

Non-linear and Linear Broadcasting with MSE Constraints: Tractable Approaches for Scenarios with Uncertain Channel Information

Michael Botros Shenouda, *Student Member, IEEE*, and Timothy N. Davidson, *Member, IEEE*,

Abstract

We consider the downlink of cellular systems in which the base station employs multiple transmit antennas and each user has one receive antenna. We consider communication schemes in which the users have Quality of Service (QoS) requirements, and we study the design of robust broadcasting schemes that minimize the transmission power necessary to guarantee the QoS requirements for all channels within bounded uncertainty regions around the transmitter's estimate of each user's channel. We formulate each user's QoS requirement as a constraint on the mean square error (MSE) in its received signal, and we show that these MSE constraints imply constraints on the received signal-to-interference-plus-noise-ratio (SINR) of each user. Using these MSE constraints, we present a unified design approach for robust linear and non-linear transceivers with QoS requirements. The proposed designs overcome the limitations of existing approaches that only provide conservative solutions and only applicable to the case of linear precoding. Furthermore, we provide tractable and computationally-efficient design formulations for a quite general model of channel uncertainty that subsumes many uncertainty regions. we also consider the problem of robust counterparts to precoding schemes that maximizes the weakest user's signal subject to a total power constraint on the transmitting antennas. For this problem, we provide quasi-convex formulations, for both non-linear and linear transceivers, that can be efficiently solved using a one-dimensional bisection search. Our numerical results demonstrate that in the presence of uncertainty in the transmitter's knowledge of users' channels, the proposed designs provide guarantees to a larger set of QoS requirements than existing approaches, and require less transmission power to satisfy these requirements.

This work was supported in part by an Ontario Graduate Scholarship, and by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. The work of the second author is also supported by the Canada Research Chairs Program.

I. INTRODUCTION

The design of wireless broadcasting schemes that satisfy the quality of service (QoS) requirements of the intended users (receivers) is of growing interest in interactive communication applications and in the downlink of cellular systems with differentiated services. The provision of multiple antennas at the transmitter (base station) of the downlink enables the design of schemes that (attempt to) satisfy the users' QoS requirements by spatially precoding the users' data in order to mitigate the multiuser interference at the (disjoint) receivers. The availability of accurate channel state information (CSI) at the transmitter is important in such schemes as it enables the mitigation of the interference experienced by the receivers as a result of channel propagation. For scenarios in which one can assume perfect CSI is available at the transmitter, the problem of designing a precoder that minimizes the transmitted power required to satisfy a set of QoS requirements has been considered in [1]–[6] for the case of linear precoding, and in [7]–[11] for the case of non-linear precoding.

In practical broadcasting systems, the CSI that is available at the transmitter is subject to a variety of sources of imperfection, such as estimation errors, channel quantization errors and short channel coherence time. For example, in communication scenarios in which the receivers feed back their quantized CSI to the transmitter (e.g., [12]–[14]), the uncertainty in the CSI that is available at the transmitter is dominated by quantization errors. Downlink precoder design methods that assume perfect CSI are particularly sensitive to these uncertainties, which can result in serious degradation of the quality of the received signals [12], [13]. This suggests that the design of downlink precoding schemes should incorporate robustness to channel uncertainty. One approach to incorporating robustness is to consider a bounded model for the error in the transmitter's estimate of the channels and to constrain the design the precoder so that the users' QoS requirements are satisfied for all channels admitted by this model. This bounded uncertainty model is useful for systems in which it is difficult to provide the transmitter with an accurate statistical model for the channel uncertainty. In particular, it is useful for systems in which users feed back quantized channel measurements to the transmitter, as knowledge of the quantization codebooks can be used to bound the quantization error.

For the downlink of cellular systems in which each receiver has a single antenna, the design of a linear precoder that minimizes the transmitted power required to guarantee that each user's QoS requirement is satisfied for all admissible channels was considered in [15], [16]; see also [3], [17] for designs based on a bounded model for the errors in the transmitter's estimate of the (deterministic) autocorrelation matrices of the channel. These different approaches formulated the QoS requirements as

constraints on the signal-to-interference-plus-noise (SINR) of each user. While the methods proposed in [15], [16] provide tractable design formulations and significant improvements in performance over previous existing designs, those approaches have two limitations. First, they are not directly applicable to non-linear precoding schemes such as Tomlinson-Harashima precoding (THP). Second, when QoS is quantified in an SINR sense, the robust linear QoS problem resulted in designs whose tractability is an open problem; see also [18]. In order to obtain tractable designs, a conservative design approach was taken in [15], [16], and that approach requires the SINR constraints to be satisfied for a superset of the original bounded set of admissible channels. In this paper, we provide remedies to both these limitations by providing tractable formulations (in the form of semidefinite programs) of both linear and non-linear downlink precoding schemes that minimize the transmitted power required to ensure that each user's QoS requirement is satisfied for all admissible channels, without expanding the admissible set. We consider each user's QoS requirement as a constraint on the mean square error (MSE) in each user's received signal, and we show these MSE constraints imply constraints on the received SINR of each user. Since the QoS is measured in terms of MSE, our approach is applicable to non-linear Tomlinson-Harashima precoding and to linear precoding as a special case. In addition, the proposed designs (for the linear case) are obtained with lower computational cost than those based on SINR formulations of the QoS in [15], [16]. Furthermore, we present a unified treatment of a quite general bounded uncertainty model that can represent uncertainty regions resulting from many quantization schemes. The model naturally includes channel uncertainty regions that are described using intersection of multiple uncertainty sets, e.g., interval constraints on the entries of each user's channel. While we provide exact robust design formulations for these types of uncertainties, we also provide conservative formulations that reduce the computational complexity of the design for these cases.

The proposed design approaches can be extended to obtain efficiently-solvable quasi-convex formulations of some related design problems. In particular, we consider the robust counterpart of the problem of maximizing the weakest user's signal (minimizing the largest MSE among the users). For precoding schemes that assume perfect CSI at the transmitter, this problem was studied for the case of linear precoding schemes in [5], [6]. For the bounded channel uncertainty model, tractable conservative approaches to the robust counterpart of the linear minimax precoder design problem were provided in [16], but the problem has remained open for the case of non-linear precoding. We provide quasi-convex formulations of this robust minimax problem, for both non-linear and linear precoding schemes. These formulations can be efficiently solved using a one-dimensional bisection search. We also show that this problem can be formulated as generalized eigenvalue problem; e.g., [19].

