

PAR-Constrained Multiuser MIMO OFDM based on Convex Optimization and Concentration of Measure

Hyun-Su Cha, *Student Member, IEEE*, and Dong Ku Kim, *Senior Member, IEEE*,

Abstract

In multi-user multiple-input multiple-output (MU-MIMO) orthogonal frequency division multiplexing systems, a block diagonalization (BD) precoding scheme is first designed to aim at minimizing the peak-to-average power ratio (PAR) for a fixed cost, which is a sum of the received SNR loss of users. Then the BD precoder is designed to provide the required PAR at the minimum cost, which is our main goal. By the aid of the concentration of measure property [1], [2], it is almost exactly able to provide the required PAR on average, and also provide the required performance specified as 0.1 percent PAR in an asymptotic way.

Index Terms

Multi-user, MIMO, OFDM, PAR, PAPR, precoding, convex, concentration of measure.

I. INTRODUCTION

MULTIPLE-INPUT MULTIPLE-OUTPUT (MIMO) and orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM) have been regarded as key technologies for wireless communication systems to boost the network capacity, but OFDM has a fundamental drawback of high peak-to-average power ratio (PAR) [3]. Unfortunately, this is further intensified by MIMO precoding techniques [4], and transmitters are required to use linear power amplifiers, although they are expensive [5].

Under these practical challenges, the authors of [6] and [7] have effectively used redundant spatial dimensions based on convex optimization to make low PAR OFDM signals while providing high data rate through the inherent MIMO precoding gain, for the multi-user (MU) multiple-input single-output (MISO) and single-user (SU) MIMO cases, respectively.

In this paper, we modify the block diagonalization (BD) precoder [8], [9] by utilizing unused spatial dimensions based on convex optimization theory, and propose MIMO precoding schemes with a focus on the PAR performance of MU-MIMO OFDM systems. First, we propose a precoding scheme to aim at minimizing the PAR for a given cost, which is represented as a sum of received SNR loss of users compared to those of SNRs that would have been achieved by the original BD scheme. Second, we design the precoder that is able to provide the required PAR at the minimum cost, which is our main goal. For this purpose, we establish the required PAR as a convex constraint by using high dimensional property of the convex body, known as the concentration of measure phenomenon [1], [2], and formulate a convex problem to determine the precoder that is able to minimize the cost while providing the required PAR performance.

As a result, even if the required PAR is small, the proposed scheme is almost exactly able to provide the required PAR on average, and asymptotically provide the required performance specified as 0.1 percent PAR, as the number of subcarriers increases.

Throughout this paper, $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{C}, \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ denote the sets of natural numbers, real numbers, positive real numbers, complex numbers, rectangular diagonal matrices and column orthonormal matrices, respectively. For arbitrary $a, b \in \mathbb{N}, a < b$, define $[a : b] = \{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$, and define $\text{diag}(a, b) = [[a, 0]^T, [0, b]^T]$. For arbitrary matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$, $\text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}) = [[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{0}]^T, [\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{B}]^T]$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$ means the null space of $\mathbf{A}$.

H.-S. Cha and D. K. Kim (*Corresponding author*) are with the school of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Yonsei University, Seoul 120-749, Korea. (e-mail: hyunsu.cha0@gmail.com, dkkim@yonsei.ac.kr).




Fig. 1. Multiuser MIMO OFDM System

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we state the system model and explain the related works. Consider the MU-MIMO OFDM system depicted in Fig. 1, where a transmitter equipped with M antennas intends to send a signal vector $\mathbf{s}_k^{[j]} \in \mathbb{C}^{d_j}$ through the k^{th} subcarrier, which is drawn from a finite alphabet set $\mathcal{A}$, to the j^{th} user equipped with N antennas for $k \in [1 : K]$ and $j \in [1 : J]$. It is assumed that $d_j \leq N$, $\sum_{j=1}^J d_j = d_\Sigma < M$ and $JN \leq M$.

Let $\mathbf{H}_k^{[j]} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times M}$, $\mathbf{F}_k^{[j]} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times d_j}$ and $\mathbf{w}_k^{[j]} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ denote the channel matrix composed of i.i.d elements, the precoding matrix and the additive noise that follows $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_n^2 \mathbf{I})$, respectively. Then the received signal vector of the j^{th} user for the k^{th} subcarrier is given by

$$\mathbf{y}_k^{[j]} = \mathbf{H}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{F}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{s}_k^{[j]} + \sum_{l=1, l \neq j}^J \mathbf{H}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{F}_k^{[l]} \mathbf{s}_k^{[l]} + \mathbf{w}_k^{[j]} \quad (1)$$

