation error vector. Furthermore, the AP also has access to the spatial channel covariance matrix $\mathbf{R}_k = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{h}_k^H]$ and associated estimation error covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_k = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\phi}_k \boldsymbol{\phi}_k^H]$. Regarding the wiretap channels, the knowledge of AP is confined to the wiretap channel covariance matrix $\mathbf{R}_e = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}_e \mathbf{g}_e^H]$, not the estimated channel \mathbf{g}_e .

A. Conditional Average Rate

We assume imperfect and partial CSIT so as to consider more practical scenarios. AP is able to access to the estimated channel of users with a known estimation error covariance and the wiretap channel covariance matrix. Since only the estimated legitimate channel and other long-term channel statistics are available at the AP, we adopt a conditional averaged secrecy SE approach [11], [43] to convert the problem for exploiting the long-term channel statistics. To this end, we define $\mathbb{E}[R_{c,k}(\mathbf{F})]$, $\mathbb{E}[R_k(\mathbf{F})]$, and $\mathbb{E}[R^{(s)}(\mathbf{F})]$ as the ergodic SEs of the common stream, private stream of user k , and maximum leakage for the stream s_s , respectively, [11], [43] and replace $R_{c,k}(\mathbf{F})$, $R_k(\mathbf{F})$, and $R^{(s)}(\mathbf{F})$ in (4), (5), and (6) with the corresponding ergodic SEs.

Then, the formulated the ergodic SE of the common stream \bar{R}_c is expressed as [11]

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}_c(\mathbf{F}) &= \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h}_k} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_c|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}} |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{P}} \right) \right] \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h}_k | \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_c|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}} |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{P}} \right) \right] \right] \right\} \\ &= \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \{ \bar{R}_{c,k}(\mathbf{F}) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where (a) comes from the law of total expectation. We also derive the ergodic SE of private stream for user k as [11]

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}_k(\mathbf{F}) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h}_k} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_k|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{k\}} |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{P}} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h}_k | \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_k|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{k\}} |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{P}} \right) \right] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Similarly, the ergodic maximum leakage SE $\bar{R}^{(s)}$ [43] is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{g}_e} \left[R^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{g}_e} \left[\max_{l \in \mathcal{L}^{(s)}} R_l^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{g}_e} \left[\max_{e \in \mathcal{E}, u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \left\{ R_e^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}), R_u^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) \right\} \right]. \quad (34)$$

Using the derived ergodic SE in (31), (32), and (33), we now rewrite the optimization problem in (9) considering the imperfect CSIT in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize}_{\mathbf{f}_c, \mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_K} \bar{R}_c(\mathbf{F}) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\bar{R}_s(\mathbf{F}) - \bar{R}^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) \right]^+ + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \bar{R}_m(\mathbf{F}) \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \|\mathbf{f}_c\|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{f}_k\|^2 \leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

B. Limited CSIT Handling Approach

As the optimization problem in (35) cannot be directly solved with the limited information available, we instead establish the lower bounds for each SE. The lower bound of the ergodic SE of the common stream $\bar{R}_{c,k}(\mathbf{F})$ in (31) is derived as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}_{c,k}(\mathbf{F}) &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k^H \mathbf{f}_c|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}} |\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \mathbf{f}_c^H \boldsymbol{\Phi}_k \mathbf{f}_c + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{f}_i^H \boldsymbol{\Phi}_k \mathbf{f}_i + \frac{\sigma^2}{P}} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[R_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F}; \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_k) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where (b) is obtained by assuming that all error terms represent independent Gaussian noise, according to the principles outlined in the generalized mutual information framework [44]. Subsequently, the derivation uses Jensen's inequality to reach its conclusion. Then, based on (31) and (36), we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}_c(\mathbf{F}) &= \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \{ \bar{R}_{c,k}(\mathbf{F}) \} \\ &\geq \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[R_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F}; \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_k) \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[\min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ R_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F}; \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_k) \right\} \right]. \quad (38)$$

Likewise, we can derive the lower bound of the ergodic SE of the private stream $\bar{R}_k(\mathbf{F})$ in (32) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}_k(\mathbf{F}) &\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \frac{|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k^H \mathbf{f}_k|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{k\}} |\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{f}_i^H \boldsymbol{\Phi}_k \mathbf{f}_i + \frac{\sigma^2}{P}} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[R_k^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F}; \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_k) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where (c) stems from Jensen's inequality.

Now, to derive the ergodic maximum leakage SE $\bar{R}^{(s)}(\mathbf{F})$ (33) in a tractable form, we introduce the following lemma:

Lemma 2. *Let random variables (X_i, Y_i) be independent with (X_j, Y_j) for $i \neq j$. Then the following approximation holds with large N :*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{X_i}{Y_i} \right) \right] \approx \log_2 \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_i]}{\mathbb{E}[Y_i]} \right). \quad (40)$$