We also consider the problem of determining the largest uncertainty region for which the QoS requirements can be satisfied for all admissible channels using finite transmission power. This problem is of considerable interest in the design of quantization codebooks for quantized channel feedback schemes. In that case, one might wish to choose the rate of the channel quantization scheme to be large enough (and the quantization cells small enough) for it to be possible to design a robust precoder with finite power. We provide quasi-convex formulations of this problem, too. Our numerical results demonstrate the efficiency of the proposed approaches. In particular, they provide guarantees to a larger set of QoS requirements than existing approaches, and require less transmission power in order to satisfy these requirements.

Our notation is as follows: We will use boldface capital letters to denote matrices, boldface lower case letters to denote vectors and medium weight lower case letters to denote individual elements; \mathbf{A}^T and \mathbf{A}^H denote the transpose and the conjugate transpose of the matrix \mathbf{A} , respectively. The notation $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm of vector \mathbf{x} , while $\|\mathbf{A}\|$ denotes the spectral norm (maximum singular value) of the matrix \mathbf{A} , and $E\{\cdot\}$ denotes the expectation operator. The term $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the trace of matrix \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}$ denotes the Kronecker product of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , and for symmetric matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , $\mathbf{A} \geq \mathbf{B}$ denotes the fact that $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$ is positive semidefinite.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider the downlink of a multiuser cellular communication system with N_t antennas at the transmitter and K users, each with one receive antenna. We consider downlink systems in which Tomlinson-Harashima precoding (THP) is used at the transmitter for multi-user interference pre-subtraction. As shown in Fig. 1, the interference pre-subtraction and channel spatial equalization at the transmitter can be modelled using a feedback matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K}$ and a feedforward precoding matrix $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times K}$. Since linear precoding is the special case of the THP model in which $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0}$, we will focus our development on the THP case and will extract the special case results for linear precoding as they are needed. The vector $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{C}^K$ in Fig. 1 contains the data symbol destined for each user, and we assume that s_k is chosen from a square QAM constellation \mathcal{S} with cardinality M and that $E\{\mathbf{s}\mathbf{s}^H\} = \mathbf{I}$. The Voronoi region of the constellation \mathcal{V} is a square whose side length is D .

In absence of the modulo operation, the output symbols of the feedback loop in Fig. 1, v_k , would be generated successively according to $v_k = s_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{B}_{k,j} v_j$, where at the k^{th} step, only the previously precoded symbols v_1, \dots, v_{k-1} are subtracted. Hence, \mathbf{B} is a strictly lower triangular matrix. The role of the transmitter's modulo operation is to ensure that v_k remains within the boundaries of \mathcal{V} , and its effect is equivalent to the addition of the complex quantity $i_k = i_k^{re} D + j i_k^{imag} D$ to v_k , where $i_k^{re}, i_k^{imag} \in \mathbb{Z}$,




Fig. 1. Multiple-input single-output downlink system with Tomlinson-Harashima precoding at the transmitter.




Fig. 2. Equivalent linear model for the transmitter.

and $j = \sqrt{-1}$. Using this observation, we obtain the standard linearized model of the transmitter that does not involve a modulo operation, as shown in Fig. 2; e.g., [20]. For that model,

$$\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{B})^{-1}\mathbf{u}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{s}$ is the modified data symbol. As a result of the modulo operation, the elements of \mathbf{v} are almost uncorrelated and uniformly distributed over the Voronoi region \mathcal{V} [20, Th. 3.1]. Therefore, the symbols of \mathbf{v} will have slightly higher average energy than the input symbols \mathbf{s} . (This slight increase in the average energy is termed precoding loss [20].) For example, for square M -ary QAM we have $\sigma_v^2 = E\{|\mathbf{v}_k|^2\} = \frac{M}{M-1}E\{|\mathbf{s}_k|^2\}$ for all k except the first one [20]. For moderate to large values of M this power increase can be neglected and $E\{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^H\} = \mathbf{I}$ is often used; e.g., [20]–[22]. Hence, the average transmitted power constraint can be written as $E_{\mathbf{v}}\{\mathbf{x}^H\mathbf{x}\} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}^H\mathbf{P})$.

The signals received at each user, y_k , can be written as

$$y_k = \mathbf{h}_k\mathbf{x} + n_k = \mathbf{h}_k\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{B})^{-1}\mathbf{u} + n_k, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N_t}$ is a row vector representing the channel gains from the transmitting antennas to the k^{th} receiver, and n_k represents the zero-mean additive white noise at the k^{th} receiver, whose variance is $\sigma_{n_k}^2$. At each receiver, the equalizing gain g_k is used to obtain an estimate $\hat{u}_k = g_k \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{B})^{-1} \mathbf{u} + g_k n_k$ of the modified data symbol u_k . Following this linear receive processing step, the modulo operation is used to obtain \hat{s} by eliminating the effect of the periodic extension of the constellation caused by the integer i_k . In terms of the modified data symbols, we can define the error signal

$$\hat{u}_k - u_k = (g_k \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{b}_k) \mathbf{v} + g_k n_k, \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{m}_k and \mathbf{b}_k are the k^{th} rows of the matrices \mathbf{I} and \mathbf{B} , respectively. The error signal in (3) is equivalent to $\hat{s}_k - s_k$ when the integer i_k is perfectly eliminated. This occurs with high probability even at reasonably low SINRs. Using this error signal, the Mean Square Error (MSE) of the k^{th} user is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}_k &= \text{E}\{|\hat{u}_k - u_k|^2\} = \|g_k \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{b}_k\|^2 + |g_k|^2 \sigma_{n_k}^2 \\ &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} g_k \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{b}_k & g_k \sigma_k \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

III. TRANSCEIVER DESIGN WITH MSE CONSTRAINTS: PERFECT CSI CASE

We consider downlink scenarios in which each user has a quality of service constraint on the form of an upper bound on its mean square error, MSE_k . The formulation of QoS design problem in terms of the MSEs is motivated by the following result.