and $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k^{[j]} = \mathbf{R}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{y}_k^{[j]}$, where $\mathbf{R}_k^{[j]} \in \mathbb{C}^{d_j \times N}$ is the receiving filter for $k \in [1 : K]$ and $j \in [1 : J]$. For the k^{th} subcarrier, we define $\mathbf{s}_k^T = [\mathbf{s}_k^{[1],T}, \dots, \mathbf{s}_k^{[J],T}] \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times d_\Sigma}$ and $\mathbf{F}_k = [\mathbf{F}_k^{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{F}_k^{[J]}] \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times d_\Sigma}$, which satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^H] = \frac{\mathcal{P}_s}{d_\Sigma} \mathbf{I}_{d_\Sigma}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{s}_k\|^2] = \mathcal{P}_s$. For the overall K subcarriers, assume the K independent flat fading channels which are completely known to the transmitter, and define $\mathbf{s} = [\mathbf{s}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{s}_K^T]^T$, $\mathbf{F} = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{F}_1, \dots, \mathbf{F}_K)$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{F} \mathbf{s}\|^2] = K \mathcal{P}_s$. All elements of $\mathbf{F}$ s are distributed to M antennas by one-to-one mapping [6] such that $[\mathbf{x}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}_K^T]^T = [\mathbf{x}^{(1),T}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(M),T}]^T$ where $\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{F}_k \mathbf{s}_k$, and $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ is the transmission signal vector by the i^{th} antenna at the transmitter.

Remark 1: For $j \in [1 : J]$ with $J \geq 2$, define

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}}_k^{[j]} = [\mathbf{H}_k^{[1],T}, \dots, \mathbf{H}_k^{[j-1],T}, \mathbf{H}_k^{[j+1],T}, \dots, \mathbf{H}_k^{[J],T}]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{(J-1)N \times M}, \quad (2)$$

and $\mathbf{U}_k^{[j]}$ satisfying $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{U}_k^{[j]} = \mathbf{0}$. By the singular value decomposition, compute

$$\mathbf{H}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{U}_k^{[j]} = \mathbf{L}_{k,L}^{[j]} \mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{L}_{k,R}^{[j],H}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{[j]} = \text{diag}(\lambda_{k,1}^{[j]}, \dots, \lambda_{k,d_j}^{[j]}), \quad (4)$$

for $j \in [1 : J]$ and $k \in [1 : K]$. Let us make $\mathbf{V}_k^{[j]}$ of the first d_j columns of $\mathbf{L}_{k,R}^{[j]}$. Then the "BD precoder" is defined as $\mathbf{U}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{V}_k^{[j]}$, and the associated receiving filter $\mathbf{R}_k^{[j]}$ is defined by the first d_j row vectors of $\mathbf{L}_{k,L}^{[j],H}$. For $J = 1$, define $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_k^{[j]} = \mathbf{H}_k^{[j]}$ and $\mathbf{U}_k^{[j]} = \mathbf{I}$.

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} = \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ be the time-axis transmission signal vector of the i^{th} antenna where $\mathbf{Q}_i \in \mathcal{U}$ is the K -point inverse discrete Fourier transform (IDFT) matrix. Assume that the number of channel taps after IDFT is always shorter than the cyclic prefix (CP) length. Then, the PAR of the i^{th} transmission antenna is defined as

$$\text{PAR}_i = K \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 / \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)}\|^2 \quad (5)$$

for $i \in [1 : M]$. Let us define $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}$ where $\mathbf{Q} = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}_M)$. For a more tractable approach, we relax the PAR measure by referring to [6], such that

$$\text{PAR}_{\text{LNR}} = MK \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty^2 / \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|^2. \quad (6)$$

Minimizing (6) is a nonconvex problem since the same variables are involved both in the denominator and the numerator as well. For this reason, the l_∞ -norm minimization has been largely considered as an alternative way, which is convex approach [5]–[7]. To design $\mathbf{F}$, we can intuitively formulate $\min \|\mathbf{F}\mathbf{s}\|_\infty$, but its solution is always zero. This indicates the necessity of the carefully restricted feasible space. For $N = 1$ and $M > J$, the zero-forcing precoding criterion is defined in [6] as an equality constraint. For $J = 1$ and $N < M$, the authors of [7] defined a quadratic constraint by setting the precoder, denoted by $\mathbf{F}_k = \dot{\mathbf{A}}_k + \ddot{\mathbf{A}}_k \mathbf{B}_k$, satisfying the following properties:

$$\dot{\mathbf{A}}_k^H \ddot{\mathbf{A}}_k = \mathbf{0}, \dot{\mathbf{A}}_k^H \dot{\mathbf{A}}_k \in \mathcal{D}, \ddot{\mathbf{A}}_k^H \ddot{\mathbf{A}}_k \succeq \mathbf{0}, \quad (7)$$

where $\dot{\mathbf{A}}_k, \dot{\mathbf{B}}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times d_\Sigma}$, $\ddot{\mathbf{A}}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times M}$, $\text{tr}(\dot{\mathbf{A}}_k^H \dot{\mathbf{A}}_k) = \gamma d_\Sigma$.

