

Pilot-Based Unsourced Random Access with a Massive MIMO Receiver: Interference Cancellation and Power Control

Alexander Fengler, Osman Musa, Peter Jung, Giuseppe Caire

Abstract—In this work we treat the unsourced random access problem on a Rayleigh block-fading AWGN channel with multiple receive antennas. Specifically, we consider the slowly fading scenario where the coherence block-length is large compared to the number of active users and the message can be transmitted in one coherence block. Unsourced random access refers to a form of grant-free random access where users are considered to be a-priori indistinguishable and the receiver recovers a list of transmitted messages up to permutation. In this work we show that, when the coherence block length is large enough, a conventional approach based on the transmission of non-orthogonal pilot sequences with subsequent channel estimation and Maximum-Ratio-Combining (MRC) provides a simple energy-efficient solution whose performance can be well approximated in closed form. Furthermore, we analyse the MRC step when successive interference cancellation (SIC) is done in groups, which allows to strike a balance between receiver complexity and reduced transmit powers. Finally, we investigate the impact of power control policies taking into account the unique nature of massive random access, including short message lengths, uncoordinated transmission, a very large amount of concurrent transmitters with unknown identities, channel estimation errors and decoding errors. As a byproduct we also present an extension of the MMV-AMP algorithm which allows to treat pathloss coefficients as deterministic unknowns by performing maximum likelihood estimation in each step of the MMV-AMP algorithm.

Index Terms—Internet of Things (IoT), Unsourced Random Access, Massive Multi-User MIMO, Approximate Message Passing (AMP).

I. INTRODUCTION

Conventional random access protocols in current mobile communication standards establish an uplink connection between user and base station (BS) by first running a multi-stage handshake protocol [2, 3]. During this initial access phase active users are identified and subsequently a scheduler assigns orthogonal transmission resources to the active users. One of the paradigms of modern machine-type communications [4] consists of a very large number of devices (here referred to as “users”) with sporadic data. Typical examples thereof are Internet-of-Things (IoT) applications, wireless sensors deployed to monitor smart infrastructure, and wearable biomedical devices [5]. In such scenarios, a BS should be able to

collect data from a large number of devices. However, due to the sporadic nature of the data generation and communication, the initial access procedure is overly wasteful.

An alternative way of communication is known as grant-free random access, where users transmit their data without awaiting the grant of transmission resources by the BS. A commonly discussed grant-free strategy in a massive multi-user MIMO setting is to assign fixed orthogonal or non-orthogonal pilot sequences to users [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. Active users then transmit their pilot sequence directly followed by their data sequence. The BS identifies the active users in the first step and estimates their channel vectors. Subsequently the channel estimates are used to detect the data sequences using either maximum-ratio-combining (MRC) or zero-forcing [7].

However, as the number of users in a system grows large and the access frequencies become small, it gets increasingly inefficient to assign fixed pilot sequences to all the users. In contrast, *unsourced random access* (U-RA) is a novel grant-free paradigm proposed in [13] and motivated by an IoT scenario where millions of cheap devices have their codebook hardwired at the moment of production, and are then disseminated into the environment. In this case, all users make use of the very same codebook and the BS decodes the list of transmitted messages irrespectively of the identity of the active users. The U-RA approach can simplify the random access protocol design because it does not require an initial access phase and, in contrast to existing grant-free approaches, it allows for a system that is completely independent of the inactive users, which makes it well suited to the IoT scenario with a huge number of devices with very sporadic activity.

Practical coding schemes for U-RA have been mainly studied on the real AWGN channel, e.g. [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21], and on the Rayleigh quasi-static fading AWGN channel [22, 23]. The U-RA problem on a Rayleigh block-fading AWGN channel in a massive MU-MIMO setting was formulated in [24] and it was shown that a covariance-based activity detection (AD) algorithm combined with a tree code [17] can achieve sum-spectral-efficiencies that grow proportional to the coherence block-length n , even if the number of active users is significantly larger than n , specifically up to $K_a = \mathcal{O}(n^2)$.

In typical wireless systems the coherence block-length n may range from a couple of hundred to a couple of thousand, depending mainly on the speed of the transmitters. At a carrier frequency of 2 GHz the coherence times, according to the model $T_c \approx 1/(4D_s)$ where D_s is the maximal Doppler

Parts of this paper have been accepted for presentation at the IEEE International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC) 2021 [1].

The authors are with the Communications and Information Theory Group, Technische Universität Berlin (`{fengler, osman.musa, peter.jung, caire}@tu-berlin.de`).

spread [25], may range from 45 ms at 3 km/h to 1 ms at 120 km/h. The coherence bandwidth depends on the maximal delay spread and, in an outdoor environment, typically ranges from 100 to 500 kHz depending on the propagation conditions. Therefore, the number of complex symbols in an OFDM coherence block may range from $n = 100$ to $n = 20000$, depending mainly on the assumed speed and the geometry of the environment. Unfortunately, the covariance-based AD algorithm in [24] has a run-time complexity that scales with n^2 , which makes it unfeasible to use at $n \gtrsim 300$. So while the covariance based approach of [24] is well suited to a fast-fading scenario with $n \lesssim 300$, it becomes unfeasible for large coherence block-lengths in the order of thousands. On the other hand, algorithms based on hybrid-GAMP [26] and tensor-based modulation [27] have shown an excellent performance at large coherence block-length at which the covariance-based approach is no longer feasible.

In this work we present a conceptually simple algorithm that can be used when $n > K_a$. It is based on pilot transmission, AD, channel estimation, MRC and single-user decoding, very similar to the state-of-the art approach for massive MIMO grant-free random access [8, 9, 12]. In contrast to the scheme with fixed pilots allocated to all users, we use a pool of non-orthogonal pilots from which active users pick one pseudo-randomly based on the first bits of their message. We show that a collision of users, i.e. two users picking the same pilot sequence, can be resolved by using a polar single-user code with a successive-cancellation-list (SCL) decoder. Finite-length simulations shows that the performance of the coding scheme can be well predicted by analytical calculations. Despite its simplicity the suggested scheme has an energy efficiency that is comparable to existing approaches. Note, that the problem treated here is formally almost equivalent to grant-free random access with fixed pilots allocated to each user. Differences arise only in the possibility of collisions and the associated use of an list decodable single-user code. The error probability of AD and MRC in the asymptotic limit $K_a, K_{\text{tot}}, n \rightarrow \infty$ with fixed ratios K_a/K_{tot} and K_{tot}/n has been analysed in [9]. In this work we focus on the finite-blocklength regime and the combination of MRC with a single-user polar code. Besides, we investigate simplified successive interference cancellation (SIC) receivers which allow to relax the power control requirements and/or decrease the average transmit power while still maintaining a manageable decoding complexity. The capacity of grouped SIC was studied in [28] and it was found that when all users are received with the same power it is possible to get arbitrary close to the Shannon capacity with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ cancellation steps by adapting the rates of the users. In this work we develop a framework that allows to calculate the number of groups required to achieve a given per-user error probability taking into account channel estimation errors and decoding errors.

Previous works on URA assumed either a perfect constant receive-power control policy, i.e. that all received signal strengths (RSS) are equal [22, 23, 27, 24] or no power control, i.e. the RSSs follow some distribution that has a random shadowing component and a distance dependent pathloss component [26]. In current cellular networks power control is

handled either in an open loop fashion, where users aim to equalize their received power based on e.g. downlink (DL) pathloss estimates, or in a closed control loop, where the BS sends power adjustment commands to each user until each user has a satisfactory SINR. Clearly, closed loop power control is infeasible in an mMTC system because individually managing the powers of several hundred users would lead to an unacceptable delay compared to the short message length. On the other hand, open loop power control is often imperfect and the pathloss estimation error at the devices has to be considered in the modelling. A no-power-control policy does have some advantages in an mMTC scenario. First, there is no delay associated with a power control phase, second, the transmit antenna does not need to have a large dynamic range, which can lead to cheaper devices, and third, the imbalance in received powers can be used as an additional source of diversity to separate users, a concept known as power-domain non-orthogonal multiple-access (NOMA) [29, 30]. However, the downside is that the overall power consumption may increase, because strong users will spend more power than necessary and, in addition, cause more interference for other users. In this work we introduce a partial power control scheme that can minimize the average transmit power, even below the value which would be needed with an equal receive-power policy, while still allowing for simplified transmitter design. The partial power control scheme relaxes perfect power control by introducing a discrete set of received power levels. Active users then dynamically choose their transmit power to target one of those power levels based on their large-scale fading coefficient (LSFC), assuming that they know their LSFC from DL measurements. In general it is hard to optimally choose the received power levels since the amount of users at a certain level is random and users choose their power level independent of each other. Nonetheless, in an mMTC scenario where the number of active users is large, e.g. several hundred, the fraction of users per level will sharply concentrate around their average values, provided that the number of levels is not too large. This concentration, which is unique to a massive random access setting allows for the design of optimized power control policies.