Proof. See Appendix B. ■

Then, to properly derive a useful bound for $\bar{R}^{(s)}(\mathbf{F})$ (33), we consider the worst-case scenario for secure communication in which all the other users and eavesdroppers engage in full collusion. In this case, the wiretap SE is upper bounded as [27], [45]

$$\bar{R}^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{|\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{e}}^H \mathbf{f}_s|^2}{|\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{e}}^H \mathbf{f}_c|^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} |\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{e}}^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{e}}^2}{P}} + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \frac{|\mathbf{h}_u^H \mathbf{f}_s|^2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{u,s\}} |\mathbf{h}_u^H \mathbf{f}_i|^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{P}} \right) \right] \quad (41)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{\approx} \log_2 \left(1 + \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{\mathbf{f}_s^H \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{f}_s}{\mathbf{f}_c^H \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{f}_c + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \mathbf{f}_i^H \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{f}_i + \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{e}}^2}{P}} + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \frac{\mathbf{f}_s^H \mathbf{R}_u \mathbf{f}_s}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{u,s\}} \mathbf{f}_i^H \mathbf{R}_u \mathbf{f}_i + \frac{\sigma^2}{P}} \right) \quad (42)$$

$$= R^{(s)\text{ub}}(\mathbf{F}; \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}, \mathbf{R}_u), \quad (43)$$

where (d) is derived from Lemma 2. We note that (43) includes the channel covariance matrices of users and eavesdroppers which are available at the AP and thus, leveraging (43) allows us to adequately incorporate the leakage SE in the optimization with the limited CSIT.

Finally, using (37), (39), and (43) we can derive the lower bound of the ergodic secrecy sum SE in (35) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{R}_c(\mathbf{F}) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\bar{R}_s(\mathbf{F}) - \bar{R}^{(s)}(\mathbf{F}) \right]^+ + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \bar{R}_m(\mathbf{F}) \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[\min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ R_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F}; \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k, \Phi_k) \right\} \right] + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[R_s^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F}; \hat{\mathbf{h}}_s, \Phi_s) \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. - R^{(s)\text{ub}}(\mathbf{F}; \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}, \mathbf{R}_u) \right]^+ + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k} \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} R_m^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F}; \hat{\mathbf{h}}_m, \Phi_m) \right]. \quad (44) \end{aligned}$$

We note that since the estimated channel information $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k$ is available at the AP, we can use (44) without the expectation over $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k$ as a new objective function. Then, relaxing the non-zero operator $[\cdot]^+$, we reformulate the lower bound of the optimization problem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize}_{\mathbf{f}_c, \mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_K} \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ R_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F}; \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k, \Phi_k) \right\} + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(R_s^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F}; \hat{\mathbf{h}}_s, \Phi_s) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - R^{(s)\text{ub}}(\mathbf{F}; \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}, \mathbf{R}_u) \right) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} R_m^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F}; \hat{\mathbf{h}}_m, \Phi_m) \quad (45) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{subject to } \|\mathbf{f}_c\|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{f}_k\|^2 \leq 1. \quad (46)$$

In the following subsection, we use the same approach as the perfect CSIT case to identify the superior local optimal solution of the reformulated problem in (45).

C. Problem Reformulation

Assuming $\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}\|^2 = 1$ where $\bar{\mathbf{f}} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{F})$, we first cast $R_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F})$ and $R_k^{\text{lb}}(\mathbf{F})$ as

$$R_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right), R_k^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_k^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_k^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right), \quad (47)$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}} = \mathbf{I}_{K+1} \otimes (\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k^H + \Phi_k) + \mathbf{I}_{N(K+1)} \frac{\sigma^2}{P}, \quad (48)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}} = \mathbf{A}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}} - \text{diag}\{\mathbf{e}_1\} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k^H, \quad (49)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_k^{\text{lb}} = (\mathbf{I}_{K+1} - \text{diag}\{\mathbf{e}_1\}) \otimes (\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k^H + \Phi_k) + \mathbf{I}_{N(K+1)} \frac{\sigma^2}{P}, \quad (50)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_k^{\text{lb}} = \mathbf{A}_k^{\text{lb}} - \text{diag}\{\mathbf{e}_{k+1}\} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k^H. \quad (51)$$

Similarly, we reformulate the average leakage SE as

$$R^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \log_2 \left(1 + \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{C}^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{D}^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right), \quad (52)$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}^{(s)\text{ub}} = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{e}_{s+1}\} \otimes \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}, \quad (53)$$

$$\mathbf{B}^{(s)\text{ub}} = \mathbf{I}_{K+1} \otimes \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}} - \mathbf{A}^{(s)\text{ub}} + \mathbf{I}_{N(K+1)} \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{e}}^2}{P}, \quad (54)$$

$$\mathbf{C}^{(s)\text{ub}} = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{e}_{s+1}\} \otimes \mathbf{R}_u, \quad (55)$$

$$\mathbf{D}^{(s)\text{ub}} = (\mathbf{I}_{K+1} - \text{diag}\{\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_{u+1}\}) \otimes \mathbf{R}_u - \mathbf{C}^{(s)\text{ub}} + \mathbf{I}_{N(K+1)} \frac{\sigma^2}{P}. \quad (56)$$

Then, the rest of the steps are the same as the perfect CSIT case: we approximate the maximum operator in (45) with the LogSumExp approach and further derive the first-order KKT condition of the problem as in Lemma 3.