Our proposed scheme includes [7] as a case of $J = 1$. Compared to [6], [7], it has the constraint of controlling the cost of individual users, and it also provides the required PAR level at the minimum cost. Also, the effect of a sufficiently large M is explored for a fixed cost.

III. MU-MIMO OFDM PRECODER DESIGN

In this section, we explain our proposed precoding scheme. We first state a proposition to clarify the characteristics of the proposed precoder.

Proposition 1: For the MU-MIMO OFDM system for a given $d_j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for all $j \in [1 : J]$, define

$$c_j \in [1 : M - (J - 1)N - d_j], \quad (8)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_k^{[j]} := c_j \text{ basis (column) vectors of } \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{R}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{H}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{U}_k^{[j]}) \quad (9)$$

for all $j \in [1 : J]$, and compute $c_\Sigma = c_1 + \dots + c_J$,

$$\dot{\mathbf{F}}_k = [\sqrt{\alpha_1} \mathbf{U}_k^{[1]} \mathbf{V}_k^{[1]}, \dots, \sqrt{\alpha_J} \mathbf{U}_k^{[J]} \mathbf{V}_k^{[J]}] \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times d_\Sigma}, \quad (10)$$

$$\ddot{\mathbf{F}}_k = [\mathbf{U}_k^{[1]} \mathbf{P}_k^{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{U}_k^{[J]} \mathbf{P}_k^{[J]}] \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times c_\Sigma} \quad (11)$$

for all $k \in [1 : K]$. Then, $\dot{\mathbf{A}}_k = \dot{\mathbf{F}}_k$ and $\ddot{\mathbf{A}}_k = \ddot{\mathbf{F}}_k$ satisfy (7).

Proof: The following equations readily hold: $\dot{\mathbf{F}}_k^H \dot{\mathbf{F}}_k = \text{blkdiag}(\alpha_1 \mathbf{I}_{d_1}, \dots, \alpha_J \mathbf{I}_{d_J}) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\ddot{\mathbf{F}}_k^H \ddot{\mathbf{F}}_k = \mathbf{I}_{c_\Sigma} \succ \mathbf{0}$, and they satisfy the last two conditions of (7). From Remark 1, the following equation also holds

$$\mathbf{R}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{H}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{U}_k^{[j]} = [\mathbf{I}_{d_j}, \mathbf{0}] \mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{L}_{k,R}^{[j],H} = \overline{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{V}_k^{[j],H}, \quad (12)$$

where $[\mathbf{I}_{d_j}, \mathbf{0}] \mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{[j]} = [\overline{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_k^{[j]}, \mathbf{0}]$, and then we can derive that

$$\mathbf{R}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{H}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{U}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{P}_k^{[j]} = \overline{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{V}_k^{[j],H} \mathbf{P}_k^{[j]} = \mathbf{0} \quad (13)$$

in consideration of (9). As a result, $\dot{\mathbf{F}}_k^H \ddot{\mathbf{F}}_k = \mathbf{0}$ holds. ■

Define $\mathbf{F}_k = \dot{\mathbf{F}}_k + \ddot{\mathbf{F}}_k \mathbf{T}_k$ for an arbitrary matrix $\mathbf{T}_k = [\mathbf{t}_{k,1}, \dots, \mathbf{t}_{k,d_\Sigma}] \in \mathbb{C}^{c_\Sigma \times d_\Sigma}$ for $k \in [1 : K]$, and we can readily find $\text{SNR}_{k,l}^{[j]} = \alpha_j \frac{\lambda_{k,l}^{[j]} P_s}{\sigma^2}$ for $l \in [1 : d_j]$, $j \in [1 : J]$ and $k \in [1 : K]$. Based on this property, we utilize $\mathbf{T}_k$ as a design parameter for all $k \in [1 : K]$. Let us denote $\dot{\mathbf{F}}, \ddot{\mathbf{F}}$ and $\mathbf{T}$ by the BD matrices of $\dot{\mathbf{F}}_k, \ddot{\mathbf{F}}_k$ and $\mathbf{T}_k$ for all $k \in [1 : K]$, respectively, and $\mathbf{F} = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{F}_1, \dots, \mathbf{F}_K) = \dot{\mathbf{F}} + \ddot{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{T}$.

Conceptually, c_j is related to the unused spatial dimensions between the transmitter and the j^{th} user, and size of c_Σ is reflected in the size of design parameter $\mathbf{T}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{c_\Sigma \times d_\Sigma}$. In (9), $\mathbf{P}_k^{[j]}$ can be alternatively defined by the column vectors of $\mathbf{L}_{k,R}^{[j]}$ corresponding to zero singular values in $\mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{[j]}$, but $c_\Sigma = 0$ if $M = JN$. For $\mathbf{F} = \dot{\mathbf{F}} + \ddot{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{T}$, (6) is rewritten as

$$\text{PAR}_{\text{LNR}} = \frac{MK \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty^2}{\|\dot{\mathbf{F}}\mathbf{s} + \ddot{\mathbf{F}}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{s}\|^2} \leq \frac{MK \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty^2}{\|\dot{\mathbf{F}}\mathbf{s}\|^2} := \text{PAR}_{\text{BD}}. \quad (14)$$

A. Scheme I: PAR minimization

The following theorem describes the first design criterion.