A. Contribution and related works

- We introduce a unsourced random access coding scheme for the quasi-static Rayleigh fading channel.
- We evaluate a simplified grouped SIC strategy at the receiver which allows to active users to transmit without power control while still maintaining a low enough receiver complexity.
- We introduced ML estimation of LSFCs within MMV-AMP which allows to estimate the received power levels in a non-Bayesian way. The method is significantly faster than Bayesian posterior-mean-estimation while achieving a comparable activity detection error.
- We give an analysis of the effective SINRs at the receiver taking into account SIC, imperfect channel estimation, short blocklengths and the random nature of uncoordinated random access.
- We introduce a partial power control policy where users

are received at one of G possible power levels and use the analysis to optimise the power levels.

Power control in MU-MIMO has been studied e.g. in [7, 12, 31], also in the context of NOMA [29, 30]. The problem at hand has some unique properties. For once, the rates of all users are fixed in the URA model, therefore no rate adaption is possible. The massive amount of users precludes any use of feedback based power control policies, even in its simplest form, e.g. 1-bit UP/DOWN power commands. In [32] Yates gave an iterative method for optimizing the received powers for a large class of standard interference functions. In a MU-MIMO system the channel estimation error depends inversely on the transmit power in the pilot phase. Therefore an increase in power of one user may decrease the interference for some of the users, which breaks the monotonicity assumption of Yates' standard interference function.¹ Power control in conjunction with imperfect SIC has been studied in [33, 34] for CDMA. In [34] an algorithm was given that allows to find the minimal received power levels such that all the SINRs are equal after SIC. The drawbacks of the algorithm of [34] is that the power of each user is controlled individually which is hardly achievable with uncoordinated transmission. Furthermore, only the received power is minimized and not the transmit power.

MMV-AMP has been proposed in [35] and its performance as an AD algorithm for MU-MIMO has been analysed in [8, 9, 11, 10]. In [10] unknown LSFCs were handled in a Bayesian optimal way by including the distribution of the LSFCs in the posterior mean estimator (PME). This approach has two downsides: for once, it is computationally expensive when the PME cannot be calculated in closed form, and second, common models for the distribution of LSFCs are mostly empirical and often unreliable. An alternative is to use a soft-thresholding function as denoiser [11]. The downside of the soft-thresholding function is that it depends on a parameter which has to be optimized empirically. A similar approach has been used with the related hybrid-GAMP algorithm in [36], where a Laplace prior distribution is assumed for the LSFCs. In the SMV case it is known that a Laplace prior leads to a soft-thresholding denoising function and that AMP with a soft-thresholding denoiser is asymptotically equivalent to the popular LASSO estimator which is known to be min-max optimal [37]. In this work we present a new approach that performs a ML estimation of the LSFCs in each MMV-AMP iteration. This approach treats the LSFCs as deterministic unknowns and does not require any prior information on the distribution of the LSFCs. We show that the proposed approach performs well in practice without the need for optimizing parameters.

II. CHANNEL MODEL

We consider a quasi-static Rayleigh fading channel with a block of n signal dimensions over which the user channel vectors are constant. In contrast to the block-fading channel

¹We assume here that the transmit power of a user in the pilot and data phase is the same. In principle the pilot powers should be optimized as well which is out of the scope of this paper.

treated in [24], where a message is encoded over multiple independent fading blocks, here we assume that a message can be transmitted in a single coherence block. Following the problem formulation in [13], each user is given the same codebook $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{c}_m : m \in [2^{nR}]\}$, formed by 2^{nR} codewords $\mathbf{c}_m \in \mathbb{C}^n$. The codewords are normalized such that $\|\mathbf{c}_m\|_2^2 \leq n$. An unknown number K_a out of K_{tot} total users transmit their message over the coherence block. Let \mathcal{K}_a denote the set of active users, i_k denote the index of the message chosen by user k , $h_{k,m} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ iid be the Rayleigh channel coefficient between user k and receive antenna m and let $g_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ denote the large-scale fading coefficient (LSFC) of user k , which captures the path-loss and shadowing components of the fading. Let P_k denote the power-per-symbol of user k . The received signal strength (RSS) is then given by $P_k g_k$. Furthermore, let $\gamma_k = g_k$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}_a$ and zero otherwise. The received signal at the m -th receive antenna takes the form

$$\mathbf{y}_m = \sum_{k=1}^{K_{\text{tot}}} \sqrt{P_k \gamma_k} h_{k,m} \mathbf{c}_{i_k} + \mathbf{z}_m = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_a} \sqrt{P_k g_k} h_{k,m} \mathbf{c}_{i_k} + \mathbf{z}_m \quad (1)$$

where $z_{m,i} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, N_0)$ iid. The BS must then produce a list \mathcal{L} of the transmitted messages $\{m_k : k \in \mathcal{K}_a\}$ (i.e., the messages of the active users). Let $n_{\text{md}} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_a} \mathbb{1}_{\{m_k \notin \mathcal{L}\}}$ denote the number of transmitted messages missing in the output list. The system performance is expressed in terms of the *Per-User Probability of Misdetction*, defined as

$$p_{\text{md}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[n_{\text{md}}]}{K_a} \quad (2)$$

where the expectation is taken over the random choices of codewords, the fading and the noise. In applications a slight overhead in the list size may be tolerable if it reduces the misdetections. Since the number of active users is not necessarily known, it is practical to let the decoder decide on a list size, which therefore becomes a random variable. Let $n_{\text{fa}} = |\mathcal{L} \setminus \{m_k : k \in \mathcal{K}_a\}|$ denote the number of messages in the output list that were not transmitted by any user, also called *False Alarms*. n_{fa} is related to the list size by

$$|\mathcal{L}| = n_{\text{fa}} + K_a - n_{\text{md}} \quad (3)$$

To get an empirical performance measure we define the *Probability of False-Alarm* as the average fraction of false alarms, i.e.,

$$p_{\text{fa}} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{n_{\text{fa}}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \right]. \quad (4)$$

Operationally, p_{fa} is the probability that a randomly chosen message from the output list is a false alarm. In the special case where K_a is known at the receiver and $|\mathcal{L}| = K_a$ is fixed it follows from (3) that $p_{\text{fa}} = p_{\text{md}} \cdot p_{\text{fa}}$ and p_{md} are also referred to as per-user probabilities of error (PUPEs).

Notice that in this problem formulation the number of total users K_{tot} is completely irrelevant, as long as it is much larger than the range of possible active user set sizes K_a (e.g., we may consider $K_{\text{tot}} = \infty$). Furthermore, as customary in coded systems, we express energy efficiency in terms of the standard quantity $E_b/N_0 := \frac{P}{RN_0}$.

In line with the classical massive MIMO setting [7], we assume an independent Rayleigh fading model for the channel coefficients $h_{k,m}$, such that the channel vectors for different users are independent from each other and are spatially white (i.e., uncorrelated along the antennas), that is, $\mathbf{h}_k = (h_{k,1}, \dots, h_{k,m})^\top \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \mathbf{I}_M)$.

