Universal Performance Bounds for Joint Self-Interference Cancellation and Data Detection in Full-Duplex Communications

Meng He, Student Member, IEEE, and Chuan Huang, Member, IEEE

Abstract

This paper studies the joint digital self-interference (SI) cancellation and data detection in an orthogonal-frequency-division-multiplexing (OFDM) full-duplex (FD) system, considering the effect of phase noise introduced by the oscillators at both the local transmitter and receiver. In particular, an universal iterative two-stage joint SI cancellation and data detection framework is considered and its performance bound independent of any specific estimation and detection methods is derived. First, the channel and phase noise estimation mean square error (MSE) lower bounds in each iteration are derived by analyzing the Fisher information of the received signal. Then, by substituting the derived MSE lower bound into the SINR expression, which is related to the channel and phase noise estimation MSE, the SINR upper bound in each iteration is computed. Finally, by exploiting the SINR upper bound and the transition information of the detection errors between two adjacent iterations, the universal bit error rate (BER) lower bound for data detection is derived.

Index Terms

Full-duplex (FD), self-interference (SI) cancellation, phase noise, joint estimation and detection.

I. INTRODUCTION

Full-Duplex (FD) technology is a promising mechanism that can significantly improve the spectral efficiency of future wireless communication systems compared to the conventional halfduplex technologies [2]–[4], since it allows the wireless transceiver to simultaneously transmit

Part of this paper was presented in IEEE Globecom 2019 [1].

M. He and C. Huang are with the Future Network of Intelligence Institute and the School of Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China, 518172 (email: menghe@link.cuhk.edu.cn and huangchuan@cuhk.edu.cn).

and receive signals over the same frequency band [5]. However, simultaneous transmission and reception at one FD transceiver introduces extremely strong self-interference (SI) from the local transmitter to the local receiver [6], [7]. To make the FD transmission practical and feasible with the potential advantages on spectral efficiency, the FD system should efficiently suppress the SI at the receiver to the noise floor [8].

Recently, bunches of literature [9]–[18] have investigated the SI cancellation in the FD systems, and according to [4], the SI cancellation methods are categorized into two types: passive suppression and active cancellation. Passive suppression techniques [9]–[11] eliminated the SI signal in the propagation domain before it is received by the local receiver. More specifically, these techniques tried to isolate the local transmitter antennas from the local receiver antennas [10] by adopting the directional antennas [3], [12], [15], absorptive shielding [10], and crosspolarization [13]. In contrast, active cancellation mechanisms [13]–[17] mitigated the SI signal in the digital and analog domains, where a reconstructed SI cancellation signal is subtracted from the received signal to cancel the strong SI. The reconstruction of the SI signal is based on the information transportation between the local transmitter and receiver, and the estimation of the unknown SI channel [18].

However, the SI cannot be completely mitigated in practical systems. Due to the mismatch between the SI signal and the reconstructed one, the residual SI always exists [19] and limits the performance of various FD systems [20]-[22]. In particular, phase noise introduced by the oscillator defects was identified to be one of the main causes of the cancellation mismatch [4], [17], [23]. In OFDM systems, phase noise introduces both the common phase error (CPE) and the inter-carrier interference (ICI). To analyze and mitigate the phase noise in the OFDM FD systems, phase noise estimation and suppression mechanisms were proposed in [6], [16]–[18], [24]– [26]. To analyze the oscillator phase noise effects on the SI cancellation capability, the authors in [6] derived the closed-form expression for the power of the residual SI, considering both the two cases with two independent oscillators and one common oscillators at one transceiver. Considering the SI channel estimation in the presence of phase noise, the authors in [25] adopted the expectation maximization (EM) scheme to jointly estimate the SI channel and CPE, and the simulation results indicated that better SI suppression performance can be achieved by considering the phase noise effects. They also predicted that an ICI mitigation scheme may further increase the SI cancellation capacity. Considering the CPE estimation, the authors in [18] analytically derived the closed-form expression for the digital SI cancellation capability in terms of the power of the CPE, the interference-to-noise-ratio (INR), and the signal-to-noiseratio (SNR), and concluded that the residual ICI severely limits the digital cancellation ability. To suppress the phase noise ICI, the authors in [24] proposed one frequency-domain and one timedomain ICI suppression methods. By the theoretical analysis and simulations, they investigated the feasibility of these two techniques in terms of complexity and achievable ICI cancellation gain, and concluded that the SI cancellation ability of the proposed ICI suppression methods is limited by the power of the signal-of-interest (SoI).