Theorem 1: In the MU-MIMO OFDM system for the given $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $d_j \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $d_\Sigma \geq \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j d_j$ for $j \in [1 : J]$, define

$$\mathbf{G}_k = \left[\mathbf{U}_k^{[1]} \mathbf{P}_k^{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{U}_k^{[J]} \mathbf{P}_k^{[J]} \right] [s_{k,1} \mathbf{I}_{c_\Sigma}, \dots, s_{k,d_\Sigma} \mathbf{I}_{c_\Sigma}] \quad (15)$$

for all $k \in [1 : K]$, and define

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathcal{BD}(\mathbf{G}_1, \dots, \mathbf{G}_K), \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^J \sqrt{\alpha_j} \mathbf{U}_1^{[j]} \mathbf{V}_1^{[j]} \mathbf{s}_1^{[j]} \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^J \sqrt{\alpha_j} \mathbf{U}_K^{[j]} \mathbf{V}_K^{[j]} \mathbf{s}_K^{[j]} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{C}^{MK \times c_\Sigma d_\Sigma K}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^{MK}$, and

$$\underset{\mathbf{t}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{t} + \mathbf{b})\|_\infty, \quad (18)$$

$$\text{subject to } \|\mathbf{t}\|^2 \leq r^2, \quad (19)$$

where $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{C}^{c_\Sigma d_\Sigma K}$ and $r^2 = (d_\Sigma - \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j d_j)K$. Then the optimal solution of $\mathbf{t}$ minimizes PAR_{BD} .

Proof: We derive (18), (19), and clarify the existence of the optimal solution by showing the convexity of them, and we refer to [10] for the convexity proof in complex domain. First, we derive $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{t} + \mathbf{b})$. Based on Proposition 1, $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_k \mathbf{T}_k \mathbf{s}_k$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\mathbf{U}_k^{[1]} \mathbf{P}_k^{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{U}_k^{[J]} \mathbf{P}_k^{[J]} \right] (\mathbf{t}_{k,1} s_{k,1} + \dots + \mathbf{t}_{k,d_\Sigma} s_{k,d_\Sigma}) \\ &= \left[\mathbf{U}_k^{[1]} \mathbf{P}_k^{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{U}_k^{[J]} \mathbf{P}_k^{[J]} \right] [s_{k,1} \mathbf{I}_{c_\Sigma}, \dots, s_{k,d_\Sigma} \mathbf{I}_{c_\Sigma}] \\ & \quad \times [\mathbf{t}_{k,1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{t}_{k,d_\Sigma}^T]^T = \mathbf{G}_k \mathbf{t}_k, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

and $\mathbf{x}_k = \sum_{j=1}^J \sqrt{\alpha_j} \mathbf{U}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{V}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{s}_k^{[j]} + \mathbf{G}_k \mathbf{t}_k$. Aggregate $\mathbf{t}_k$ for all $k \in [1 : K]$ to make a single vector variable $\mathbf{t}$ as

$$\mathbf{t} = [\mathbf{t}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{t}_K^T]^T, \mathbf{t}_k = [\mathbf{t}_{k,1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{t}_{k,d_\Sigma}^T]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{c_\Sigma d_\Sigma}. \quad (21)$$

Then we can find $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{t} + \mathbf{b}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{t} + \mathbf{b})$. Let us derive (19) from $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}\|^2]$. For better understanding, first consider the k^{th} subcarrier such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_k\|^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j \|\mathbf{U}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{V}_k^{[j]} \mathbf{s}_k^{[j]}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{G}_k \mathbf{t}_k\|^2 \right],$$

which is rewritten as $\mathcal{P}_s \geq \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j \frac{d_j \mathcal{P}_s}{d_\Sigma} + \mathbf{t}_k^H \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{G}_k^H \mathbf{G}_k] \mathbf{t}_k$ by Jensen's inequality, and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{G}_k^H \mathbf{G}_k] = \frac{\mathcal{P}_s}{d_\Sigma} \mathbf{I}$ is readily derived. For K subcarriers,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}\|^2] = K \mathcal{P}_s \geq \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j d_j \frac{\mathcal{P}_s K}{d_\Sigma} + \frac{\mathcal{P}_s}{d_\Sigma} \|\mathbf{t}\|^2, \quad (22)$$

which is defined as the following geodesic ball with radius r .