A. Power Control

In a multiple access system without SIC it is usually desired that active users are received at the same power level at the receiver. This can be achieved, possibly up to some error, through a DL beacon signal which all devices listen to to estimate their LSFC. Then they can adjust their transmit power accordingly. It is well known though, e.g. in CDMA systems, that a non-uniform received power distribution is beneficial when SIC is used at the receiver side [38]. Therefore, in this work we investigate the advantages of non-uniform received power distributions in a massive random access system. Specifically in an mMTC scenario a relaxation of perfect power control can lead to several desirable effects. 1) A reduced or simplified power control phase can reduce the access latency of the active devices 2) If SIC is used at the receiver, a heterogeneous received power distribution may lead to a reduced required average transmit power 3) When the transmitter does not have to fully invert its LSFC its dynamic range can be reduced, which allows for cheaper amplifiers at the transmitter side.

Throughout this work we assume the LSFCs of active users are distributed according to the shadowing-pathloss model

$$g_k[\text{dB}] = -\alpha - \beta \log_{10}(d_k) + \sigma_{\text{shadow}}^2 z, \quad (5)$$

where d_k is the distance from user k to the BS in km and $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The active user are then allowed to adapt their transmit power based on their LSFC, which we assume they know from downlink measurements. This leads to different distributions of received powers depending on the power control policy. We investigate the following policies in this work

- No power control (NPC): All users have the same transmit power. The distribution of received powers is given by a scaled version of (5). In addition, we limit the maximal received power to g_{\max} , which can be achieved in practice by limiting the minimal distance to the BS.
- Statistical channel inversion (SCI): User perfectly invert their LSFC. All users are received at the same power level $P_k g_k = \text{const.}$
- Imperfect SCI: As above, but some error is allowed, i.e. because of measurement errors.
- Partial SCI: Users invert their channel not fully but only to reach one of G possible levels. Users choose this level based on their own LSFC independent of the other users $P_k g_k \in \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_G\}$. The average fraction of users on level i is denoted by ξ_i .

III. PILOT-BASED MASSIVE MIMO U-RA

Let the coherence block be divided into two periods of lengths n_p and n_d . In the first period each user chooses one of $N = 2^J$ (non-orthogonal) pilot sequences based on the first J bits of its

message. Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_p \times N}$ denote the matrix of pilot sequences with columns normalized as $\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^2 = n_p$ and for $i = 1, \dots, N$ let \mathcal{A}_i denote the set of users that have chosen the pilot with index i . The received signal in the identification phase can be written in matrix form as

$$\mathbf{Y}_p = \mathbf{A} \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \tilde{\mathbf{H}} + \mathbf{Z}_p \in \mathbb{C}^{n_p \times M}, \quad (6)$$

$\tilde{\mathbf{H}} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times M}$ is a matrix with iid $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ entries and $\tilde{\mathbf{I}}$ is the diagonal matrix with $\tilde{\gamma}_i = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}_i} P_k g_k$ on the diagonal. Note, that we have used the Gaussianity of the channel vectors here, which implies that $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}_i} \sqrt{P_k g_k} \mathbf{h}_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \tilde{\gamma}_i \mathbf{I}_M)$. We also introduce the indicator variables \tilde{b}_i which indicate whether the pilot with index i has been chosen by at least one user:

$$\tilde{\gamma}_i =: \tilde{b}_i \tilde{g}_i \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{b}_i = 1$ if $\mathcal{A}_i \neq \emptyset$ and 0 otherwise. Note, that channel vectors are only defined for those indices which have been chosen by the active users. Formally, we define the remaining channel vectors as zero. The BS uses an AD algorithm as in [24] to estimate \mathcal{I} , the indices of the used pilots, and the corresponding LSFCs. Let $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$ denote the matrix with the estimates $\hat{\gamma}_k$ of $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ on the diagonal and let $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ be the estimate of the set of active pilots. For an index set \mathcal{I} and for any matrix \mathbf{B} let $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{I}}$ denote the matrix that contains only the columns of \mathbf{B} with indices in \mathcal{I} . Then a linear MMSE estimate of the channel matrix is computed as

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}}^H \left(\mathbf{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}} \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}} \mathbf{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}}^H + N_0 \mathbf{I}_{n_p} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_p \in \mathbb{C}^{\hat{K}_a \times M} \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}}$ denotes a sub-matrix of the pilot matrix \mathbf{A} which contains only the columns which have been estimated as active and $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}}$ contains the estimates of $\tilde{\gamma}_i$ on the diagonal. In the second period each users encodes its remaining $B - J$ -bit message with a binary $(B - J, 2n_d)$ block code and modulates the $2n_d$ coded bits via QPSK on a sequence of n_d complex symbols \mathbf{s}_k . These are transmitted over the n_d channel uses in the second phase. The matrix of received signals in the second phase is

$$\mathbf{Y}_d = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_a} \sqrt{P_k g_k} \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{h}_k + \mathbf{Z}_d \in \mathbb{C}^{n_d \times M}. \quad (9)$$

The BS uses the channel estimate $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ from the first phase to perform user separation, or more precisely message separation, via MRC, i.e. it computes

$$\hat{\mathbf{S}} = \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\hat{\mathcal{I}}}^{-1/2} \hat{\mathbf{H}} \mathbf{Y}_d^H \in \mathbb{C}^{\hat{K}_a \times n_d} \quad (10)$$

The rows of $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ correspond to estimates of the transmitted sequences \mathbf{s}_k . Note, that it is also possible to use zero-forcing [7] instead of MRC but this would require that $M > K_a$. The rows of $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ are individually demodulated, the bit-wise log-likelihood ratios are computed and fed into a soft-input single-user decoder. If the decoder finds a valid codeword, the index of the corresponding pilot is converted back to a J bit sequence and prepended to the codeword. Then the combination of the two is added to the output list. The use of a polar code with CRC-bits and a successive-cancellation-list decoder has the additional benefit that we can include all

the valid codewords in the output list of the SCL decoder in the U-RA output list. This allows to recover the messages of colliding users which have chosen the same pilot in the first phase. The ability of polar codes to resolve sums of codewords has been observed and used for U-RA on the AWGN in combination with spreading sequences [20] and a slotted Aloha approach [39, 23]. After a valid codeword has been recovered it can be re-encoded and subtracted from \mathbf{Y}_d , followed by a new MRC and single-user decoding attempt. This is known as successive interference cancellation (SIC). Besides full SIC (each correctly recovered codewords gets cancelled individually) and no SIC, we consider a grouped SIC approach where groups of users are decoded in parallel before all correctly decoded codewords from this group are cancelled. Note, that the CRC-bits of the polar code allow to detect with high probability whether decoding was successful.

A. Activity Detection with MMV-AMP

For AD in the pilot phase we use the MMV-AMP algorithm, which was introduced in [35], and used for AD in a Bayesian setting where the LSFCs are either known, or their distribution is known [8, 10]. The algorithm aims to recover the unknown matrix $\mathbf{X} = \tilde{\mathbf{\Gamma}}\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ from the linear Gaussian measurements \mathbf{Y}_p defined in (6). Let $\mathbf{X}_{k,:}$ denote the k -th row of \mathbf{X} . The MMV-AMP iterations are defined as follows:

$$\tau_{t+1,i}^2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{Z}_{:,i}^t\|_2^2}{N} \quad i = 1, \dots, M \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{X}^{t+1} = \eta(\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{Z}^t + \mathbf{X}^t, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{t+1}) \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{Z}^{t+1} = \mathbf{Y}_p - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}^{t+1} + \frac{N}{n_p} \mathbf{Z}^t \langle \eta'(\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{Z}^t + \mathbf{X}^t, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{t+1}) \rangle \quad (13)$$

with $\mathbf{X}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{Z}^0 = \mathbf{Y}_p$. The function $\eta : \mathbb{C}^{N \times M} \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{N \times M}$ is defined row-wise as

$$\eta(\mathbf{R}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1(\mathbf{R}_{1,:}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_N(\mathbf{R}_{N,:}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where each row function $\eta_k : \mathbb{C}^M \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^M$ is chosen as an estimate of the random vector $\mathbf{x}_k = \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}_k} \mathbf{h}_k$ in the *decoupled* Gaussian observation model

$$\mathbf{r}_k = \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{z}_k, \quad (15)$$

where \mathbf{z}_k is a complex Gaussian noise vector with components $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\tau}))$. The choice of η will be discussed later. The term $\langle \eta'(\cdot, \cdot) \rangle$ in (13) is defined as

$$\langle \eta'(\mathbf{R}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \eta'_k(\mathbf{R}_{k,:}, \boldsymbol{\tau}), \quad (16)$$

where $\eta'_k(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times M}$ is the Jacobi matrix of the function $\eta_k(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ evaluated at the k -th row $\mathbf{R}_{k,:}$ of the matrix argument \mathbf{R} . Calculating the full matrix $\eta'_k(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ at each iteration would give a complexity per-row per-iteration of $\mathcal{O}(M^2)$. Note, that for many commonly used η the diagonal terms are much larger than the off-diagonal terms. Therefore, we approximate the derivative by calculating only the diagonal elements of $\eta'_k(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ and setting the rest to zero, as described in [24].