Lemma 3. *With limited CSIT, the first-order optimality condition of problem (46) without the power constraint is satisfied if the following condition holds:*

$$(\mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}^{\text{lb}})^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \mathbf{A}_{\text{KKT}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \bar{\mathbf{f}} = \lambda^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \bar{\mathbf{f}}, \quad (57)$$

where

$$\lambda^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \left[\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} w_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \right]^{-\alpha} \left[\prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_s^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_s^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\ln 2}} - \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} (1 + \right. \quad (58)$$

$$\left. \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}} w_{\mathbf{e}}^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_u^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \right)^{\frac{1}{\ln 2}} \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_m^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_m^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\ln 2}},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_{\text{KKT}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) &= \lambda_{\text{num}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \times \left[\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{w_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{K}} w_{c,l}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \frac{\mathbf{A}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{A}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right. \\ &+ \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\mathbf{A}_s^{\text{lb}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{A}_s^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \left(w_e^{(s)\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left(\frac{\mathbf{B}_e^{(s)\text{ub}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{B}_e^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right)}{1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} w_i^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_i^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \right. \\ &\left. \left. + \frac{\sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \left(w_u^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left(\frac{\mathbf{D}_u^{(s)\text{ub}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{D}_u^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right)}{1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} w_i^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_i^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \right\} + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{\mathbf{A}_m^{\text{lb}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{A}_m^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) &= \lambda_{\text{den}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \times \left[\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{w_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{K}} w_{c,l}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \frac{\mathbf{B}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{B}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right. \\ &+ \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\mathbf{B}_s^{\text{lb}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{B}_s^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \left(w_e^{(s)\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left(\frac{\mathbf{A}_e^{(s)\text{ub}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{A}_e^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right)}{1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} w_i^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_i^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \right. \\ &\left. \left. + \frac{\sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \left(w_u^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left(\frac{\mathbf{C}_u^{(s)\text{ub}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{C}_u^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) \right)}{1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} w_i^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_i^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \right\} + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{\mathbf{B}_m^{\text{lb}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{B}_m^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

with $w_{c,k}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{A}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{B}_{c,k}^{\text{lb}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha \ln 2}}$, $w_e^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{A}_e^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{B}_e^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}$, and $w_u^{(s)\text{ub}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{C}_u^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^{\text{H}} \mathbf{D}_u^{(s)\text{ub}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}$. Here, $\lambda_{\text{num}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ and $\lambda_{\text{den}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ can be any functions of $\bar{\mathbf{f}}$ which satisfies $\lambda^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \lambda_{\text{num}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) / \lambda_{\text{den}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$.

Proof. We omit the detailed proof here as it is similar to the one of Lemma 1. ■

We remark that Algorithm 1 can be also used to find the principal eigenvector of (57) to derive a superior KKT stationary point by replacing $\mathbf{A}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ with $\mathbf{A}_{\text{KKT}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}^{\text{lb}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$, respectively. We call it as robust SSSE-GPI-RSMA (RSSSE-GPI-RSMA) algorithm.

D. Complexity Analysis

The computational complexity of our proposed algorithm hinges on the calculation of the $\mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}_t)$ matrix. Given that the matrix size is $N(K+1) \times N(K+1)$, the typical complexity for inverting $\mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}_t)$ is on the order of $\mathcal{O}((K+1)^3 N^3)$. However, leveraging the block diagonal structure of $\mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}_t)$, it becomes feasible to reduce the computational complexity to $\mathcal{O}((K+1)N^3)$. This optimization arises by computing the inversion of each $N \times N$ sub-matrix separately, given that there are $(K+1)$ such sub-matrices. Let us denote the variable T_{GPI} , T_{WMMSE} , and T_{SCA} as the representative count of total iterations for each algorithm. Then, the total complexity order of the proposed algorithm is given as $\mathcal{O}(T_{\text{GPI}}(K+1)N^3)$. Similarly, the complexity of the convex relaxation method proposed in [11], which relies on a quadratically constrained quadratic program, can be expressed in terms of the order of $\mathcal{O}(T_{\text{WMMSE}} K^{3.5} N^{3.5})$. In [32], the joint WMMSE and SCA

based algorithm is classified as a specialized SCA method, characterized by a complexity order of $\mathcal{O}(T_{\text{SCA}} K^{3.5} N^4)$. In this regard, the proposed algorithm demonstrates a more computationally efficient approach than the state-of-the-art precoding methods.

VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we conduct comparison of the sum secrecy SEs achieved by the proposed algorithm and existing baseline methods. We adopt the one-ring model as proposed for the spatial channel covariance matrix [46]. The user channel covariance between the AP's antenna a and b is defined as

$$[\mathbf{R}_k]_{a,b} = \frac{1}{2\Delta_k} \int_{\theta_k - \Delta_k}^{\theta_k + \Delta_k} e^{-j\frac{2\pi}{\psi} \Psi(x)(\mathbf{r}_a - \mathbf{r}_b)} dx, \quad (61)$$

where $[\mathbf{R}_k]_{a,b}$ denotes the (a, b) th element of \mathbf{R}_k , Δ_k is the angular spread of the user k , θ_k is angle-of-arrival (AoA) of user k , $\Psi(x) = [\cos(x), \sin(x)]$, and \mathbf{r}_a is the position vector of the a th antenna. With the Karhunen-Loeve model, the channel vector \mathbf{h}_k can be decomposed as [46] $\mathbf{h}_k = \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k$, where $\mathbf{\Lambda}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{r_k \times r_k}$ is a diagonal matrix that contains the non-zero eigenvalues of the channel covariance matrix \mathbf{R}_k , $\mathbf{U}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times r_k}$ is the corresponding eigenvectors, and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{r_k}$ is a independent and identically distributed complex Gaussian vector with zero mean and unit variance. Similar to the treatment of user channels, the eavesdroppers' channels adhere to analogous principles in their modeling and characterization.