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}} := \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}}(r) = \{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{C}^{c_\Sigma d_\Sigma K} : \|\mathbf{t}\|^2 \leq r^2\}. \quad (23)$$

Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a convex subset for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A real-valued function $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function if $f(\theta \mathbf{a} + (1 - \theta) \mathbf{c}) \leq \theta f(\mathbf{a}) + (1 - \theta) f(\mathbf{c})$ where $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$. By Minkowski inequality, we can state $\|\theta \mathbf{a} + (1 - \theta) \mathbf{c}\|_p \leq |\theta| \|\mathbf{a}\|_p + |(1 - \theta)| \|\mathbf{c}\|_p$ for $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, where $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Thus, $\|\cdot\|_\infty : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function, and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is also a convex subset that is derived as a case of $p = 2$. Therefore, there always exists the feasible solution $\hat{\mathbf{t}}$ minimizing PAR_{BD} if $d_\Sigma > \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j d_j$, which completes the proof. ■

Based on Proposition 1 and Theorem 1, we explain the overall design procedure for all $j \in [1 : J]$ and $k \in [1 : K]$. **Step 1)** compute $\mathbf{U}_k^{[j]}$, $\mathbf{V}_k^{[j]}$, $\mathbf{R}_k^{[j]}$ by Remark 1, and define c_j , $\mathbf{P}_k^{[j]}$ by Proposition 1. **Step 2)** find the solution $\hat{\mathbf{t}}$ of Theorem 1 by using interior point methods (IPMs) referring to [10], [11]. **Step 3)** decompose $\hat{\mathbf{t}}$ to $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_k$ referring to (21). Compute $\hat{\mathbf{T}}_k$ by $f_{\text{mat}}(\hat{\mathbf{t}}_k)$ for all $k \in [1 : K]$, where $[\mathbf{t}_{k,1}, \dots, \mathbf{t}_{k,d_\Sigma}] = f_{\text{mat}}([\mathbf{t}_{k,1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{t}_{k,d_\Sigma}^T]^T)$, and make $\hat{\mathbf{T}} = \mathcal{BD}(\hat{\mathbf{T}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{T}}_N)$. Finally, compute $\hat{\mathbf{F}} = \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \hat{\mathbf{F}} \hat{\mathbf{T}}$.

B. Scheme II: Cost minimization with constraint on the PAR

In this subsection, we make the precoder that is able to minimize the cost to achieve the required PAR. The size of the volume (feasible space) of $\mathcal{B}_C$ is changed according to the radius r , and r is represented as a function of α_j, d_j and K as shown in (19) for all $j \in [1 : J]$. In this subsection, consider that the system parameters d_j and K are still given, while α_j is unknown parameter for all $j \in [1 : J]$. Let us define $r^2 = (d_\Sigma - \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j d_j)K = (1 - \gamma)d_\Sigma K$, where

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{d_\Sigma}(\alpha_1 d_1 + \dots + \alpha_J d_J), \quad (24)$$

where $\gamma \leq 1$. If γ is fixed, there are many possible α_j satisfying (24) for all $j \in [1 : J]$. Thus, α_j can be determined after design of γ . Let us substitute γ to (22), and we can find that the effective power consumption that contributes to the received SNR is $\gamma K \mathcal{P}_s$. As a consequence, we can minimize the cost by minimizing $1 - \gamma$ while satisfying the required PAR. The radius $r = \hat{r}$ considering the resultant maximum $\gamma = \hat{\gamma}$ would provide the minimum volume of $\mathcal{B}_C$ that contains the optimal solution $(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\gamma})$ to satisfy the required PAR denoted by ζ .

The PAR measures in (14) are unavailable since $\mathbf{t}, \gamma$ and α_j are unknowns. By the aid of the concentration of measure phenomenon [1], [2], we state the following proposition, and it gives us key insight to define a reasonable PAR measure.

Proposition 2: In Theorem 1, if $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{c_\Sigma d_\Sigma K}$ and $c_\Sigma \cdot K$ is an arbitrarily large number, then the optimal solution $\hat{\mathbf{t}}$ almost always satisfies $\|\hat{\mathbf{t}}\|^2 \simeq r^2$.

Proof: For a notational convenience, assume $m = c_\Sigma d_\Sigma K$. For $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, (23) is defined as a Euclidean ball denoted by $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$, and its volume is expressed as

$$\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}) \approx (m\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (2\pi e \cdot r^2/m)^{\frac{m}{2}}. \quad (25)$$

For r_1, r_2 where $r_1 < r_2 = r_1 + \Delta r_1$, the volume ratio is described as

$$\frac{\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}(r_2))}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}(r_1))} = (1 + \Delta r_1/r_1)^m. \quad (26)$$

It implies $\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}(r_2)) \gg \text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}(r_1))$ for a large m referring to [1], [2]. For this reason, most of the volume exists in an annulus of width $O(\frac{r}{m})$ near the boundary by referring to [12, Ch.2], where

$$\frac{r}{m} = \sqrt{\frac{(d_\Sigma - \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j d_j)}{c_\Sigma^2 d_\Sigma^2 K}}. \quad (27)$$