B. The choice of η

Two approaches for the choice of η in the AD setting have been suggested in the literature [8, 10]. In the Bayesian optimal version of MMV-AMP η_k are chosen as the posterior mean estimates (PME) of \mathbf{x}_k over the joint distribution of \mathbf{x}_k and \mathbf{z}_k defined by the decoupled channel (15) and the prior distribution of \mathbf{x}_k .

$$\eta_k(\mathbf{r}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_k | \mathbf{r}_k] \quad (17)$$

The other approach is to assume that \tilde{g}_k are known from prior measurements and calculate the conditional PME over the joint distribution of $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$ and \mathbf{z}_k .

$$\eta_k(\mathbf{r}, \tilde{g}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{r}, \tilde{g}_k]. \quad (18)$$

It is important to recall the difference between the AD setting and the URA setting here. In the AD setting each column of \mathbf{A} is permanently associated with a user, which in principle allows to measure the LSFCs of those users beforehand. In contrast, in URA the columns of \mathbf{A} are associated with messages which are randomly chosen by active users. Therefore, it is conceptually impossible to obtain the coefficients \tilde{g}_i in (7) beforehand, even if the LSFCs of all users are known. In addition, the distribution of \tilde{g}_i is very complicated due to the possibility of multiple users picking the same pilot, which makes the Bayesian optimal MMV-AMP infeasible here. A valid approach to approximate the distribution of \tilde{g}_i when $K_a \ll N$ is to neglect the possibility of collisions, which leads to

$$p(\tilde{\gamma}_i) \approx p(|\mathcal{A}_i| = 0) \delta(\tilde{\gamma}_i) + p(|\mathcal{A}_i| = 1) p_g(\tilde{\gamma}_i = P_{\mathcal{A}_i} g_{\mathcal{A}_i}) \quad (19)$$

$$= (1 - N^{-1})^{K_a} \delta(\tilde{\gamma}_i) \quad (20)$$

$$+ \left[1 - (1 - N^{-1})^{K_a} \right] p_g(\tilde{\gamma}_i = P_{\mathcal{A}_i} g_{\mathcal{A}_i}) \quad (21)$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{K_a}{N} \right) \delta(\tilde{\gamma}_i) \quad (22)$$

$$+ \frac{K_a}{N} p_g(\tilde{\gamma}_i = P_{\mathcal{A}_i} g_{\mathcal{A}_i}) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{K_a^2}{N^2}\right) \quad (23)$$

where $p_g(\cdot)$ denotes the distribution of the LSFCs and $\delta(x) = 1$ if $x = 0$ and 0 otherwise. In [15] it was shown that in the unfaded single-antenna case AMP with the mismatched PME using this approximated prior converges rapidly to the Bayesian optimal AMP. With the approximation (19) the PME in the URA setting reduces to the PME in the AD setting. Nonetheless, even with such an approximation using the PME in MMV-AMP comes with some severe drawbacks: the distribution of LSFCs is often complicated and varies over several orders of magnitude. In addition, for most commonly used distributions the PME can not be computed in closed form, so it has to be computed by numerical integration which significantly increases the computational complexity. In the following we suggest an alternative approach that treats factors $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ as deterministic unknowns and does not require any statistical knowledge of the LSFCs.

C. Maximum Likelihood Estimation of the LSFCs

We suggest to compute an ML estimate of $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ is in each iteration MMV-AMP iteration from the row vectors

$$\mathbf{r}_t^k = (\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{Z}^t + \mathbf{X}^t)_{k,:} \quad (24)$$

under the assumption that the decoupled channel model holds true, i.e. that $\mathbf{r}_t^k \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{x}_k, \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_t))$ and \mathbf{x}_k follows a conditional Gaussian distribution $\mathbf{x}_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \tilde{\gamma}_k \mathbf{I}_M)$, therefore $\mathbf{r}_t^k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \tilde{\gamma}_k \mathbf{I}_M + \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_t))$. Then the ML estimate of $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ at iteration t is given by

$$\hat{\gamma}_k^{\text{ML}} = \max \left(0, \frac{\|\mathbf{r}_t^k\|_2^2}{M} - \frac{\sum_{m=1}^M \tau_m}{M} \right) \quad (25)$$

We set

$$\hat{g}_k = \max(\hat{\gamma}_k^{\text{ML}}, g_{\min}) \quad (26)$$

to avoid too small estimates of g_k for inactive columns which would lead to undesired overfitting effects. The denoiser is then chosen as the conditional mean estimator (18) but with the true value of \tilde{g}_k replaced by its regularized ML estimate:

$$\eta_k^{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \eta_k(\mathbf{r}, \hat{g}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \quad (27)$$

The conditional PME (18) has been given in [8], we recall the equations here for completeness:

$$\eta_k(\mathbf{r}, g_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \phi_k(\mathbf{r}, g_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}) g_k (g_k \mathbf{I}_M + \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\tau}))^{-1} \mathbf{r}, \quad (28)$$

where the coefficient $\phi_k(\mathbf{r}, g_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \in [0, 1]$ is given by

$$\phi_k(\mathbf{r}, g_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \left\{ 1 + \frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda} \prod_{i=1}^M \left[\frac{g_k + \tau_i^2}{\tau_i^2} \exp \left(-\frac{g_k |r_i|^2}{\tau_i^2 (g_k + \tau_i^2)} \right) \right] \right\}^{-1} \quad (29)$$

with $\lambda = \frac{K_a}{N}$.

The MMV-AMP iterations are repeated T times, then the active set can be obtained in two ways. The first it to pick the indices with the $K_a + \Delta$ largest $\hat{\gamma}_k$, where Δ is a parameter which allows to control the number of false alarms. While this method performs generally well it requires an estimate of K_a . Alternatively one can pick a sequence of thresholds $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N$ and define

$$\mathcal{A} = \{k : \|\mathbf{r}_T^k\|_2^2 > \theta_k\}. \quad (30)$$

The thresholds can be chosen as

$$\hat{\theta}_k = M \frac{\tau_T^2 (\hat{g}_k + \tau_T^2)}{\hat{g}_k} \log \left(1 + \frac{\hat{g}_k}{\tau_T^2} \right) \quad (31)$$

which coincide with the thresholds suggested in [8] only that the true values of \tilde{g}_k are replaced by their ML estimates. This choice of thresholds was motivated in [8] by the fact that they leads to vanishing activity detection error probabilities in the limit $M \rightarrow \infty$. The activity detection error probabilities $P_{\text{md}}^{\text{AD}}$ and $P_{\text{fa}}^{\text{AD}}$ are defined as the probabilities of missing an active column of \mathbf{A} or falsely declaring an column as a active, not to be confused with the URA per-user error probabilities defined in (2) and (4).