In this work, we consider the joint digital SI cancellation and data detection problem in an OFDM FD two-way system with phase noise introduced by the oscillators at both the transmitter and the receiver [24]. In particular, we consider a typical scenario that the coherence time of the SI channel is much longer compared with the duration of an OFDM symbol, and that the phase noise and the SoI channel vary much faster than the SI channel. Thus, a two-stage framework is adopted to estimate the SI channel in the first stage and detect the desired data in the second stage. In the SI channel estimation stage, one pilot OFDM symbol is transmitted from the remote transmitter to the local receiver, and all the unknown channel coefficients and phase noise are jointly estimated. In the data transmission stage, the mixed pilot and data OFDM symbol is transmitted to the local receiver, and then the unknown SI phase noise, SoI channel and the desired data are iteratively estimated and detected. Next, we investigate the universal estimation and detection performance for the considered two-stage framework. The MSE lower bounds for the estimation of SoI channel and SI phase noise in each iteration are derived by analyzing the Fisher information of the received signal, considering the data detection results from the previous iteration. Then, by subsisting the derived estimation MSE lower bounds into the effective SINR expression, which in related to the channel and phase noise estimation MSE, the effective SINR upper bound in each iteration is then computed. Finally, by exploiting the SINR upper bound and the transition information of the detection errors between two adjacent iterations, the theoretically BER lower bound for the two-stage framework is derived, and is independent of any specific estimation and detection methods.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section II introduces the considered FD OFDM two-way system. Section III formulates the SI cancellation and data detection problem, and proposes the two-stage framework for the problem. Then, section IV gives the theoretical performance analysis for the considered scheme. Next, section V presents the simulation analysis. Finally, section VI concludes this paper.

Notations: Boldface small letters, e.g. **x**, denote vectors, and boldface capital letters, e.g. **X**, denote matrices. $\mathbf{I}_{N \times M}$ and $\mathbf{0}_{N \times M}$ represent all one and zero $N \times M$ matrix, respectively. $[\mathbf{X}]_{i,j}$ denotes the (i, j)-th entry of matrix **X**. tr{**X**} denotes the trace of matrix **X**. The operator diag{**x**} transforms the vector **x** into a diagonal matrix. $(\cdot)^*, (\cdot)^T, (\cdot)^H$, and * denote conjugate, transpose, conjugate transpose and convolution operators, respectively. $\mathbb{E}[\cdot], \Re\{\cdot\}$, and $\Im\{\cdot\}$ represent expectation, real and imaginary operators, respectively. $\lfloor\cdot\rfloor$ is the round down operator. $|\cdot|$ denotes the absolute. $\log(\cdot)$ is the base-10 logarithm function. $||\cdot||^2$ is the L-2 norm. $p(\cdot)$ denotes the probability. \mathbb{N}^+ is the positive integer set.



Fig. 1: Two-way full-duplex OFDM communication system.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

In this paper, a FD OFDM two-way system is considered as shown in Fig. 1, where two transceivers, labeled as Node 1 and Node 2, respectively, simultaneously transmit and receive signals at the same frequency band. Take Node 1 for example: at its local transmitter, the digital symbols $\{X_I[k]\}_{k=0}^{N-1}$ are first transformed into the time-domain signal $x_I(t)$ by a standard OFDM modulator [18], with N being the total number of subcarriers in one OFDM symbol. Then, at the local transmitter oscillator, $x_I(t)$ is mixed with the oscillator signal $e^{j(2\pi f_c(t)+\phi_I(t))}$ to obtain the radio frequency (RF) signal $\tilde{x}_I(t)$ to be transmitted to Node 2, i.e.,

$$\tilde{x}_I(t) = x_I(t)e^{j(2\pi f_c t + \theta_I(t))},\tag{1}$$

where f_c is the carrier frequency and $\phi_I(t)$ represents the phase noise at the transmitter oscillator. Notice that this RF signal from Node 1 to Node 2 is also received by the local receiver of Node 1, and becomes a strong SI at the local receiver.

At the local receiver antenna of Node 1, the SoI from Node 2 is mixed with the SI from the local transmitter of Node 1, and thus the received RF signal $\tilde{y}(t)$ at the receiver antenna is given as

$$\tilde{y}(t) = \sum_{l=0}^{L_I - 1} h_I(l) \tilde{x}_I(t - \tau_I(l)) + \sum_{l=0}^{L_S - 1} h_S(l) \tilde{x}_S(t - \tau_S(l)) + w(t),$$
(2)

where w(t) is the circular symmetric complex Gaussian (CSCG) noise, $\tilde{x}_S(t)$ is the time-domain desired data signal, $\{h_I(l)\}_{l=0}^{L_I-1}$ and $\{h_S(l)\}_{l=0}^{L_S-1}$ represent the time-domain multipath SI and SoI channel impulse, with L_I and L_S being the numbers of the SI and SoI multipath channel taps, respectively.