Lemma 1: For any given set of users' channels \mathbf{h}_k , if there exists a transceiver design $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}, g_k$ that guarantees that $\text{MSE}_k \leq \zeta_k$, then that design also guarantees that $\text{SINR}_k \geq (1/\zeta_k) - 1$.

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

It worth observing that Lemma 1 provides a relation between the guaranteed MSE of each user and its achievable SINR that extends to scenarios in which users' channels are not accurately available at the transmitter. This is valid as long as long as the MSE is guaranteed for all channels within a given uncertainty set around the transmitter's estimate of the users' channels. Analogous relation existed for when accurate CSI is assumed to be available at the transmitter, e.g., [9]. In order to facilitate our development of robust precoding schemes with QoS constraints, we will briefly consider the design problem for the case of accurate transmitter's knowledge of the users' channels. In that case, the design of the downlink transceiver components \mathbf{P} , \mathbf{B} and g_k so as to minimize the total transmitted power

subject to satisfying the users' MSE requirements can be formulated as

$$\min_{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}, g_k} \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{P})\|^2 \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \left\| \left[g_k \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{b}_k, \quad g_k \sigma_k \right] \right\|^2 \leq \zeta_k. \quad (5b)$$

Since the norm in (5b) is unitarily invariant, problem is independent on the phase of each g_k . Indeed, if $\{|g_k| e^{j\theta_k}\}$ and \mathbf{P} are the optimal equalization gains and precoding matrix, respectively, then $\{|g_k|\}$ and $\mathbf{P} \text{Diag}(e^{j\theta_1}, \dots, e^{j\theta_K})$ are also optimal. Hence, there is no loss of generality in choosing the all the equalization gains g_k to be real. Using this observation and the definitions

$$\underline{\mathbf{h}}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}\{\mathbf{h}_k\} & \text{Im}\{\mathbf{h}_k\} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{P}} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}\{\mathbf{P}\} & \text{Im}\{\mathbf{P}\} \\ -\text{Im}\{\mathbf{P}\} & \text{Re}\{\mathbf{P}\} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{b}}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}\{\mathbf{b}_k\}/g_k & \text{Im}\{\mathbf{b}_k\}/g_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{m}}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}\{\mathbf{m}_k\} & \text{Im}\{\mathbf{m}_k\} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

$$f_k = 1/g_k \quad (10)$$

the design problem in (5) can be formulated as a convex Second Order Cone Program (SOCP)

$$\min_{\underline{\mathbf{P}}, \underline{\mathbf{B}}, f_k, t} t \quad (11a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \|\text{vec}(\underline{\mathbf{P}})\| \leq t, \quad (11b)$$

$$\|[\underline{\mathbf{h}}_k \underline{\mathbf{P}} - f_k \underline{\mathbf{m}}_k - \underline{\mathbf{b}}_k, \quad \sigma_{n_k}]\| \leq \sqrt{\zeta_k} f_k \quad 1 \leq k \leq K, \quad (11c)$$

When the channel is accurately known at the transmitter, we can obtain stronger conclusions than those provided by Lemma 1. In this case, it can show be shown using a contradiction argument that solution to (11) results in $\text{MSE}_k = \zeta_k$, i.e., the constraints in (11c) are achieved with equality at optimality. Since at optimality, each $\text{MSE}_k = 1/\zeta_k$, we have that for the perfect CSI case, $\text{SINR}_k = 1/\text{MSE}_k - 1$, e.g., [9].

Another advantage of the convex conic formulation in (11) is the possibility to include shaping constraints (e.g., [23]) on the transmitting antennas. These constraints are expressed as either second order cone or positive semidefiniteness constraints on the precoding matrix \mathbf{P} . More importantly, the convex formulation in (11) enables us to derive robust counterparts of the original design problem in (5)

for uncertainty models presented in the following section.

IV. CHANNEL UNCERTAINTY MODEL

We will consider an additive uncertainty model on the form:

$$\mathcal{U}_k(\delta_k) = \{\underline{\mathbf{h}}_k \mid \underline{\mathbf{h}}_k = \hat{\underline{\mathbf{h}}}_k + \underline{\mathbf{e}}_k = \hat{\underline{\mathbf{h}}}_k + \sum_{j=1}^J w_j \phi_j, \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{w} \leq \delta_k^2\}, \quad (12)$$

where $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{h}}}_k$ is the transmitter's estimate of the k^{th} user's channel, and $\underline{\mathbf{e}}_k$ is the corresponding estimation error. The above model enables us to treat several different uncertainty regions in a unified way. For example, it can model the following uncertainty sets:

- **Ellipsoidal and Spherical Uncertainty Sets:** By choosing $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{I}$, the uncertainty set in (12) describes an ellipsoidal uncertainty region around the channel estimate $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{h}}}_k$. The spherical uncertainty set with center $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{h}}}_k$ and radius δ_k is the special case that arises when ϕ_j are selected to be the rows of \mathbf{I}_{2N_t} .
- **Interval Uncertainty Sets:** Interval constraints on each element of $\underline{\mathbf{h}}_k$ can also be modeled as uncertainty sets of the form in (12). By taking ϕ_j to be the rows of \mathbf{I}_{2N_t} and \mathbf{Q} to be the matrix whose only non-zero element is $Q_{ii} = 1$, then the uncertainty set in (12) models an interval constraint on the i^{th} entry of the error $\underline{\mathbf{h}}_k$. Interval constraints on multiple entries of $\underline{\mathbf{h}}_k$ can be represented as the intersection of uncertainty sets on the form (12); see Section V-A.

This additive uncertainty model is useful for systems in which the channel state information is quantized at the receivers and fed back to the transmitter; e.g., [12]. If a vector quantizer is employed at the receivers, then the quantization cells in the interior of the quantization region can be often approximated by ellipsoids. On the other hand, if a simple scalar quantizer is employed, the quantization regions can be modeled using a set of interval constraints.