D. Posterior Mean Estimation

A more practical version of the posterior mean estimator can be obtained when the received power is limited to be in a discrete set (π_1, \dots, π_G) . This is the case when the partial SCI policy described in Section II-A is employed where the probability of a user being received on level i is given by ξ_i . Furthermore, a discrete distribution can be used to approximate a continuous distribution p_g . In that case we set $\xi_i = p_g(\pi_{i-1} < P_k g_k \leq \pi_i)$. In both cases we employ (19) and ignore the possibility of collisions, since they would lead to intractable equations. With (19) the posterior probabilities of the power levels in the decoupled Gaussian channel are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\pi_i | \mathbf{r}) &= \frac{p(\mathbf{r} | \pi_i) p(\pi_i)}{p(\mathbf{r}_k)} \\ &= \frac{\xi_i}{p(\mathbf{r}_k)} \left[\frac{\lambda}{\pi_i + \tau^2} \exp \left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_2^2}{\pi_i + \tau^2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1-\lambda}{\tau^2} \exp \left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_2^2}{\tau^2} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $p(\mathbf{r}_k) = \sum_{i=1}^G p(\mathbf{r}_k | \pi_i) p(\pi_i)$. With this, the posterior mean estimator (17) takes on the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_k(\mathbf{r}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}) &= \left[\sum_{i=1}^G p(\pi_i | \mathbf{r}) \phi_{t,k}(\mathbf{r}, \pi_i, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \pi_i (\pi_i \mathbf{I}_M + \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\tau}))^{-1} \right] \mathbf{r}_k \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

After the final iteration of MMV-AMP the posterior distribution can be used to find the MAP estimate

$$\hat{\pi}_k = \arg \max_{\pi \in (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_G)} p(\pi | \mathbf{r}_k). \quad (34)$$

The ML estimation method from the previous section can of course still be used with discrete power levels since it treats the LSFCs as deterministic unknowns. In addition, the estimate can be improved by rounding the final ML estimates to the nearest allowed power level. AD can then be done as described in Section III-C.

E. Analysis

1) MRC Analysis

In this section we calculate an approximate finite-blocklength lower bound on the error probability and on the energy efficiency of the MRC approach. For the purpose of analysing the MRC step we assume that the identification of the active columns can be done without errors. This is justified empirically, since for the range of parameters we use in the simulations section the observed error rates are in the order of 10^{-5} or less. Since this is much smaller than the targeted PUPEs we neglect them.

In addition, we restrict the MRC analysis to the case where $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is known, i.e. $\hat{\Gamma} = \tilde{\Gamma}$. The general case with mismatched LSFCs can be treated in a similar way, but leads to additional interference terms which do not admit a simple expression. Also we ignore the possibility of collisions in the analysis since the probability of a collision for the parameters of interest is much smaller than the targeted per-user error probability.

With this simplifications we obtain a lower bound on the error probability and in the regime where $K_a < n_p$ we expect it to be tight, as in this regime the AD error rates and the error of the LSFC estimation are very low [8, 24]. The covariance of the channel estimation error of the LMMSE estimation in (8) is given by

$$\mathbf{C}_e = \mathbf{I}_{K_a} - \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}}^{1/2} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{I}}^H (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{I}} \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{I}}^H + N_0 \mathbf{I}_{n_p})^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{I}} \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}}^{1/2} \quad (35)$$

and the MSE of the channel estimate of user $k \in \mathcal{K}_a$ is given by $\sigma_k^2 := \mathbb{E}\{|h_{k,m} - \hat{h}_{k,m}|^2\} = (\mathbf{C}_e)_{k,k}$. A typically tight approximation of the effective SINR of each user after MRC is [7, 40]

$$\text{SINR}_k = \frac{M(1 - \sigma_k^2)g_k P}{N_0 + \sigma_k^2 g_k P + \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^{K_a} g_j P} \quad (36)$$

For orthogonal pilots the channel estimation error reduces to

$$\sigma_k^2 = \frac{N_0}{N_0 + n_p P g_k} \quad (37)$$

which lower bounds the actual channel estimation error. Although (37) is a crude bound, it is useful when the evaluation of (35) is computationally too expensive since it requires the inversion of a possibly large matrix. We use it only in the optimization procedure in Section III-G

An approximation of the achievable rates of a block-code with block-length $2n_d$ and error probability p_e on a real AWGN channel with power SINR is given by the normal approximation [41]

$$R \approx 0.5 \log(1 + \text{SINR}) - \sqrt{\frac{V}{2n_d}} Q^{-1}(p_e) \quad (38)$$

where

$$V = \frac{\text{SINR}}{2} \frac{\text{SINR} + 2}{(\text{SINR} + 1)^2} \log^2 e \quad (39)$$

and $Q(\cdot)$ is the Q-function. Using the normal approximation we can find the required SINR to achieve a certain error probability at a given block-length and then we can find the required input power to achieve the target SINR.

Remark 1. The normal approximation here is used as an easy-to-evaluate formula for the achievable error probability in a Gaussian channel at some SINR and n_d . If the goal is to analyse a given single-user code, much more accurate results can be obtained by empirically obtaining the p_e over SNR relation for this code on an AWGN channel and using this relation instead of the normal approximation, see Figure 1. To better estimate the best achievable error probabilities tighter formulas than the normal approximation are available [41, 42].

F. SIC

Under full SIC, i.e. each message is individually recovered and subtracted from \mathbf{Y}_d , starting with the user with the largest LSFC (assuming $g_1 > g_2 > \dots$), the average effective SINRs are given by

$$\text{SINR}_k = \frac{M(1 - \sigma_k^2)g_k P}{N_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} I_i^R + \sum_{j=k+1}^{K_a} g_j P} \quad (40)$$

where

$$I_i^R = (1 - \epsilon_i) \sigma_i^2 g_i P + \epsilon_i g_i P \quad (41)$$




Fig. 1: Polar code with $n = 4096$ and 84 bits vs normal approximation.

is the residual interference left after interference cancellation of user i . $\epsilon_k \in \{0, 1\}$ is a Bernoulli random variable indicating whether the codeword of user k has been erroneously decoded or not. $P(\epsilon_k = 1) = p_e(\text{SINR}_k)$ can be calculated from SINR_k in sequential order, $k = 1, \dots, K_a$ by the normal approximation (38) or the p_e -over-SINR curve for a given code. Note, that even if a message is decoded correctly, i.e. ($\epsilon_k = 0$), a residual interference $\sigma_k^2 g_k P$ remains due to the channel estimation error. The vector $\text{SINR} = (\text{SINR}_1, \dots, \text{SINR}_{K_a})$ is random due to the presence of the ϵ_k . For a target outage probability δ we define a vector $\underline{\text{SINR}} = (\underline{\text{SINR}}_1, \dots, \underline{\text{SINR}}_{K_a})$ by the property

$$p(\text{SINR}_k < \underline{\text{SINR}}_k) = \delta \quad \forall k, \quad (42)$$

where the probability is over ϵ_k and g_k . With this an upper bound on p_{md} is given by

$$p_{\text{md}} \leq \frac{1}{K_a} \sum_{k=1}^{K_a} [(1 - \delta)p_e(\underline{\text{SINR}}_k) + \delta]. \quad (43)$$

$\underline{\text{SINR}}$ can be numerically estimated by sampling $N_s = \mathcal{O}(\delta^{-1})$ vectors of SINRs and then choosing the $\lfloor N_s \delta \rfloor$ 'th smallest entry of $(\text{SINR}_1^1, \dots, \text{SINR}_k^{N_s})$ as $\underline{\text{SINR}}_k$.

Although full SIC leads to the best SINRs it is computationally inefficient since single-user decoding can not be done in parallel which makes it not practicable for a large number of active users. Therefore, we consider a simplified SIC scheme where, in the MRC phase, the BS divides the active users into G groups, based on their received power. Then all messages within one group are decoded and subtracted in parallel starting from the group with the highest average power. Let $(\mathcal{G}_q)_{q=1, \dots, G}$ be some partition of $[1 : K_a]$ into G groups, i.e. $\bigcup_{q=1}^G \mathcal{G}_q = [1 : K_a]$ and $\mathcal{G}_q \cap \mathcal{G}_l = \emptyset$ for $q \neq l$. Furthermore, assume that the groups are fully ordered according to the LSFCs, i.e. $g_i \leq g_j$ for all $i \in \mathcal{G}_q, j \in \mathcal{G}_l$ if $q \geq l$. Let SINR_k^q denote the SINR of user k in group q after the contributions of groups $1, \dots, q-1$ have been cancelled. They are given by:

$$\text{SINR}_k^q = \frac{M(1 - \sigma_k^2)g_k P}{N_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}_i} I_k^R + \sum_{j=q}^G \sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}_j} g_k P} \quad (44)$$




Fig. 2: SINR profile under different SIC strategies. The dashed line represents the SINR necessary to achieve $P_e < 0.05$ according to the normal approximation. The LSFCs follow the shadowing-pathloss distribution (5).