For CSIT acquisition, we consider frequency division duplex (FDD) systems whose estimated channel is given as [47]

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k = \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sqrt{1 - \kappa^2} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k + \kappa \mathbf{v}_k \right) = \sqrt{1 - \kappa^2} \mathbf{h}_k + \mathbf{q}_k, \quad (62)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k$ is the estimated channel vector of user k , \mathbf{v}_k is drawn from IID $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$, \mathbf{q}_k is the CSIT quantization error vector, and κ is a parameter that determines the quality of the channel with $0 \leq \kappa \leq 1$. With (30), the error covariance is derived as

$$\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\phi}_k \boldsymbol{\phi}_k^{\text{H}}] = \boldsymbol{\Phi}_k = \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} (2 - 2\sqrt{1 - \kappa^2}) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_k^{\text{H}}. \quad (63)$$

A. Performance Evaluation

To evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms, SSSE-GPI-RSMA and RSSSE-GPI-RSMA, we compare its performance with the baseline methods. The baselines for comparison are as follows:

- **SSE-SCA-RSMA:** This method is the joint WMMSE and SCA-based RSMA sum secrecy SE (SSE) maximization algorithm in [32]. Although this algorithm treats other users as potential eavesdroppers, it does not account for the presence of actual eavesdroppers. To facilitate comparison with the our proposed algorithm, we establish a minimum user rate threshold, R_s^{th} , assigning it a sufficiently small value and ignore the user weights.
- **SE-WMMSE-RSMA:** WMMSE-based RSMA algorithm for sum SE maximization without security consideration proposed in [11] under perfect CSIT and partial CSIT.

For the initialization, we use the precoding vector $\mathbf{f}_k = \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k$ employing maximum ratio transmission (MRT) strategy.




Fig. 2. The sum secrecy SE versus SNR for $N = 4$ AP antennas, $K = 4$ total users, $S = 2$ secret users, $M = 2$ normal users, and $E = 2$ eavesdroppers.

Specifically for the common stream, we utilize the average of the channel vectors for initialization. We set $\Delta_k = \pi/6$, $\kappa = 0.4$, $\sigma^2 = 1$, $\epsilon = 0.05$, and $t_{\max} = 100$, and $\sigma^2 = \sigma_e^2$. We also set $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ which is tuned empirically. Unless otherwise stated, it is assumed that the users are distributed within a sector of $\pi/6$ radians and eavesdroppers are randomly positioned. In other words, for the correlated channel, the angular difference between users, $\theta_k - \theta_{k'}$, with θ_k defined in (61), is $\pi/6$.

B. Secrecy SE versus SNR

Fig. 2 illustrates the sum secrecy SE as a function of the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), defined by P/σ^2 , in a general scenario where multiple users—comprising both secret and normal users—coexist alongside eavesdroppers. In Fig. 2(a), the performance under perfect CSIT is analyzed. Here, the proposed SSSE-GPI-RSMA algorithm emerges as the top

performer, showcasing the highest sum secrecy SE. The SSE-SCA-RSMA algorithm demonstrates comparable efficacy, closely trailing the performance of the proposed algorithm. The performance disparity between SSSE-GPI-RSMA and SSE-SCA-RSMA can be attributed to the fundamental difference in security optimization approaches. While SSSE-GPI-RSMA employs targeted security optimization for only secret users, SSE-SCA-RSMA implements uniform security measures across all users. This strategic distinction demonstrates the superior performance of SSSE-GPI-RSMA, particularly in heterogeneous user environments across diverse SNR regimes. The performance gap between SE-WMMSE-RSMA and its counterparts becomes more pronounced in the high SNR regime. This degradation stems from inherent limitation of SE-WMMSE-RSMA in addressing information leakage optimization. As the SNR increases, the impact of inter-user information leakage becomes more substantial, revealing SE-WMMSE-RSMA's inability to effectively mitigate this interference.

Similarly, Fig. 2(b) presents a performance of the sum secrecy SE under partial CSIT, where the proposed RSSSE-GPI-RSMA algorithm demonstrates superior performance. Notably, in contrast to Fig. 2(a), SE-WMMSE-RSMA outperforms SSE-SCA-RSMA in this scenario. This performance difference can be attributed to the stringent security constraints inherent in SSE-SCA-RSMA, highlighting the fundamental trade-off between enhanced security measures and system efficiency. The comprehensive evaluation presented in Fig. 2 validates the robustness of our proposed algorithm across diverse operational scenarios, maintaining consistent performance in both perfect and imperfect CSIT conditions with heterogeneous user environments.

Fig. 3 displays the variations in sum secrecy SE with respect to SNR under specialized scenarios: exclusively composed of normal users and secret users, respectively. In Fig. 3(a), SDMA-based algorithms are introduced to facilitate a fair comparative analysis between RSMA and SDMA approaches. This methodological choice stems from the fundamental architectural assumption: RSMA applies security objectives solely to the private stream, excluding the common component. For performance metrics independent of security considerations, both algorithms provide a valid basis for comparison. The following SDMA-based algorithms are implemented in this analysis:

- **RSSSE-GPI-SDMA**: The proposed GPI-based algorithm for sum secrecy SE maximization without a common stream of proposed RSSSE-GPI-RSMA algorithm.
- **SE-RZF-SDMA**: The conventional linear regularized zero-forcing (RZF) precoder for sum SE maximization.