V. TRANSCEIVER DESIGN WITH MSE CONSTRAINTS: UNCERTAIN CSI CASE

In this section, we will design a robust transceiver that minimizes the total transmitted power necessary to guarantee that the users' MSE requirements are satisfied for all admissible channels $\underline{\mathbf{h}}_k$ in the uncertainty region $\mathcal{U}_k(\delta_k)$ in (12). Using the formulation in (11), this robust problem can be stated

as

$$\min_{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}, f_k, t} t \quad (13a)$$

$$\text{s. t. } \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{P})\| \leq t, \quad (13b)$$

$$\|[\mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{P} - f_k \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{b}_k, \sigma_{n_k}]\| \leq \sqrt{\zeta_k} f_k \quad \forall \mathbf{h}_k \in \mathcal{U}_k(\delta_k), \quad 1 \leq k \leq K. \quad (13c)$$

This is a semi-infinite conic programming problem. In particular, the constraint (13c) represents K infinite sets of second order cone (SOC) constraints, one for each $\mathbf{h}_k \in \mathcal{U}_k(\delta_k)$. However, we can precisely characterize each of these infinite sets of SOC constraints using a single Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI), as stated by the following theorem.

Design Formulation 1: The robust transceiver design problem in (13) is equivalent to the following semidefinite program (SDP)

$$\min_{\substack{\mu, t \\ \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}, f_k}} t \quad (14a)$$

$$\text{s. t. } \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{P})\| \leq t, \quad (14b)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_k(\zeta_k, \delta_k) = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\zeta_k} f_k - \mu_k & \mathbf{0} & [\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{m}_k f_k - \mathbf{b}_k, \sigma_{n_k}] \\ \mathbf{0} & \mu_k \mathbf{Q}_k & \delta_k [\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{0}] \\ [\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k \mathbf{P} - f_k \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{b}_k, \sigma_{n_k}]^T & \delta_k [\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{0}]^T & \sqrt{\zeta_k} f_k \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad (14c)$$

$$1 \leq k \leq K,$$

□

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

This result shows that the original design problem in (13) with an infinite set of constraints is equivalent to the convex SDP in (14) that can be efficiently solved using interior point methods, e.g., [24]. Such equivalence is an advantage of the structure of the uncertain parameter of the SOC representation, in (13c). In these SOC constraints, the channels \mathbf{h}_k , and consequently the uncertain parameters only exist on one side of the SOC. Hence, exact characterization of these SOC with uncertain parameters can be obtained. In contrast, when the QoS requirements are of the form of bounds on the SINR, then even in the case of linear precoding, both sides of the SOC constraints that enforce the QoS requirement depend on \mathbf{h}_k , and the resulting design problem is not known to be tractable [18, pp. 7]. In [15], [16] this unknown tractability was addressed by taking a conservative approach to the robust design problem. By adopting

MSE constraints, the QoS robust design problem can be efficiently solved.

A. Case of Intersecting Uncertainty Sets for each \mathbf{h}_k

The design problem in (13) and its efficiently-solvable equivalent in (14) were obtained for an uncertainty set of the form in (12). However, that design extends naturally to the case in which the uncertainty region for each \mathbf{h}_k is described as the intersection of more than one uncertainty set \mathcal{U}_k^ℓ of the form (12); that is, uncertainty set is of the form

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_k = \bigcap_{\ell=1}^L \mathcal{U}_k^\ell(\delta_k) \quad (15)$$

Note that there is no restriction in assuming that each \mathcal{U}_k^ℓ has the same uncertainty size parameter δ_k , since \mathbf{Q}_k^ℓ , in (12) can be chosen to accommodate different sizes and geometrical regions. Examples of constraint sets of the form in (15) include interval constraints on each of the entries of $\underline{\mathbf{h}}_k$ discussed in Section IV. In that case, there is a constraint on the form of (12) for each element of $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{h}}}_k$, and hence $L = 2N_t$. To formulate the modified version of (13) with \mathcal{U}_k replaced by $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_k$ as an SDP, one simply observes that each $\mathcal{U}_k^\ell(\delta_k)$ in (15) constitutes an LMI of the form in (14c) and that all LMIs must be satisfied. Hence, the resulting SDP has LK LMIs. While that formulation is precise, when L is large it might be prudent to adopt a conservative formulation with fewer constraints. This conservative approach involves enveloping (15) in a superset that can be described more efficiently, and then requiring the MSE constraints to be satisfied for all channels in this superset. The following theorem describes a conservative approach that results in a formulation with the same number of LMIs as that in (14). This represents a reduction in the number of LMIs by factor of L .

Design Formulation 2: The solution of robust transceiver design problem in (13) for the intersection of uncertainty sets in (15) is upper-bounded by the solution of the following SDP

$$\min_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu}, t \\ \mathbf{P}, \underline{\mathbf{E}}, f_k}} t \quad (16a)$$

$$\text{s. t. } \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{P})\| \leq t, \quad (16b)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_k(\zeta_k, \delta_k) = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\zeta_k} f_k - \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mu_k^\ell & \mathbf{0} & [\hat{\underline{\mathbf{h}}}_k \mathbf{P} - f_k \underline{\mathbf{m}}_k - \underline{\mathbf{b}}_k, \sigma_{n_k}] \\ \mathbf{0} & \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mu_k^\ell \mathbf{Q}_k^\ell & \delta_k [\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{0}] \\ [\hat{\underline{\mathbf{h}}}_k \mathbf{P} - f_k \underline{\mathbf{m}}_k - \underline{\mathbf{b}}_k, \sigma_{n_k}]^T & \delta_k [\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{0}]^T & \sqrt{\zeta_k} f_k \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad (16c)$$

$$1 \leq k \leq K.$$

□

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

B. Largest Feasible Uncertainty Size

In this section we consider the related design problem of finding the largest value of the uncertainty size δ , namely δ_{max} for which there exists a robust transceiver of finite power that satisfies the MSE constraints for all admissible channels in the uncertainty region of size δ_{max} . This problem is connected to the problem of designing codebooks for the quantization of the users' channels. The codebook design needs to yield quantization regions that can be “covered” by uncertainty sets of size δ_{max} in order for the robust transceiver design problem to be feasible. Using the problem formulation in (14), finding the value of δ_{max} is equivalent to solving