In Figure 2 we compare the SINR profiles under the different SIC strategies according to formulas (36),(40) and (44) under the NPC policy with $R = 1$ km, $\alpha = 128.1$, $\beta = 36.7$, $g_{\max} = -3$ dB. We choose $K_a = 800$, $M = 50$, $n = 3200$, $L = 1152$. For simplicity we used the approximation (37) for the channel estimation errors. For the grouped approach we have divided users into four groups $\mathcal{G}_i = \{k : o_{i-1} > g_k \geq o_i\}$ with dividing points $(o_0, \dots, o_4) = (\infty, -16, -23, -28, -\infty)$ dB. δ and the dashed line in Figure 2 are chosen such that $(1 - \delta)p_e(\text{SINR}_k) + \delta < 0.05$ when SINR_k is above the dashed line. We can see that without SIC less than 150 users have an acceptable SINR. Furthermore, the picture shows that four groups are sufficient to achieve an error probability similar to full SIC.

Formula (44) simplifies when in addition to grouped SIC the partial SCI policy of Section II-A is employed. For this we assume again that the active users are partitioned into $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_G$ and furthermore that each user in \mathcal{G}_q is received with the same power π_q , satisfying $\pi_1 > \pi_2 > \dots > \pi_G$. Let $n_q = |\mathcal{G}_q|$ denote the number of users in group q . Then each user in group q has the same SINR given by:

$$\text{SINR}^q = \frac{M(1 - \sigma_q^2)\pi_q}{N_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} [(n_i - \zeta_i)\sigma_i^2\pi_i + \zeta_i\pi_i] + \sum_{j=q}^G n_j\pi_j} \quad (45)$$

where $\zeta_q = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}_q} \epsilon_k$ is the number of wrongly decoded messages in group q . Note, that in the partial power control policy users chooses their own group based on their LSFC which has been estimated in the downlink. Therefore, n_q is in general a random variable.

When the group size are large enough, since users choose their group independent of each other, the distribution of (n_1, \dots, n_G) will concentrate sharply around its mean $\mathbb{E}(n_1, \dots, n_G) = K_a(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_G)$ where ξ_q is the probability that a user chooses group q . For a given distribution of LSFCs these are given as $\xi_q = \mathbb{P}(o_{q-1} < g_k \leq o_q)$. The concentration can be more precisely stated as a large-deviation property [43,

Thm. 2.4.3]:

$$\lim_{K_a \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K_a} \log \mathbb{P}(n_1, \dots, n_G) = D_{KL} \left(\frac{n_1}{K_a}, \dots, \frac{n_G}{K_a} \parallel \xi_1, \dots, \xi_G \right) \quad (46)$$

which implies exponential convergence of (n_1, \dots, n_G) to its mean with K_a . Therefore, if the group sizes are sufficiently large we can approximate the random variables n_i by $K_a \xi_i$. The same holds for the RVs ζ_i which are also sums of iid RVs. With this approximation the SINR profile is not a random variable anymore but depends only on the power levels and their occupancies. In the following section we propose methods to optimize those parameters.

G. Optimization of the power levels

Let the power control policy be defined by a set of corner points (o_1, \dots, o_G) and a set of power levels (π_1, \dots, π_G) . We wish to optimize these parameters w.r.t. the average transmit power

$$P_T = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{K_a} \pi_{q(k)} g_k^{-1} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^G \pi_i \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}_i} g_k^{-1} \right], \quad (47)$$

where $q(k)$ denotes the group of user k , under the constraint that the average PUPE remains below P_e . Given the recursive nature of (45) this is a highly non-convex problem. We introduce two solutions based on different approximations and compare them.

1) Equal group size constraint

In this approach we fix the number of groups G and let each group have the same expected size, i.e. the corner points are chosen such that $\xi_i = K_a/G$. This allows to calculate the coefficients $\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}_i} g_k^{-1} \right]$ and minimize the transmit power (47) w.r.t. (π_1, \dots, π_G) under the constraint $\text{SINR}^q \geq \text{SINR}^*$.

$$\min_{(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_G)} \sum_{q=1}^G \pi_q \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}_q} g_k^{-1} \right] \quad (48a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \forall q : \text{SINR}^q \geq \text{SINR}^*, \quad (48b)$$

2) (Almost) Linear optimization

In this approach we introduced an overcomplete set of W power levels. E.g. all equally spaced power levels between -30 and 0 dB. Then the optimization problem is formulated to find the optimal fraction of active users for each power level. Since the coefficients $\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}_q} g_k^{-1} \right]$ in the transmit power (47) depend on the group sizes they cannot be precomputed and make the objective function very complicated. Therefore, we use only the total received power as objective function, given by $P_R = \sum_{q=1}^W \xi_q \pi_q$ leading to the following optimization problem.

$$\min_{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_W} \sum_{q=1}^W \xi_q \pi_q \quad (49a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \forall q : \text{SINR}^q \geq \text{SINR}^*, \quad \text{if } \xi_q > 0 \quad (49b)$$

$$\sum_{q=1}^W \xi_q = 1. \quad (49c)$$




Fig. 3: Gains of the transmit power (47) in dB by introducing multiple received power levels according to formula (45). Power levels are obtained by the two optimization methods introduced in III-G. The LSFCs follow the shadowing-pathloss distribution (5) and $K_a = 800$. The remaining parameters are chosen as in Section IV.

Although there is no explicit constraint to keep the number of power levels with $\xi_q > 0$ low the number of non-zero terms in the optimal solutions is usually much smaller than W . We then let $G = |\{q : \xi_q > 0\}|$. When a solution is found, the corner points, which define the groups assignments, are chosen to get the resulting ξ_q .

Note, that neither of the two methods is a convex problem. The addition “if $\xi_q > 0$ ” in (49b) makes the second method non-linear. Nonetheless, common interior-point based non-linear solvers, like MATLABs `fmincon`, are able to solve those problems reliably. The two approaches are compared in Figure 3. In approach 1 the number of levels is the only parameter as opposed to approach 2 where the number of levels is an outcome of the optimization. For approach 2 we choose linearly spaced power levels with different values of the spacing. The optimal solution puts weight only on few power levels the number of which is summarized in Table I. For each spacing values the offset is optimized empirically over 5 values.

spacing [dB]	2	1	0.5	0.1
levels	2	3	5	22

TABLE I: Number of power levels with $\xi_i > 0$ in the solution of (49) depending on the spacing $\pi_i - \pi_{i+1}$.

IV. SIMULATIONS

A. Active Column Detection

In this section we provide simulations of AD error probabilities for MMV-AMP with the proposed ML estimation of LSFCs in Section III-C. For the simulations we choose $L = 300, K_a = 300, N = 2^{12}$. AD is done by picking the $K_a + \Delta$ columns with the largest $\hat{\gamma}_i$. In Figure 4 and Figure 5




Fig. 4: P_{md}^{AD} under imperfect SCI with LSFCs distributed uniformly between $[-3, 3]$ dB.




Fig. 5: P_{md}^{AD} under the NPC policy with LSFCs distributed according to the shadowing-pathloss model (5).

we set $\Delta = 0$. In Figure 6 Δ is varied between $[-0.06K_a]$ and K_a to tradeoff between missed detections and false alarms. We compare the ML estimation approach to the PME approach with a finite number of levels as described in Section III-D. The levels and their distribution are obtained by approximating the distribution of LSFCs with a histogram with a varying number of bins. The bins are chosen to be of equal size in log-scale. Figure 4 shows P_{md}^{AD} under imperfect SCI power control with received powers distributed uniformly between -3 and 3 dB. The parameter g_{min} for the ML estimation of LSFCs in (26) is chosen as $g_{min} = -3$ dB, the lower limit of possible values. We can see that the ML approach is close to the approximated PME and even outperforms it for large M . Besides, we can observe that the performance of the approximate PME saturates at two levels. A similar trend is observed with the more complicated RSS distribution under the NPC policy, only that the approximate PME requires at least 5 levels to achieve an acceptable performance. In Figure 5 the NPC policy is used with $R = 1, r = 0.25, \alpha = 128.1, \beta = 36.7, \sigma_{shadow}^2 = 4$. Limiting the largest possible received power by setting $r = 0.25$ is crucial here because individual LSFCs which are much larger than the other may severely disrupt the convergence of the algorithm. We choose $g_{min} = 2\tau_T^2$ as parameter for the ML estimation, where T is the final iteration index. Due to the shadowing component the LSFCs do not have a lower limit, therefore it seems more appropriate to choose g_{min} relative to the noise variance in the decoupled channel (15).