In Fig. 3(a), both the proposed RSSSE-GPI-RSMA and SE-WMMSE-RSMA algorithms exhibit the highest sum SE performance. This comparable performance pattern emerges in scenarios with normal users only, where stringent security optimization is not essential. While SSE-SCA-RSMA is designed to minimize information leakage to potential eavesdroppers, such robust security measures prove redundant in normal-user environments. Consequently, the SSE-SCA-RSMA algo-



(a) $M = 4$ normal users only(b) $S = 4$ secret users only

Fig. 3. The sum secrecy SE versus SNR for $N = 4$ AP antennas, $K = 4$ users, $E = 0$ eavesdroppers under partial CSIT.

gorithm experiences performance degradation attributed to its rigorous security constraints. This effect becomes increasingly pronounced as the SNR increases, leading to a widening performance gap between the SSE-SCA-RSMA and the SE-WMMSE-RSMA algorithms. The RSMA advantage is evident in the performance differential between RSSSE-GPI-RSMA and RSSSE-GPI-SDMA. In this figure, we can observe the importance of balanced security protocols that optimize system efficiency.

Contrasting with the scenario in Fig. 3(a), Fig. 3(b) demonstrates the impact of security optimization for secret users. The SE-WMMSE-RSMA algorithm exhibits notable performance degradation beyond 20 dB, primarily due to increased inter-user signal leakage at higher SNR values. This performance characteristic emphasizes the critical need for security optimization in scenarios exclusively comprising secret users to ensure secure communication. In other words, the perfor-




Fig. 4. The sum secrecy SE versus the number of secret users S for $N = 8$ AP antennas, $K = 8$ total users, $E = 0$ eavesdroppers, and SNR = 10 dB under partial CSIT.

mance gap observed between the SSE-SCA-RSMA and SE-WMMSE-RSMA algorithms serves as a quantifiable measure of the gains achieved through security optimization. The comprehensive analysis in Fig. 3 validates our algorithm's adaptability through user categorization, effectively addressing varying security requirements across different scenarios.

C. Secrecy SE versus Number of Users and Eavesdroppers

Fig. 4 illustrates the impact of varying the number of secret users on sum secrecy SE performance. The increasing number of secret users necessitates enhanced security optimization, leading to performance degradation across all evaluated algorithms due to greater security requirements. Despite this degradation, the proposed algorithm maintains superior performance compared to baseline approaches. The SE-WMMSE-RSMA algorithm exhibits the most significant performance decline, attributable to its design focus on sum SE maximization without explicit security considerations. This architectural limitation results in increased vulnerability to information leakage as the number of secret users grows, demonstrating the critical interplay between SE optimization and security requirements in wireless networks.

Fig. 5 examines the impact of increasing the number of eavesdroppers on sum secrecy SE at 20 dB SNR, with randomly distributed legitimate users and adjacent eavesdroppers. The proposed algorithm demonstrates superior performance compared to baseline methods. Although all algorithms exhibit performance degradation with increasing the number of eavesdroppers, the proposed RSSSE-GPI-RSMA algorithm reveals the robust performance by explicitly accounting for eavesdroppers in the precoder design. Conversely, SSE-SCA-RSMA shows gradual performance degradation due to its limitation of considering only legitimate users as potential eavesdroppers, leading to increased information leakage. SE-WMMSE-RSMA exhibits the most significant performance decline due to its lack of eavesdropper consideration. These




Fig. 5. The sum secrecy SE versus the number of eavesdroppers for $N = 4$ AP antennas, $S = 4$ secret users, $M = 0$ normal users and $\text{SNR} = 20$ dB under partial CSIT.




Fig. 6. The sum secrecy SE versus the angular difference for correlated channel $\theta_k - \theta_{k'}$ for $N = 6$ AP antennas, $S = 4$ secret users, $M = 2$ normal users, $E = 2$ eavesdroppers and $\text{SNR} = 20$ dB under partial CSIT.

results demonstrate the importance of incorporating comprehensive security mechanisms in RSMA algorithms for maintaining secrecy SE in eavesdropper-rich environments.

D. Secrecy SE versus Channel Condition

Fig. 6 shows the change in sum secrecy SE according to $\theta_k - \theta_{k'}$, the angular difference parameter between users. All algorithms exhibit improved performance with increasing angular difference due to reduced inter-user interference. The proposed RSSSE-GPI-RSMA algorithm consistently shows the highest performance, significantly surpassing both SE-WMMSE-RSMA and SSE-SCA-RSMA. SSE-SCA-RSMA shows lower performance due to its stringent security constraints that considers all RSMA users as potential eavesdroppers. These




Fig. 7. The sum secrecy SE versus the quality of the channel κ for $N = 4$ AP antennas, $S = 2$ secret users, $M = 2$ normal users, $E = 2$ eavesdroppers and $\text{SNR} = 20$ dB under partial CSIT.




Fig. 8. Convergence results in terms of the sum secrecy SE for $N = 4$ AP antennas, $S = 2$ secret users, $M = 2$ normal users, and $E = 2$ eavesdroppers under partial CSIT.

results validate the effectiveness of our optimization approach across varying angular difference conditions.