$$\max_{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}, \zeta_k, \mu, \rho} \rho \tag{17a}$$

$$\text{s. t. } \mathbf{A}_k(\zeta_k, \rho) \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K, \tag{17b}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_k(\zeta_k, \rho)$ is defined in (14c). Since ρ is an optimization variable rather than a design parameter, the bilinear terms in $\mathbf{A}_k(\zeta_k, \rho)$ mean that design problem is not jointly convex in the design variables ρ and \mathbf{P} . However, the problem is quasi-convex (c.f. [25]), and an optimal solution can be efficiently found using a one-dimensional bisection search on ρ in which the problem solved at each step is the convex feasibility problem corresponding to (17) with a fixed value for ρ . For the case of the intersection of uncertainty regions in (15) the constraint $\mathbf{B}_k(\zeta_k, \rho)$ in (16c) can be used in the place of (17b). In that case, the optimal value of the design problem becomes a lower bound on δ_{max} . It is worth observing that largest uncertainty size for the special case of linear precoding is less than of its THP counterpart. This follows by observing that finding δ_{max} in the linear precoding case solves a restriction of the problem (17) in which each \mathbf{b}_k is set to $\mathbf{0}$. This result does not use the assumption of negligible precoding loss, since δ_{max} is the maximum uncertainty supported by any transceiver design with finite power.

VI. ROBUST COUNTERPART OF FAIR MINIMAX TRANSCEIVER DESIGN

In the previous section, the focus was on the robust counterpart of the transceiver design problem that minimize the total transmitted power subject to satisfying the users' MSE constraints. In this section, we consider the related problem of minimizing the maximum MSE among all users subject to a transmitted power constraint, in scenarios with uncertain CSI. This design problem provides a notion of fairness

among users based on the value of their MSEs. While this problem has been considered in scenarios that assume perfect CSI in [5], [6], we can formulate the robust counterpart of this design problem under the channel uncertainty model in (12) as the following semi-infinite quasi-convex optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_a, f_k, \sqrt{\zeta_0}} \sqrt{\zeta_0} \quad (18a)$$

$$\text{s. t. } \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k \mathbf{P} - f_k \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{b}_k, \sigma_{n_k}\| \leq \sqrt{\zeta_0} f_k, \quad \forall \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k \in \mathcal{U}_k(\delta_k), \quad 1 \leq k \leq K, \quad (18b)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^T) \leq P_{\text{total}}. \quad (18c)$$

Using the characterization in (14c) of the infinite set of SOC constraints in (18b), this design problem can be formulated as the following quasi-convex optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_a, f_k, \sqrt{\zeta_0}} \sqrt{\zeta_0} \quad (19a)$$

$$\text{s. t. } \mathbf{A}_k(\zeta_0, \delta_k) \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K, \quad (19b)$$

$$\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{P})\| \leq \sqrt{2 P_{\text{total}}}. \quad (19c)$$

This problem can be efficiently solved by using a bisection search on $\sqrt{\zeta_0}$ in which problem solved at each step is the convex feasibility problem generated by (19) with a fixed value of $\sqrt{\zeta_0}$. Furthermore, we can observe that each constraint in (19b) can be written as

$$\sqrt{\zeta} \begin{bmatrix} 1/g_k & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 1/g_k \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\zeta} f_k - \mu_k & \mathbf{0} & [\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k \mathbf{P} - f_k \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{b}_k, \sigma_{n_k}] \\ \mathbf{0} & \mu_k \mathbf{Q}_k & \delta_k [\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{0}] \\ [\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k \mathbf{P} - f_k \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{b}_k, \sigma_{n_k}]^T & \delta_k [\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{0}]^T & \sqrt{\zeta} f_k \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \geq \mathbf{0}.$$

Hence, (18) is equivalent to minimizing the largest generalized eigenvalue of a pair of (block diagonal) symmetric matrices that depend affinely on the decision variables [19], [26] — a problem that takes the form

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}, \alpha} \alpha \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{s. t. } \alpha \mathbf{A}^1(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{A}^2(\mathbf{x}) \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad (20b)$$

$$\mathbf{A}^1(\mathbf{x}) \geq \mathbf{0}. \quad (20c)$$

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \mathbf{0}. \quad (20d)$$

this observation allows us to employ efficient algorithms that exploit the structure of the constituent matrices in (??) are available for such problems; c.f. [19], [27].

VII. SIMULATION STUDIES

In this section, we demonstrate the performance of the proposed robust QoS designs for non-linear Tomlinson-Harashima precoding (RTHP-order 1, 2) and linear precoding (RLin) that were presented in Section V. For Tomlinson-Harashima precoding, ordering of the users' channels is necessary prior to precoding. Finding the optimal ordering requires exhaustive search over all possible permutations of the transmitter's estimate of users' channels $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k$, and instead of that we have implemented two suboptimal ordering methods. The first method applies the BLAST ordering in [28] to the transmitter's estimate of users' channels. The second method is a generalization of the ordering method in [29] that selects a channel ordering that minimizes the reciprocals of the received SINRs when the precoder matrix \mathbf{P} is an identity matrix. In our generalization, the ordering selection criteria is minimizing the sum of each user's SINR requirements divided by its received SINR (when $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}$), a quantity that is proportional to the power necessary for each user to achieve its SINR requirement.