In (27), the maximum r is readily found as d_Σ when $\alpha_j = 0$ for all $j \in [1 : J]$. Thus, the maximum $\frac{r}{m}$ is represented as $\sqrt{\frac{1}{c_\Sigma^2 d_\Sigma K}}$, where $c_\Sigma \geq 1$ and $d_\Sigma \geq 1$. In wireless communication systems, it is reasonable to consider the number of subcarriers is at least greater than 64, i.e., $K \geq 64$, and then it is readily found that $\frac{r}{m} \ll 1$, i.e., almost all of the volume of the high dimensional $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$ is concentrated near the boundary, so that almost all of the feasible space is also concentration near the boundary, which implies that $\|\mathbf{t}\|^2 \simeq r^2$. ■

For example, if $r_2 = 1.01r_1$ and $c_\Sigma d_\Sigma K = 512$, then 99.39% of the volume exists in $r \in [r_1, r_2]$, while the expression of $\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_C)$ is too complex [13, eq. (11)]. Even if the exact volume comparison is not easy, we apply Proposition 2 for $\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_C)$ by following reasons. First, in case of $(\mathcal{B}_C)$, the equality of (26) is changed to the inequality by Riemannian volume comparison theorem in [14] that indicates the possibility of the volume concentration, and the theoretical study [15] provides the similar volume concentration result to Proposition 2 for the geodesic ball $(\mathcal{B}_C)$, statistically. Based on these, let us consider $\|\hat{\mathbf{t}}\|^2 \simeq d_\Sigma K (1 - \hat{\gamma})$ for $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{C}^{c_\Sigma d_\Sigma K}$. Then the inequality in (22) can be replaced by the similar equality denoted by " $\simeq$ ". As a result, by breaking the correlation between the value of the denominator and the variable $\mathbf{t}$, we can define the required PAR through the relaxation of PAR_{LNR} as

$$\frac{MK \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty^2}{\mathbb{E}[\|(\dot{\mathbf{F}} + \ddot{\mathbf{F}}\mathbf{T})\mathbf{s}\|^2]} \simeq \frac{M \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty^2}{\mathcal{P}_s} = \zeta, \quad (28)$$

and can also define an inequality constraint $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\frac{\zeta \mathcal{P}_s}{M}}$, which is reflected in the following corollary.

Corollary 1: In the MU-MIMO OFDM system with given d_j for $j \in [1 : J]$ and $\zeta > 1$, define

$$\underline{\mathbf{b}} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^J \mathbf{U}_1^{[j]} \mathbf{V}_1^{[j]} \mathbf{s}_1^{[j]} \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^J \mathbf{U}_K^{[j]} \mathbf{V}_K^{[j]} \mathbf{s}_K^{[j]} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

and

$$\underset{\mathbf{t}, \gamma}{\text{minimize}} \quad 1 - \gamma, \quad (30)$$

subject to

$$0 \leq \gamma \leq 1, \quad (31)$$

$$\|\mathbf{t}\|^2 \leq d_\Sigma K (1 - \gamma), \quad (32)$$

$$\|\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{t} + 0.5(1 + \gamma)\underline{\mathbf{b}})\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\zeta \mathcal{P}_s / M}. \quad (33)$$

If it is feasible, ζ is achieved more accurately, when K increases and the optimal solution $\hat{\gamma}$ is closer to 1.

Proof: First, substitute $(1 - \gamma)d_\Sigma K$ to (19) of Theorem 1, then we can find (32). Rewrite (18) as a constraint depending on $(\gamma, \mathbf{t})$ such that $\|\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{t} + \sqrt{\gamma} \cdot \underline{\mathbf{b}})\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\zeta \mathcal{P}_s / M}$, but this is not a convex constraint due to $\sqrt{\gamma}$, and hence, we relax $\sqrt{\gamma}$ by linear approximation as

$$\sqrt{\gamma} \simeq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma) \quad (34)$$

where $\gamma = 1 - \delta$, and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is an arbitrary small number. Then, (33) is found. We now show the convexity of (31), (32) and (33). First, the real line of (31) is readily convex subset.