B. Unsourced Random Access

For the simulation in Figure 7 we choose $n = 3200, P_e = 0.05, B = 100, n_p = 1152, n_d = 2048$ and




Fig. 6: $P_{\text{md}}^{\text{AD}}$ over $P_{\text{fa}}^{\text{AD}}$. The tradeoff is achieved by varying Δ as described in Section III-C. Left: $M = 15, P = -10$ dB. Right: $M = 20, P = 18$ dB.

$J = 16$. A randomly sub-sampled DFT matrix is used as pilot matrix [1] and in the AD phase we use the MMV-AMP algorithm with an approximate calculation of the derivative as described in Section III-A. For simplicity we assume that K_a is known at the receiver, and after the MMV-AMP iterations are finished the active columns are estimated by picking the $K_a + \Delta$ indices with the largest estimated LSFCs. We set $\Delta = \lfloor K_a/40 \rfloor$. We use a polar code [44, 45] with an SCL decoder with 16 CRC bits and a list size of 32. The polar code is constructed by the Bhattacharyya method [46]. Figure 7 shows the required E_b/N_0 to achieve $P_e = p_{\text{md}} + p_{\text{fa}} \leq 0.05$ under a perfect SCI policy, i.e. all $g_k = 1$. For comparison we add the reported values of the tensor-based-modulation (TBM) approach [27], with tensor signature (8,5,5,4,4) and an outer BCH code, although the values have been obtained with the higher value $P_e = 0.1$. Figure 8 shows the average transmit energy-per-bit $P_T B / (nK_a)$, with P_T defined in (47), under the shadowing-pathloss model (5) with parameters as above and $M = 50$. The SCI curve coincides with the $M = 50$ curve in Figure 7 scaled by the average inverse channel coefficient $\mathbb{E}[\sum g_k^{-1}]/K_a$. For the NPC curve SIC is done in 4 groups defined by the LSFCs division points $(-\infty, -26, -20, -12, \infty)$ dB. For the partial SCI policy we use three groups with levels $(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) = (0, 1, 2.5)$ dB, which coincides, up to a common scaling factor and some rounding errors, with the output of the optimization procedure (48) for $K_a = 800$. We can see that with only 3 levels the average transmit energy can be reduced by about 3 dB at $K_a = 800$ as predicted by Figure 3. Furthermore, the grouped SIC allows to decode $K_a = 1000$ users at $M = 50$ which was not possible without SIC. Note, that NPC does not work at all without SIC and we have found empirically that 4-stage SIC is the minimum amount of stages required to decode up to $K_a = 800$ active users.

C. Complexity

The complexity of AD with the modified MMV-AMP algorithm with ML estimation of LSFCs is in the order of $\mathcal{O}(MN \log N)$ when the pilots are chosen as the columns of a randomly sub-sampled DFT matrix ((1)) and the approximate calculation of the derivatives in the MMV-AMP as described in [24]. For MMV-AMP with approximated PME the complexity is multiplied by the number of levels used to approximate the distribution of LSFCs. The complexity of MRC is $\mathcal{O}(K_a M n_d)$




Fig. 7: Required energy-per-bit with the MRC approach and perfect SCI to achieve $P_e = p_{\text{md}} + p_{\text{fa}} < 0.05$. Solid lines represent the theoretical estimates from Section III-E1 with the P_e over SNR curve from the used polar code and DFT pilots. Dotted lines represent theoretical results using the normal approximation and Gaussian iid pilots. The markers represent simulation results.




Fig. 8: Average required transmit energy-per-bit with the MRC approach and $M = 50$ to achieve $P_e = p_{\text{md}} + p_{\text{fa}} < 0.05$ under different power control policies and SIC strategies as described in the text. The LSFCs are assumed to follow the shadowing-pathloss distribution (5). The partial SCI levels have been calculated according to the optimization (48). Note, that the levels are optimized only for $K_a = 800$.

and the complexity of single-user decoding is $\mathcal{O}(K_a n_d \log n_d)$ regardless of whether SIC has been used or not. The SIC only influences the ability to process the users in parallel.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work we presented a coding scheme for the quasi-static Rayleigh fading AWGN MAC with a massive MIMO receiver that is compliant with the unsourced paradigm. I.e. no user identification is done at the physical layer, instead the receiver recovers a list of transmitted messages up to permutation. Sim-