Fig. 7 depicts the relationship between sum secrecy SE and channel quality parameter κ . All algorithms exhibit performance degradation with increasing κ , indicating sensitivity to deteriorating channel conditions. Notably, the proposed algorithm consistently outperforms the others across all sections, highlighting its superior capability. Fig. 7 validates the robustness of our proposed algorithm in practical scenarios with imperfect channel conditions.

E. Convergence

Fig. 8 displays the convergence outcomes relative to the number of iterations for SNR values in the set $\{0, 10, 20, 30\}$ dB. The proposed RSSSE-GPI-RSMA algorithm achieves fast

convergence within 7 iterations across all the specified SNR levels, which is relatively quick. Consequently, the proposed algorithm is more advantageous for practical applications compared to other advanced precoding techniques, as it presents significantly reduced complexity as discussed and achieves fast convergence.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this study, we introduced a precoding algorithm that integrates RSMA with security consideration, initially under perfect CSIT, subsequently extending its applicability to scenarios with partial CSIT. Given the inherent non-smooth and non-convex nature of the problem under both CSIT conditions, we employed the LogSumExp technique for problem smoothing, further reformulating the problem into a variant of the Rayleigh quotient to enhance tractability. For scenarios characterized by limited CSIT, it became imperative to leverage the conditional average SE, employing lower bounding and approximation strategies for practicality. By deriving the stationary condition of the reformulated problem and mapping it onto a nonlinear eigenvalue problem, we were able to pinpoint the most advantageous local optimal solution. Our simulation results demonstrated the superiority of the proposed method over existing state-of-the-art algorithms, particularly in achieving the highest sum secrecy SE. The primary advantage of our proposed algorithm is its ability to accommodate multiple users with heterogeneous privacy priorities and eavesdroppers within a general framework under limited CSIT. Consequently, our algorithm ensures higher sum secrecy SE compared to existing baselines, significantly advancing secure wireless communications.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 1

It is assumed that we employ the maximum power of the precoder $\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}\|^2 = 1$. Since the problem in (24) with the reformulated objective function is invariant up to the scaling of $\bar{\mathbf{f}}$, we can indeed disregard the power constraint in this context. Let the objective function in (24) as $L(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$. Then $L(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ itself is a Lagrangian function. We consider $L(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = L_1(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + L_2(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + L_3(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + L_4(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ where

$$L_1(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \ln \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha \ln 2}} \right)^{-\alpha},$$

$$L_2(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right),$$

$$L_3(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \ln \left(\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_e^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_e^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha \ln 2}} + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{C}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{D}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha \ln 2}} \right)^{\alpha},$$

$$L_4(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \log_2 \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right).$$

To derive the first-order Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) condition, we solve $\frac{\partial L(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{f}}^H} = 0$. Utilizing the following derivative:

$$\partial \left(\frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right) / \partial \bar{\mathbf{f}}^H = 2 \times \frac{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \left[\frac{\mathbf{A} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} - \frac{\mathbf{B} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right], \quad (64)$$

the partial derivative of each component can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L_1(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{f}}^H} &= \frac{2}{\ln 2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left[\frac{w_{c,k}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{K}} w_{c,l}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{A}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} - \frac{\mathbf{B}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_{c,k} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right\} \right], \\ \frac{\partial L_2(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{f}}^H} &= \frac{2}{\ln 2} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\frac{\mathbf{A}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}} - \frac{\mathbf{B}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_s \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right], \\ \frac{\partial L_3(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{f}}^H} &= - \frac{2}{\ln 2} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\frac{\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} w_e^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{A}_e^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_e^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} - \frac{\mathbf{B}_e^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_e^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right\}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} w_i^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_i^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\sum_{u \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_u^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{C}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{C}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} - \frac{\mathbf{D}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{D}_u^{(s)} \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right\}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} w_i^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{s\}} w_i^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})} \right], \\ \frac{\partial L_4(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{f}}^H} &= \frac{2}{\ln 2} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left[\frac{\mathbf{A}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{A}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}} - \frac{\mathbf{B}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}}{\bar{\mathbf{f}}^H \mathbf{B}_m \bar{\mathbf{f}}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where $w_{c,k}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$, $w_e^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$, and $w_u^{(s)}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ are defined in Lemma 1. The first-order KKT condition holds when

$$\frac{\partial L_1(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{f}}^H} + \frac{\partial L_2(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{f}}^H} + \frac{\partial L_3(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{f}}^H} + \frac{\partial L_4(\bar{\mathbf{f}})}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{f}}^H} = 0. \quad (66)$$

Carefully re-arranging the components in (66), the first-order KKT condition can be expressed equivalently as

$$\mathbf{A}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \bar{\mathbf{f}} = \lambda(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}) \bar{\mathbf{f}}, \quad (67)$$

where \mathbf{A}_{KKT} and \mathbf{B}_{KKT} are defined in Lemma 1. Given that $\mathbf{B}_{\text{KKT}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ exhibits Hermitian properties and maintains full rank, it is therefore invertible. This concludes the proof. ■