By [10, Proposition 8.23], if $f : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then its perspective function is defined as $g(\mathbf{t}, r_0) = r_0 f\left(\frac{\mathbf{t}}{r_0}\right)$ where $g : \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and g is a convex function, if f is a convex function. Consider $f(\mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{t}^H \mathbf{t}$, $r_0 = 1 - \gamma$ and (31), then $g(\mathbf{t}, 1 - \gamma) = \mathbf{t}^H \mathbf{t} / (1 - \gamma)$. Thus, (32) is a convex constraint since $f(\mathbf{t})$ is convex. In (33), the inner term of $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is convex since the sum of two affine functions satisfies convex, and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ has been proved in Section III-A. Thus, if ζ is achievable, there exists the optimal solution $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mathbf{t}})$. In Proposition 2, most of the volume is contained in an annulus of width $O\left((c_\Sigma^2 d_\Sigma K)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)$, and the width becomes increasingly thinner as K increases, which makes more tight approximation of ζ . As $\hat{\gamma}$ is closer to 1, the improved accuracy of the approximation of $\sqrt{\gamma}$ makes a more accurate constraint (33). ■

Notice that if ζ is so close to 1, there would not exist $(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\gamma})$, since $\zeta = 1$ is the ideal PAR performance. We describe the overall design procedure. The first step is the same as Section III-A except for α_j decision. **Step 2)** find the solution $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mathbf{t}})$ of Corollary 1 by using IPMs, and determine $\hat{\mathbf{T}}_k = f_{\text{mat}}(\hat{\mathbf{t}}_k) \forall k \in [1 : K]$, $\hat{\mathbf{T}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$. **Step 3)** determine α_j subject to $\hat{\gamma} d_\Sigma = \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j d_j$.

C. Discussion

In this subsection, we briefly discuss some related issues. First, α_j of Section III-B could be more carefully designed by considering user scheduling issue. Second, the nonlinear convex problem of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 is generally solved by IPMs [10], [11]. One of them, we consider Primal-Dual IPM [10], [11] that has the approximated computational complexity as $\mathcal{O}(K^3)$ if $M \ll K$. Also, the optimization package such as [16] would be useful to find the solution. At last, let us consider the effect of a large enough M for a fixed cost.

Proposition 3: For $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{C}$ in (23), if $c_\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$ ($M \rightarrow \infty$) for a fixed r ($\alpha_j, d_j K$), then $\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow 0$.

Proof: For the given expression of $\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R})$ by the proof of Proposition 2, if $c_\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$ for a fixed r , then $\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow 0$. By Bishop-Gromov inequality, $\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{C}) \leq \text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R})$ holds if $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{C}$ have the same dimension and radius, and a defined Riemannian manifold for $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{C}$ has positive Ricci curvature which is guaranteed by following the manifold definition in [17]. Then, $\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow 0$ holds by $\text{vol}(\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow 0$. ■

It indicates that a large $c_\Sigma(M)$ does not always beneficial if r is fixed, since the size of feasible space is highly reduced, although the number of free variables is increased. Its actual effect is shown in the following section.




Fig. 2. (left) CCDF of PAR_i for $K = 128$, $M = 8$, $c_\Sigma \in \{4, 6, 10\}$. (right) CDF of PAR_i for $K \in \{64, 128, 256\}$, $M = 4$, $c_\Sigma = 2$, by Theorem 1.




Fig. 3. (left) CDF of $\hat{\gamma}$ and (right) $E[\hat{\gamma}]$ for $K = 128$, $M(c_\Sigma) = 4(2), 8(10), 16(26)$, by Corollary 1.

TABLE I
EMPIRICAL AVERAGE VALUE OF PAR_i

	$\zeta = 1.5$ (1.76 dB)	$\zeta = 1.8$ (2.55 dB)	$\zeta = 2.0$ (3.00 dB)
$E[\text{PAR}_i] \ M = 4$	1.77	1.90(2.79)	2.07
$E[\text{PAR}_i] \ M = 8$	1.54	1.81	2.01
$E[\text{PAR}_i] \ M = 16$	1.55	1.81	2.01




Fig. 4. (left) CDF of $\hat{\gamma}$ and (right) CCDF of PAR_i for $M = 4$ where $\zeta = 1.8$ (2.55 dB), by Corollary 1.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Let us define complementary CDF as $P[\text{PAR}_i \geq \text{PAR}_0]$ (CCDF) for $i \in [1 : M]$, and consider that $|\mathcal{A}| = 16$ (QAM), $N = J = d_\Sigma = 2$, $\alpha_\Sigma = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$, $d_1 = d_2 = 1$, and $\zeta \in \{1.5 (1.76 \text{ dB}), 1.8 (2.55 \text{ dB}), 2.0 (3.00 \text{ dB})\}$, $M \in \{4, 8, 16\}$, in order to evaluate the PAR performance according to α_Σ , c_Σ and K , and other parameters are specified in each figure.

Fig. 2 plots the CCDF and the CDF of PAR_i . In the CCDF, a lower PAR_i is shown in case that α_Σ is smaller under the same c_Σ . Also, a lower PAR_i is shown in case that c_Σ is larger under the same α_Σ . This result would not be deviated from our intuitions and would be predicted from [6], [7], while the CDF of Fig. 2 shows that the variance of PAR_i is reduced as K increases. From the proof of Proposition 2, it would be reasonable to infer that the volume concentration phenomenon is intensified as K increases, and the average power is hardened. With this observation, we focus on showing the effectiveness of the scheme II based on Corollary 1.