ulations show that the presented scheme performs better than existing approaches for the quasi-static MIMO MAC despite its conceptual simplicity. We give a closed form analysis that predicts the achievable limits of this scheme when a single user code is used which can achieve the normal approximation. We introduced a modified version of the MMV-AMP algorithm which allows to treat the unknown LSFCs in a non-Bayesian way while maintaining the same complexity and still achieving results close to the Bayesian version without the need to obtain the distribution of LSFCs. The results show that the presented approach can scale to many hundreds of users and achieve high sum-spectral efficiencies with low power requirement and without any coordination between users. Simplified power control policies allow to improve the performance even further with only few interference cancellation steps being required at the receiver. Specifically, with $M = 50$ receive antennas and 3-stage SIC more than a thousand users can be served concurrently, which leads to sum-spectral efficiencies beyond 30 bits per channel use.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Fengler, P. Jung, and G. Caire. “Pilot-Based Unsourced Random Access with a Massive MIMO Receiver in the Quasi-Static Fading Regime”. In: *ArXiv201203277 Cs Math* (Aug. 2021). arXiv: 2012.03277 [cs, math].
- [2] E. Dahlman, S. Parkvall, and J. Skold. *4G: LTE/LTE-Advanced for Mobile Broadband*. English. 2. Edition. Amsterdam ; New York: Academic Press, Oct. 2013.
- [3] E. Dahlman, S. Parkvall, and J. Skold. *5G NR: The Next Generation Wireless Access Technology*. Academic Press, Aug. 2018.
- [4] T. Taleb and A. Kunz. “Machine Type Communications in 3GPP Networks: Potential, Challenges, and Solutions”. en. In: *IEEE Commun. Mag.* 50.3 (Mar. 2012), pp. 178–184. doi: 10.1109/MCOM.2012.6163599.
- [5] M. Hasan, E. Hossain, and D. Niyato. “Random Access for Machine-to-Machine Communication in LTE-Advanced Networks: Issues and Approaches”. en. In: *IEEE Commun. Mag.* 51.6 (June 2013), pp. 86–93. doi: 10.1109/MCOM.2013.6525600.
- [6] E. G. Larsson et al. “Massive MIMO for next Generation Wireless Systems”. In: *IEEE Commun. Mag.* 52.2 (Feb. 2014), pp. 186–195. doi: 10.1109/MCOM.2014.6736761.
- [7] T. L. Marzetta and H. Yang. *Fundamentals of Massive MIMO*. en. Cambridge University Press, Nov. 2016.
- [8] L. Liu and W. Yu. “Massive Connectivity with Massive MIMO-Part I: Device Activity Detection and Channel Estimation”. In: *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* 66.11 (June 2018), pp. 2933–2946. doi: 10.1109/TSP.2018.2818082.
- [9] L. Liu and W. Yu. “Massive Connectivity with Massive MIMO-Part II: Achievable Rate Characterization”. In: *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* 66.11 (June 2018), pp. 2947–2959. doi: 10.1109/TSP.2018.2818070.
- [10] Z. Chen, F. Sahrabi, and W. Yu. “Sparse Activity Detection for Massive Connectivity”. In: *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* 66.7 (Apr. 2018), pp. 1890–1904. doi: 10.1109/TSP.2018.2795540.
- [11] L. Liu et al. “Sparse Signal Processing for Grant-Free Massive Connectivity: A Future Paradigm for Random Access Protocols in the Internet of Things”. In: *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.* 35.5 (Sept. 2018), pp. 88–99. doi: 10.1109/MSP.2018.2844952.
- [12] K. Senel and E. G. Larsson. “Grant-Free Massive MTC-Enabled Massive MIMO: A Compressive Sensing Approach”. In: *IEEE Trans. Commun.* 66.12 (Dec. 2018), pp. 6164–6175. doi: 10.1109/TCOMM.2018.2866559.
- [13] Y. Polyanskiy. “A Perspective on Massive Random-Access”. In: *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. June 2017, pp. 2523–2527. doi: 10.1109/ISIT.2017.8006984.
- [14] O. Ordentlich and Y. Polyanskiy. “Low Complexity Schemes for the Random Access Gaussian Channel”. In: *2017 IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory ISIT* (2017), pp. 2533–2537. doi: 10.1109/ISIT.2017.8006985.
- [15] A. Fengler, P. Jung, and G. Caire. “SPARCs for Unsourced Random Access”. In: *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* (2021), pp. 1–1. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2021.3081189.
- [16] R. Calderbank and A. Thompson. “CHIRRUP: A Practical Algorithm for Unsourced Multiple Access”. In: *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA* 9.4 (Dec. 2020), pp. 875–897. doi: 10.1093/imaia/iaz029.
- [17] A. Vem et al. “A User-Independent Serial Interference Cancellation Based Coding Scheme for the Unsourced Random Access Gaussian Channel”. en. In: *2017 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*. Kaohsiung, Taiwan: IEEE, Nov. 2017, pp. 121–125. doi: 10.1109/ITW.2017.8278023.
- [18] S. S. Kowshik et al. “Short-Packet Low-Power Coded Access for Massive MAC”. en. In: *2019 53rd Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*. Pacific Grove, CA, USA: IEEE, Nov. 2019, pp. 827–832. doi: 10.1109/IEEECONF44664.2019.9048748.
- [19] V. K. Amalladinne, J.-F. Chamberland, and K. R. Narayanan. “A Coded Compressed Sensing Scheme for Unsourced Multiple Access”. In: *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* (2020). doi: 10.1109/TIT.2020.3012948.
- [20] A. K. Pradhan et al. “Polar Coding and Random Spreading for Unsourced Multiple Access”. In: *ICC 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. June 2020, pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1109/ICC40277.2020.9148687.
- [21] D. Ustinova et al. “Efficient Concatenated Same Codebook Construction for the Random Access Gaussian MAC”. In: *2019 IEEE 90th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2019-Fall)*. Sept. 2019, pp. 1–5. doi: 10.1109/VTCFall.2019.8891568.
- [22] S. S. Kowshik et al. “Energy Efficient Coded Random Access for the Wireless Uplink”. In: *IEEE Trans. Commun.* (2020), pp. 1–1. doi: 10.1109/TCOMM.2020.3000635.
- [23] K. Andreev, E. Marshakov, and A. Frolov. “A Polar Code Based TIN-SIC Scheme for the Unsourced Random Access in the Quasi-Static Fading MAC”. In: *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. June 2020, pp. 3019–3024. doi: 10.1109/ISIT44484.2020.9174247.
- [24] A. Fengler et al. “Non-Bayesian Activity Detection, Large-Scale Fading Coefficient Estimation, and Unsourced Random Access with a Massive MIMO Receiver”. In: *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* (2021), pp. 1–1. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2021.3065291.
- [25] D. Tse and P. Viswanath. *Fundamentals of Wireless Communication*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, May 2005.
- [26] V. Shyianov et al. “Massive Unsourced Random Access Based on Uncoupled Compressive Sensing: Another Blessing of Massive MIMO”. In: *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.* (2020), pp. 1–1. doi: 10.1109/JSAC.2020.3019722.
- [27] A. Decurninge, I. Land, and M. Guillaud. “Tensor-Based Modulation for Unsourced Massive Random Access”. In: *IEEE Wirel. Commun. Lett.* (2020), pp. 1–1. doi: 10.1109/LWC.2020.3037523.
- [28] S. Hanly and P. Whiting. “Interference Cancellation in Groups”. In: *Proceedings of 1995 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*. Sept. 1995, pp. 446–. doi: 10.1109/ISIT.1995.550433.
- [29] K. Higuchi and A. Benjebbour. “Non-Orthogonal Multiple Access (NOMA) with Successive Interference Cancellation for Future Radio Access”. en. In: *IEICE Trans. Commun.* E98.B.3 (2015), pp. 403–414. doi: 10.1587/transcom.E98.B.403.
- [30] S. M. R. Islam et al. “Power-Domain Non-Orthogonal Multiple Access (NOMA) in 5G Systems: Potentials and Challenges”. In: *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutorials* 19.2 (2017), pp. 721–742. doi: 10.1109/COMST.2016.2621116.
- [31] H. Q. Ngo et al. “Cell-Free Massive MIMO: Uniformly Great Service for Everyone”. In: *2015 IEEE 16th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*. Stockholm, Sweden: IEEE, June 2015, pp. 201–205. doi: 10.1109/SPAWC.2015.7227028.
- [32] R. Yates. “A Framework for Uplink Power Control in Cellular Radio Systems”. In: *Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Journal on* 13 (Oct. 1995), pp. 1341–1347. doi: 10.1109/49.414651.
- [33] J. G. Andrews and T. H. Meng. “Optimum Power Control for Successive Interference Cancellation with Imperfect Channel Estimation”. In: *IEEE Trans. Wirel. Commun.* 2.2 (Mar. 2003), pp. 375–383. doi: 10.1109/TWC.2003.809123.
- [34] A. Agrawal et al. “Iterative Power Control for Imperfect Successive Interference Cancellation”. In: *Wireless Communications, IEEE Transactions on* 4 (June 2005), pp. 878–884. doi: 10.1109/TWC.2005.846996.

- [35] J. Kim et al. “Belief Propagation for Joint Sparse Recovery”. In: *arXiv:1102.3289* (Feb. 2011). arXiv: 1102.3289.
- [36] F. Bellili, F. Sotirovic, and W. Yu. “Massive MIMO mmWave Channel Estimation Using Approximate Message Passing and Laplacian Prior”. In: *2018 IEEE 19th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*. June 2018, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/SPAWC.2018.8446036.
- [37] M. Bayati and A. Montanari. “The LASSO Risk for Gaussian Matrices”. In: *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 58.4 (2012), pp. 1997–2017. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2011.2174612.
- [38] S. Verdú. *Multiuser Detection*. en. Cambridge University Press, Aug. 1998.
- [39] E. Marshakov et al. “A Polar Code Based Unsourced Random Access for the Gaussian MAC”. In: *2019 IEEE 90th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2019-Fall)*. Sept. 2019, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/VTCFall.2019.8891583.
- [40] G. Caire. “On the Ergodic Rate Lower Bounds With Applications to Massive MIMO”. In: *IEEE Trans. Wirel. Commun.* 17.5 (May 2018), pp. 3258–3268. DOI: 10.1109/TWC.2018.2808522.
- [41] Y. Polyanskiy, H. V. Poor, and S. Verdú. “Channel Coding Rate in the Finite Blocklength Regime”. In: *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 56.5 (2010), pp. 2307–2359. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2010.2043769.
- [42] J. Östman et al. “URLLC with Massive MIMO: Analysis and Design at Finite Blocklength”. In: *ArXiv200910550 Cs Eess Math* (May 2021). arXiv: 2009.10550 [cs, eess, math].
- [43] R. Ellis. *Entropy, Large Deviations, and Statistical Mechanics*. en. Classics in Mathematics. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2006. DOI: 10.1007/3-540-29060-5.
- [44] E. Arikan. “Channel Polarization: A Method for Constructing Capacity-Achieving Codes for Symmetric Binary-Input Memoryless Channels”. In: *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 55.7 (July 2009), pp. 3051–3073. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2009.2021379.
- [45] A. Balatsoukas-Stimming, M. B. Parizi, and A. Burg. “LLR-Based Successive Cancellation List Decoding of Polar Codes”. In: *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* 63.19 (Oct. 2015), pp. 5165–5179. DOI: 10.1109/TSP.2015.2439211.
- [46] I. Tal and A. Vardy. “How to Construct Polar Codes”. In: *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 59.10 (Oct. 2013), pp. 6562–6582. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2013.2272694.