In our numerical studies, we consider a spherical uncertainty region of radius δ_k for each user. This model will facilitate the comparisons with other existing approaches for the linear precoding model, namely the robust autocorrelation matrix approach in [3], [4] (Robust Correl. Appr.), the robust power loading approach (RLin-PL1) using SINR constraints in [17], and the robust power loading approach (RLin-PL2) using MSE constraints in [30]. We will also compare with the conservative approach to robust linear precoding with SINR constraints in [15], [16]. The work in [15], [16] presented three conservative approaches and we are comparing with the best conservative approach, namely the "Structured SDP" approach in Section VI of [15]; see also Section IV [16]. As we make the comparisons, we would like to point out that all previous approaches do not extend to non-linear Tomlinson-Harashima precoding, but the approaches proposed herein are inherently applicable to both linear and Tomlinson-Harashima approaches. In order to totally specify the schemes used in our comparisons, we point out that the approaches in [17] and [] requires the beamforming vectors (normalized columns of \mathbf{P}) to be specified. We will use the zero-forcing beamforming vectors (the columns of the pseudo-inverse of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$). In addition, the approaches in [3], [4] and [17] are based on uncertainty models that are different from the one in (12), and from each other. The approach in [3], [4] considers a model in which the spectral norm of the error in the (deterministic) autocorrelation matrix $\mathbf{C}_k = \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{h}_k$ is bounded, and in the approach in [17] the Frobenius norm of the error in \mathbf{C}_k is bounded. However, by bounding these norms of \mathbf{C}_k

in terms of the norm of \mathbf{e}_k , a comparable uncertainty set can be generated.¹ We will compare these schemes in an environment with $N_t = 3$ transmit antennas and $K = 3$ users. In our experiments, we will evaluate performance statistics for the standard case of independent Rayleigh fading channels in which the coefficients of the fading channels are modeled as being independent circular complex Gaussian random variables with zero-mean and unit variance, and the receivers' noise sources are modeled as zero-mean, additive, white, and circular Gaussians with unit variance.

A. Performance Comparisons against SINR Requirements

In this comparison, we randomly generated 2000 realizations of the set of channel estimates $\{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ and examined the performance of each method in the presence of uncertainties of equal sizes, $\delta_k = \delta = 0.05, \forall k$. The SINR requirements of the three users are also equal. For each set of channel estimates and for each value of the required SINR we determined whether each design method is able to generate a precoder (of finite power) that guarantees the required SINRs. In Fig. 3 we plot the fraction of the 2000 channel realizations for which each method generated a precoder with finite power against the equal SINR requirement of each user.

From this figure, it clear that the proposed robust designs for linear (RLin) and non-linear (RTHP-order 1, 2) precoding satisfy the SINR requirements for larger percentages of channels. The robust conservative approach for linear precoding (RLin-Conservative) [15], [16] and the power loading method in [] achieve the QoS requirements for a percentage of channels that is quite close to that of the proposed linear approach (RLin). For the robust linear power loading approach (RLin-PL2) in [30], the QoS design problem in terms of MSE constraints was justified as a heuristic measure for the SINR requirements. However, using Lemma 1 we showed that the MSE constraint of each user implies a minimum achieved SINR.

For the comparison in Fig. 4, we selected all the sets of channel estimates from the 2000 sets used in the previous experiment for which all design methods were able to provide robust QoS guarantees for all SINRs less than or equal to 6dB, and we calculated the average, over the 274 such channel environments, of the transmitted power required to achieve these robust QoS guarantees. We have plotted the equal SINR requirement of each user versus the average transmitted power in Fig. 4. The average transmitted power approaches infinity for a certain value of SINR when for one (or more) of the channel

¹A bound on the spectral norm of the error in the matrix \mathbf{C}_k can be obtained as follows: $\|(\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k + \mathbf{e}_k)^H (\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k + \mathbf{e}_k) - \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{h}_k\| = \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k^H \mathbf{e}_k + \mathbf{e}_k^H \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k + \mathbf{e}_k^H \mathbf{e}_k\| \leq \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k^H \mathbf{e}_k\| + \|\mathbf{e}_k^H \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k\| + \|\mathbf{e}_k^H \mathbf{e}_k\| = 2\|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k\| \|\mathbf{e}_k\| + \|\mathbf{e}_k\|^2$. The same bound also holds for the Frobenius norm, since the matrices on the immediate right hand side of the inequality are all rank one. Furthermore, the uncertainty $\mathbf{e}_k = \delta_k \hat{\mathbf{h}}_k / \|\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k\|$ achieves this upper bound with equality for both norms. (See also [31].)




Fig. 3. Percentage of the 2000 channel realizations for which the robust QoS guarantee can be made against the required SINRs, for a system with $N_t = 3$ and $K = 3$.

estimates the method under consideration cannot provide the robust QoS guarantee with finite power. This figure demonstrates the saturation effect that channel uncertainty imposes on the growth of the SINR of each user with the transmitted power for both of linear and non-linear precoding. This effect was observed in [12] for non-robust linear precoding on the MISO downlink with quantized CSI. Fig. 4 also illustrates the role that robust precoding can play in extending the SINR interval over which linear growth with the transmitted power can be achieved. This is particularly evident for the robust non-linear approaches (RTHP-order 1, 2) and the robust linear approach (RLin). We also observe that the second ordering method for Tomlinson-Harashima precoding provides better performance than the first one, since it selects the channel ordering in a way that attempts to minimize the sum of powers necessary to achieve each SINR requirement.

B. Performance Comparisons against Uncertainty Size

In this comparison, we used the 2000 randomly generated realizations of the set of channel estimates $\{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ to examine the performance of each method in the presence of equal uncertainty, $\delta_k = \delta$, $\forall k$. The QoS requirement of each user is such that the SINR is at least 10 dB. In Fig. 5 we provide the percentage of the 2000 channel realizations for which each method generated a precoder with finite




Fig. 4. Maximum achievable (equal) SINRs against the average transmitted power, for a system with $N_t = 3$ and $K = 3$.

power as a function of the size of the uncertainty. From this figure, it is clear that for a large range of uncertainty sizes, the proposed non-linear approaches (RTHP-Order 1, 2) provide SINR requirements for many more channel realizations than other approaches. This is due to the fact that the proposed linear approach is a special case of the proposed THP design, and the other existing linear approaches are either conservative or restricted to the optimization of powers for a given transmit directions. While the conservative linear precoding approach (RLin-conservative) in [15], [16] and the robust linear power loading approaches (RLin-PL2) in [30] have close performance in terms of number of channel realizations for which the methods achieves the QoS requirements, they do use more power in order to achieve the QoS requirements as shown in Fig 6.