APPENDIX B PROOF OF LEMMA 2

We begin by considering the case for $N = 2$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{X_i}{Y_i} \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \left\{ \frac{X_1}{Y_1} + \frac{X_2}{Y_2} \right\} \right) \right] \quad (68)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\log_2 \left(1 + \left\{ \frac{X_1 Y_2 + X_2 Y_1}{Y_1 Y_2} \right\} \right) \right] \quad (69)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\approx} \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_1 Y_2 + X_2 Y_1]}{\mathbb{E}[Y_1 Y_2]} \right) \quad (70)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \log_2 \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_i]}{\mathbb{E}[Y_i]} \right), \quad (71)$$

where (a) comes from Lemma 1 in [48], and (b) follows from the assumption of independence. It is straightforward to extend to $N > 2$, yielding the approximation result in (40).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Lee, S. Park, J. Park, and J. Choi, "Rate-Splitting Multiple Access Precoding for Selective Security," in *2023 IEEE 97th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2023-Spring)*. IEEE, Jun. 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [2] P. Yang, Y. Xiao, M. Xiao, and S. Li, "6G wireless communications: Vision and potential techniques," *IEEE netw.*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 70–75, Jul. 2019.
- [3] Z. Zhang, Y. Xiao, Z. Ma, M. Xiao, Z. Ding, X. Lei, G. K. Karagiannidis, and P. Fan, "6G wireless networks: Vision, requirements, architecture, and key technologies," *IEEE Veh. Technol. Mag.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 28–41, Jul. 2019.