Fig. 3 shows the CDF of $\hat{\gamma}$ and $E[\hat{\gamma}]$ based on Corollary 1, according to ζ, M . It is observed that most of the empirical $E[\text{PAR}_i]$ is similar to ζ , except for $M = 4, \zeta = 1.5$. In this case, most of $\hat{\gamma}$ samples are away from 1, and $E[\text{PAR}_i] = 1.77$ is not relatively close to $\zeta = 1.5$, which is due to the inaccuracy of approximation of $\sqrt{\hat{\gamma}}$ when $\hat{\gamma}$ gets away from 1. Also, for $\zeta = 1.5$, the variance of $\hat{\gamma}$ for $M = 8$ is smaller than the variance of $\hat{\gamma}$ for $M = 16$, and $E[\hat{\gamma}]$ for $M = 8$ is also greater than $E[\hat{\gamma}]$ for $M = 16$. This result can be inferred from Proposition 3. Thus, increasing c_Σ needs to be considered with other parameters affecting r . As an example, the CDF is plotted for $M = 16, \zeta = 1.5$ with $K = 256$.

Fig. 4 respectively shows the CDF of $\hat{\gamma}$, the CCDF of PAR_i and the CDF of PAR_i for $M = 4, \zeta = 1.8$, assuming that the performance difference between $\zeta = 2.55 \text{ dB}$ and $E[\text{PAR}_i] = 2.79 \text{ dB}$ is negligible. As K increases, most of the generated PAR_i samples are concentrated on $E[\text{PAR}_i] = 2.79 \text{ dB}$, since the variance of PAR_i decreases. Thus, PAR_i at the CCDF $= 10^{-3}$ goes closer to $E[\text{PAR}_i]$. In consideration of $E[\text{PAR}_i] \approx \zeta$, this result coincides with Corollary 1. Thus, we can infer the similar performance trend in case with another ζ, M and other simulation parameters from this numerical result.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The MIMO precoding scheme has been proposed for MU-MIMO OFDM system. We have shown that, on average, the proposed scheme achieves the required PAR nearly accurate and that it can be effectively used for the required performance specified as 0.1 percent PAR if K is large. Also, for the effective application in large-scale MIMO systems, the parameters α_j, d_j and K for all $j \in [1 : J]$ need to be carefully determined considering the size of the feasible space.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Ledoux, *The concentration of measure phenomenon*. Providence, R.I. : American Mathematical Society, 2001.
- [2] D. L. Donoho, "High-dimensional data analysis: The curses and blessings of dimensionality," in *Proc. AMS Conference on Math Challenges of the 21st Century*, 2000.
- [3] E. Larsson, O. Edfors, F. Tufvesson, and T. Marzetta, "Massive MIMO for next generation wireless systems," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 186–195, Feb. 2014.
- [4] H.-J. Su, C.-P. Lee, W.-S. Liao, R.-J. Chen, C.-L. Ho, C.-L. Tsai, and Z. Yan-Xiu, "Peak-to-average power ratio issue of beamforming/precoding schemes," in *IEEE C802.16m-08/1302*, Oct. 2008.
- [5] A. Aggarwal and T. H. Meng, "Minimizing the peak-to-average power ratio of OFDM signals using convex optimization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 3099–3110, Aug. 2006.
- [6] C. Studer and E. G. Larsson, "PAR-aware large-scale multi-user MIMO-OFDM downlink," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 303–313, Feb. 2013.
- [7] H.-S. Cha, H. Chae, K. Kim, J. Jang, J. Yang, and D. K. Kim, "Generalized inverse aided PAPR-aware linear precoder design for MIMO-OFDM system," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 1363–1366, Aug. 2014.
- [8] R. Chen, Z. Shen, J. Andrews, and R. Heath, "Multimode transmission for multiuser MIMO systems with block diagonalization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 3294–3302, Jul 2008.
- [9] C.-B. Chae, S. Shim, and R. Heath, "Block diagonalized vector perturbation for multiuser MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 4051–4057, Nov. 2008.
- [10] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*. Springer, 2011.
- [11] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [12] J. Hopcroft and R. Kannan, "Foundations of data science," Available online only: <http://research.microsoft.com/en-us/people/kannan/book-dec-30-2013.pdf>, Dec. 2013.
- [13] A. Barg and D. Nogin, "Bounds on packings of spheres in the Grassmann manifold," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 2450–2454, Sep. 2002.

- [14] I. Chavel, *Riemannian Geometry: A Modern Introduction, 2nd Edition*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [15] I. L. Dryden, “Statistical analysis on high-dimensional spheres and shape spaces,” *Ann. Statist.*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 1643–1665, Aug. 2005.
- [16] M. Grant and S. Boyd, “CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.1,” <http://cvxr.com/cvx>, Mar. 2014.
- [17] O. Henkel, “Sphere-packing bounds in the Grassmann and Stiefel manifolds,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 3445–3456, Oct. 2005.