In Fig 6, we selected those sets of channel estimates from the 2000 sets used in the previous experiment for which all design methods were able to provide robust QoS guarantees for all uncertainties with $\delta \leq 0.015$. We calculated the average, over the 614 such channel environments, of the transmitted power required to achieve these robust QoS guarantees and we have plotted the results for different values of δ in Fig. 6. The average transmitted power approaches infinity for a certain value of δ when for one (or more) of the channel estimates the method under consideration cannot provide the robust QoS guarantee with finite power. It is clear from Fig. 6 that the proposed robust Tomlinson-Harashima designs are




Fig. 5. Percentage of channel realizations for which the robust QoS guarantee can be made against the uncertainty size δ , for a system with $N_t = 3$ and $K = 3$.

capable of achieving SINR requirements for larger values of uncertainty sizes than other approaches.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We presented a unified design approach for robust non-linear and linear transceivers with users' QoS requirements subject to deterministically-bounded channel uncertainty model. The proposed approach formulated the QoS requirements in terms of MSE constraints and showed that these constraints imply corresponding constraints on the achieved SINR of each user. It provided (convex) semidefinite program formulations of the design problem that are efficiently-solvable. Furthermore, these design formulations were obtained for a quite general model of channel uncertainty that include many uncertainty regions. We also showed how these designs can be used to provide quasi-convex designs for the robust counterpart of the problem of fair transceivers that maximizes the signal quality of the user with the weakest signal. Numerical results demonstrated that under uncertain CSI conditions, the proposed designs provided guarantees to a larger set of QoS requirements than existing approaches, and require less transmission power to satisfy these requirements.




Fig. 6. Average of the transmitted power $\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}^H \mathbf{P})$, on a linear scale, versus uncertainty size δ for a system with $N_t = 3$ and $K = 3$.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Consider the quantity $(\hat{u}_k - u_k)$ in equation (3). Assuming correct removal of i_k , we have

$$\hat{s}_k - s_k = (g_k \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{m}_k - \mathbf{b}_k) \mathbf{v} + g_k n_k, \quad (21)$$

or equivalently,

$$\hat{s}_k = a_k s_k + \sum_{i \in I_k} a_i s_i + a_0 n_k, \quad (22)$$

where I_k is the set of interfering symbols with s_k . Using (22), we can write

$$\mathbb{E}\{|\hat{s}_k|^2\} = |a_k|^2 + \sum_{i \in I_k} |a_i|^2 + |a_0|^2 \sigma_k^2, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathbb{E}\{|\hat{s}_k - s_k|^2\} = |a_k - 1|^2 + \sum_{i \in I_k} |a_i|^2 + |a_0|^2 \sigma_k^2, \quad (24)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\{|\hat{s}_k|^2\} + 1 - 2 \text{Re}\{\mathbf{a}_k\}, \quad (25)$$

$$1 + 1/\text{SINR}_k = \mathbb{E}\{|\hat{s}_k|^2\}/|a_k|^2. \quad (26)$$

Consider the MSE constraint $E\{|\hat{s}_k - s_k|^2\} = E\{|\hat{s}_k|^2\} + 1 - 2\text{Re}\{a_k\} \leq \zeta_k \leq 1$. This can be written as

$$E\{|\hat{s}_k|^2\}(1 - \zeta_k) \leq 2\text{Re}\{a_k\}(1 - \zeta_k) - (1 - \zeta_k)^2 \quad (27)$$

$$= \text{Re}^2\{a_k\} - (\text{Re}\{\mathbf{a}_k\})^2 - (1 - \zeta_k)^2 \leq |a_k|^2. \quad (28)$$

The latter inequality is equivalent to $1 + 1/\text{SINR}_k \leq 1/(1 - \zeta_k)$, or equivalently $\text{SINR}_k \geq (1/\zeta_k) - 1$.

APPENDIX B

PROOFS OF DESIGN FORMULATIONS 1 AND 2

The proofs are based the following lemma which is a concatenation of two results in [32]:

Lemma 2: Consider the SOC constraint $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}\| \leq y$ for every $[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b}]$ in the uncertainty region given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} &= \left\{ [\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b}] \mid [\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b}] = [\mathbf{A}^0, \mathbf{b}^0] + \sum_{j=1}^J \theta_j [\mathbf{A}^j, \mathbf{b}^j], \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{V} \right\} \\ \mathcal{V} &= \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \mathbf{Q}^\ell \boldsymbol{\theta}, \ell = 1, \dots, L \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Then the set \mathcal{S}_1 of pairs (\mathbf{x}, y) satisfying $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}\| \leq y$ for every $[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b}] \in \mathcal{U}$ is subset of the set \mathcal{S}_2 of pairs (\mathbf{x}, y) such that there exist non-negative scalars μ^1, \dots, μ^L satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} y - \sum_l \mu^\ell & \mathbf{0} & (\mathbf{A}^0 \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^0)^T \\ \mathbf{0} & \sum_l \mu^\ell \mathbf{Q}^\ell & [\mathbf{A}^1 \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^1 \dots \mathbf{A}^J \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^J]^T \\ \mathbf{A}^0 \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} & [\mathbf{A}^1 \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^1 \dots \mathbf{A}^J \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^J] & y \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \geq \mathbf{0}. \quad (30)$$

When $L = 1$, $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}_2$. □

To prove Design Formulation 1, we involve Lemma 2 with $L = 1$ to show the equivalence between the SOC constraints in (13c) and the corresponding LMIs in (14c). The nonnegativity constraints on each μ_k is implied by positive semidefiniteness of the diagonal blocks of the matrices in (13c). The proof of the Design Formulation 2 is similar, but when $L \geq 2$ the application of Lemma 2 results in a conservative design formulation, and hence an upper bound on the required transmission power.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Rashid-Farrokhi, L. Tassiulas, and K. J. R. Liu, "Joint optimal power control and beamforming in wireless networks using antenna arrays," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 46, no. 10, pp. 1313–1324, Oct. 1998.