- [4] Y. Zou, J. Zhu, X. Wang, and L. Hanzo, "A survey on wireless security: Technical challenges, recent advances, and future trends," *Proc. of the IEEE*, vol. 104, no. 9, pp. 1727–1765, May 2016.
- [5] H. Joudeh and B. Clerckx, "Robust transmission in downlink multiuser MISO systems: A rate-splitting approach," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 23, pp. 6227–6242, Dec. 2016.
- [6] A. I. Sulyman and C. Henggeler, "Physical layer security for military IoT links using MIMO-beamforming at 60 GHz," *Information*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 100, Feb. 2022.
- [7] W. Shin, M. Vaezi, B. Lee, D. J. Love, J. Lee, and H. V. Poor, "Non-orthogonal multiple access in multi-cell networks: Theory, performance, and practical challenges," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 55, no. 10, pp. 176–183, Aug. 2017.
- [8] B. Clerckx, H. Joudeh, C. Hao, M. Dai, and B. Rassouli, "Rate splitting for MIMO wireless networks: A promising PHY-layer strategy for LTE evolution," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 98–105, May 2016.
- [9] J. Park, B. Lee, J. Choi, H. Lee, N. Lee, S.-H. Park, K.-J. Lee, J. Choi, S. H. Chae, S.-W. Jeon *et al.*, "Rate-Splitting Multiple Access for 6G Networks: Ten Promising Scenarios and Applications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12978*, 2023.
- [10] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, and V. O. Li, "Rate-splitting multiple access for downlink communication systems: Bridging, generalizing, and outperforming SDMA and NOMA," *Eurasip J. Wireless Commun. Netw.*, vol. 2018, pp. 1–54, May 2018.
- [11] H. Joudeh and B. Clerckx, "Sum-rate maximization for linearly precoded downlink multiuser MISO systems with partial CSIT: A rate-splitting approach," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 4847–4861, Aug. 2016.
- [12] C. Hao, Y. Wu, and B. Clerckx, "Rate analysis of two-receiver MISO broadcast channel with finite rate feedback: A rate-splitting approach," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 63, no. 9, pp. 3232–3246, Jul. 2015.
- [13] Z. Li, C. Ye, Y. Cui, S. Yang, and S. Shamai, "Rate splitting for multi-antenna downlink: Precoder design and practical implementation," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 1910–1924, Jun. 2020.
- [14] Z. Yang, M. Chen, W. Saad, and M. Shikh-Bahaei, "Optimization of rate allocation and power control for rate splitting multiple access (RSMA)," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 69, no. 9, pp. 5988–6002, Jun. 2021.
- [15] M. Dai, B. Clerckx, D. Gesbert, and G. Caire, "A rate splitting strategy for massive MIMO with imperfect CSIT," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 15, no. 7, pp. 4611–4624, Mar. 2016.
- [16] J. Park, J. Choi, N. Lee, W. Shin, and H. V. Poor, "Rate-splitting multiple access for downlink MIMO: A generalized power iteration approach," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 1588–1603, Sep. 2022.
- [17] S. A. Haider, M. N. Adil, and M. Zhao, "Optimization of secure wireless communications for IoT networks in the presence of eavesdroppers," *Comput. Commun.*, vol. 154, pp. 119–128, 2020.
- [18] J. L. Massey, "An introduction to contemporary cryptology," *Proc. of the IEEE*, vol. 76, no. 5, pp. 533–549, May 1988.
- [19] A. D. Wyner, "The wire-tap channel," *The Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1355–1387, Oct. 1975.
- [20] C. E. Shannon, "Communication theory of secrecy systems," *The Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 656–715, Oct. 1949.
- [21] Y.-S. Shiu, S. Y. Chang, H.-C. Wu, S. C.-H. Huang, and H.-H. Chen, "Physical layer security in wireless networks: A tutorial," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 66–74, Apr. 2011.
- [22] P. K. Gopala, L. Lai, and H. El Gamal, "On the secrecy capacity of fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 4687–4698, Sep. 2008.
- [23] A. Khisti, A. Tchamkerten, and G. W. Wornell, "Secure broadcasting over fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 2453–2469, May 2008.
- [24] S. Shafiee and S. Ulukus, "Achievable rates in Gaussian MISO channels with secrecy constraints," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory*. IEEE, Jun. 2007, pp. 2466–2470.
- [25] A. Khisti and G. W. Wornell, "Secure Transmission With Multiple Antennas I: The MISOME Wiretap Channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 3088–3104, Jul. 2010.
- [26] A. Khisti and G. Wornell, "Secure transmission with multiple antennas—Part II: The MIMOME wiretap channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 11, pp. 5515–5532, Nov. 2010.
- [27] J. Choi and J. Park, "Sum secrecy spectral efficiency maximization in downlink MU-MIMO: Colluding eavesdroppers," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 1051–1056, Jan. 2021.
- [28] —, "SecureLinQ: Joint precoding and scheduling for secure device-to-device networks," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 9, no. 12, pp. 2078–2082, Jul. 2020.
- [29] J. Kampeas, A. Cohen, and O. Gurewitz, "On secrecy rates and outage in multi-user multi-eavesdroppers MISO systems," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory*, Jul. 2016, pp. 2449–2453.
- [30] W. Wang, K. C. Teh, and K. H. Li, "Secrecy throughput maximization for MISO multi-eavesdropper wiretap channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Security*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 505–515, 2016.
- [31] E. Choi, M. Oh, J. Choi, J. Park, N. Lee, and N. Al-Dahir, "Joint Precoding and Artificial Noise Design for MU-MIMO Wiretap Channels," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, Dec. 2022.
- [32] H. Xia, Y. Mao, X. Zhou, B. Clerckx, S. Han, and C. Li, "Secure beamforming design for rate-splitting multiple access in multi-antenna broadcast channel with confidential messages," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07328*, 2022.
- [33] H. Fu, S. Feng, W. Tang, and D. W. K. Ng, "Robust secure beamforming design for two-user downlink MISO rate-splitting systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 12, pp. 8351–8365, Sep. 2020.
- [34] P. Li, M. Chen, Y. Mao, Z. Yang, B. Clerckx, and M. Shikh-Bahaei, "Cooperative rate-splitting for secrecy sum-rate enhancement in multi-antenna broadcast channels," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. on Pers., Indoor and Mobile Radio Commun.* IEEE, Oct. 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [35] T. Cai, J. Zhang, S. Yan, L. Meng, J. Sun, and N. Al-Dahir, "Resource allocation for secure rate-splitting multiple access with adaptive beamforming," in *Int. Conf. on Commun. Workshop.* IEEE, Jul. 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [36] S. Lee, E. Choi, and J. Choi, "Max-Min Fairness Precoding for Physical Layer Security with Partial Channel Knowledge," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, Jun. 2023.
- [37] Y. Lu, K. Xiong, P. Fan, Z. Zhong, B. Ai, and K. B. Letaief, "Worst-case energy efficiency in secure SWIPT networks with rate-splitting ID and power-splitting EH receivers," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 1870–1885, Sep. 2021.
- [38] J. Choi, N. Lee, S.-N. Hong, and G. Caire, "Joint user selection, power allocation, and precoding design with imperfect CSIT for multi-cell MU-MIMO downlink systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 162–176, Sep. 2019.
- [39] M. Bloch, J. Barros, M. R. Rodrigues, and S. W. McLaughlin, "Wireless information-theoretic security," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 2515–2534, 2008.
- [40] M. Oh, J. Park, and J. Choi, "Joint optimization for secure and reliable communications in finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Trans. on Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 12, pp. 9457–9472, 2023.
- [41] C. Shen and H. Li, "On the dual formulation of boosting algorithms," *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Anal. and Mach. Intell.*, vol. 32, no. 12, pp. 2216–2231, Mar. 2010.
- [42] Y. Cai, L.-H. Zhang, Z. Bai, and R.-C. Li, "On an eigenvector-dependent nonlinear eigenvalue problem," *SIAM J. on Matrix Anal. and Appl.*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 1360–1382, 2018.
- [43] A. Salem, C. Masouros, and B. Clerckx, "Secure Rate Splitting Multiple Access: How Much of the Split Signal to Reveal?" *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, Dec. 2022.
- [44] T. Yoo and A. Goldsmith, "Capacity and power allocation for fading MIMO channels with channel estimation error," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 2203–2214, 2006.
- [45] M. Yang, D. Guo, Y. Huang, T. Q. Duong, and B. Zhang, "Physical layer security with threshold-based multiuser scheduling in multi-antenna wireless networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 64, no. 12, pp. 5189–5202, Sep. 2016.
- [46] A. Adhikary, J. Nam, J.-Y. Ahn, and G. Caire, "Joint spatial division and multiplexing—The large-scale array regime," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 6441–6463, Jun. 2013.
- [47] S. Wagner, R. Couillet, M. Debbah, and D. T. Stocck, "Large system analysis of linear precoding in correlated MISO broadcast channels under limited feedback," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 4509–4537, 2012.
- [48] Q. Zhang, S. Jin, K.-K. Wong, H. Zhu, and M. Matthaiou, "Power scaling of uplink massive MIMO systems with arbitrary-rank channel means," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 966–981, May 2014.