- [2] F. Rashid-Farrokhi, K. J. R. Liu, and L. Tassiulas, "Transmit beamforming and power control for cellular wireless systems," *IEEE J. Select. Areas Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 1437–1450, Oct. 1998.
- [3] M. Bengtsson and B. Ottersten, "Optimal downlink beamforming using semidefinite optimization," in *Proc. 37th Allerton Conf. Comm., Control, Computing*, Monticello, IL, 1999, pp. 987–996.
- [4] M. Bengtsson and B. Ottersten, "Optimal and suboptimal transmit beamforming," in *Handbook of Antenna in Wireless Communications*, L. C. Godara, Ed., chapter 18. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, August 2001.
- [5] M. Schubert and H. Boche, "Solution of the multiuser downlink beamforming problem with individual SINR constraints," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 53, pp. 18–28, Jan. 2004.
- [6] A. Wiesel, Y.C. Eldar, and S. Shamai, "Linear precoding via conic optimization for fixed MIMO receivers," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 161–176, Jan. 2006.
- [7] Fred C.-H. Fung, Wei Yu, and T. J. Lim, "Non-linear multi-user precoding for multi-antenna downlink channels using independent MSE constraints," in *Proc. 22nd Biennial Symposium on Communications*, Kingston, Ontario, May 2004.
- [8] R. Doostnejad, T. Lim, and E. Sousa, "Joint precoding and beamforming design for the downlink in a multiuser MIMO system," in *Wireless Mobile Computing, Networking, Commun.*, Montreal, Aug. 2005, vol. 1, pp. 153–159.
- [9] M. Schubert and S. Shi, "MMSE transmit optimization with interference pre-compensation," in *Proc. Veh. Tech. Conf.*, Stockholm, May 2005, vol. 2, pp. 845–849.
- [10] L. Sanguinetti and M. Morelli, "Non-linear pre-coding for multiple-antenna multi-user downlink transmissions with different QoS requirements," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 852 – 856, March 2007.
- [11] M. Schubert and H. Boche, "Iterative multiuser uplink and downlink beamforming under SINR constraints," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 53, no. 7, pp. 2324–2334, July 2005.
- [12] N. Jindal, "MIMO broadcast channels with finite rate feedback," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 11, pp. 5045–5059, Nov. 2006.
- [13] P. Ding, D. J. Love, and M. D. Zoltowski, "Multiple antenna broadcast channels with shape feedback and limited feedback," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 55, pp. 3417–3428, July 2007.
- [14] T. Yoo, N. Jindal, and A. Goldsmith, "Multi-antenna downlink channels with limited feedback and user selection," *IEEE J. Select. Areas Commun.*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 1478–1491, Sept. 2007.
- [15] M. Botros Shenouda and T. N. Davidson, "Linear matrix inequality formulations of robust QoS precoding for broadcast channels," in *Proc. IEEE Canadian Conf. Elec. & Comp. Engineering*, Vancouver, April 2007, pp. 324–328.
- [16] M. Botros Shenouda and T. N. Davidson, "Convex conic formulations of robust downlink precoder designs with quality of service constraints," To appear in *IEEE J. Select. Topics Signal Processing*, Dec. 2007.
- [17] M. Biguesh, S. Shahbazpanahi, and A.B. Gershman, "Robust downlink power control in wireless cellular systems," *EURASIP J. Wireless Commun. Networking*, vol. 2, pp. 261–272, 2004.
- [18] D. Bertsimas and M. Sim, "Tractable approximations to robust conic optimization problems," *Math. Program.*, vol. 107, no. 1, 2006.
- [19] S. Boyd and L. El Ghaoui, "Method of centers for minimizing generalized eigenvalues," *Linear Algebra Appl.*, vol. 188, no. 189, pp. 63–111, 1993.
- [20] R. F. H. Fischer, *Precoding and Signal Shaping for Digital Transmission*, Wiley, New York, 2002.
- [21] C. Windpassinger, R. F. H. Fischer, T. Vencel, and J. B. Huber, "Precoding in multi-antenna and multiuser communications," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1305–1316, Jul. 2004.
- [22] O. Simeone, Y. Bar-Ness, and U. Spagnolini, "Linear and nonlinear preequalization/equalization for MIMO systems with

- long-term channel state information at the transmitter,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 373–378, Mar. 2004.
- [23] D. P. Palomar, “Unified framework for linear MIMO transceivers with shaping constraints,” *IEEE Commun. Letters*, vol. 8, no. 12, pp. 697–699, 2004.
- [24] J. Sturm, “Using SeDuMi 1.02, a MATLAB toolbox for optimization over symmetric cones,” *Optim. Methods Softw.*, vol. 11, pp. 625–653, 1999.
- [25] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2004.
- [26] L. El-Ghaoui, F. Oustry, and H. Lebret, “Robust solutions to uncertain semidefinite programs,” *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 9, pp. 33–52, 1998.
- [27] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovskii, “An interior-point method for generalized linear-fractional programming,” *Math. Program.*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 177–204, 1995.
- [28] G. D. Golden, C. J. Foschini, R. A. Valenzuela, and P. W. Wolniansky, “Detection algorithm and initial laboratory results using V-BLAST space-time communication architecture,” *Electron. Lett.*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 14–16, 7 Jan. 1999.
- [29] C. Windpassinger, T. Vencel, and R. F. H. Fischer, “Precoding and loading for BLAST-like systems,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, Anchorage, May 2003, vol. 5, pp. 3061–3065.
- [30] M. Payaro, A. Pascual-Iserte, and M. Lagunas, “Robust power allocation designs for multiuser and multiantenna downlink communication systems through convex optimization,” *IEEE J. Select. Areas Commun.*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 1390–1401, Sept. 2007.
- [31] T.-L. Tung and K. Yao, “Robust downlink power-control for DS-CDMA system with multimedia services,” in *IEEE Wkshp Signal Processing Advances Wireless Commun.*, Rome, June 2003, pp. 532–536.
- [32] A. Ben-Tal, A. Nemirovski, and C. Roos, “Robust solutions of uncertain quadratic and conic-quadratic problems,” *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 535–560, Oct. 2002.