At the receiver oscillator, the received RF signal $\tilde{y}(t)$ is mixed with the oscillator signal to be downconverted to the baseband signal y(t), i.e., $y(t) = \tilde{y}(t)e^{-j(2\pi f_c(t) - \phi_R(t))}$, where $\phi_R(t)$ represents the phase noise at the receiver oscillator of Node 1. Then, after the OFDM demodulation, y(t) is restored to the digital frequency-domain symbols $\{Y[k]\}_{k=0}^{N-1}$ [27], i.e,

$$Y[k] = \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} X_{I}[l] H_{I}[l] J_{I}[k-l] + \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} X_{S}[l] H_{S}[l] J_{S}[k-l] + W[k],$$
(3)

where $k \in \{0, 1, ..., N-1\}$ is the OFDM subcarrier index, $X_I[k]$ and $X_S[k]$ represent the digital SI and SoI symbols, $H_I[k]$ and $H_S[k]$ denote the frequency-domain SI and SoI channel impulse coefficients, W[k] is the frequency-domain receiver CSCG noise with zero mean and variance $\frac{1}{N}\sigma_w^2$, $J_I[k]$ and $J_S[k]$ denote the frequency-domain SI and SoI phase noises [28], i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} J_{I}[k] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{j(\theta_{I}(nT_{s}-t_{I})+\theta_{R}(nT_{s}))} e^{-j\frac{2\pi kn}{N}}, \\ J_{S}[k] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{j(\theta_{S}(nT_{s}-t_{S})+\theta_{R}(nT_{s}))} e^{-j\frac{2\pi kn}{N}}, \end{cases}$$
(4)

 $\theta_S(t)$ represents the phase noise at the transmitter oscillator of Node 2, T_s is the digital sampling time, t_I is the SI transmission delay, and t_S is the SoI transmission delay. Compared with the case without the oscillator phase noise, i.e., $Y[k] = H_I[k]X_I[k] + H_S[k]X_S[k] + W[k]$, it is observed from equation (3) that phase noise destroys the orthogonality of the OFDM subcarriers and introduces the intercarrier interference (ICI). Thus, the existence of oscillator phase noise causes the signal constellation rotation and increases the noise floor, which degrades the SI cancellation performance [18].

Using the matrix notations, the received signal is rewritten as

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{I}} + \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{S}} + \mathbf{w},\tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{y} = [Y[0], \dots, Y[N-1]]^T$ is the received signal, $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{I}} = [X_I[0], \dots, X_I[N-1]]^T$ denotes the SI symbol, $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{S}} = [X_S[0], \dots, X_S[N-1]]^T$ is the desired data, $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{I}} = \text{diag}\{H_I[0], H_I[1], \dots, H_I[N-1]\}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{S}} = \text{diag}\{H_S[0], H_S[1], \dots, H_S[N-1]\}$ are the SI and SoI channel matrices, respectively, and $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{I}}$ and $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{S}}$ represent the SI and SoI phase noise matrices with their entries being $[\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{I}}]_{m,n} = J_I[m-n], [\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{S}}]_{m,n} = J_S[m-n], m, n = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \text{ and } \mathbf{w} = [W[0], W[1], \dots, W[N-1]]^T$ is the CSCG noise vector, $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{N \times 1}, \frac{1}{N}\sigma_w^2\mathbf{I}_{N \times N})$.

III. TWO-STAGE SCHEME

In this section, a two-stage joint SI cancellation and data detection framework is adopted to estimate the SI channel in the first stage and detect the desired data in the second stage. According to Fig. 1 and Eq. (5), the SI symbol x_I at the receiver of Node 1 is known, while the desired data x_S from Node 2, the channels H_I and H_S , and the phase noises J_I and J_S are all unknown.



Fig. 2: Two-stage joint SI cancellation and data detection for OFDM systems.

Generally, the SI channel is slowly varying across multiple OFDM symbols [29]. On the other hand, phase noise has a much smaller coherence time compared with that of the SI channel and thus should be repeatedly estimated in each OFDM symbol. Accordingly, we can group multiple

OFDM symbols as one frame. Due to the slowly-varying nature of the SI channel, we only need to estimate its channel state information (CSI) in the first symbol of one frame and use this estimation in the rest symbols of this frame. Based on the above analysis, the following two-stage framework shown in Fig. 2 is considered to solve the joint SI cancellation and data detection problem for the FD OFDM systems.

1) SI Channel Estimation Stage: The first OFDM symbol of each frame is utilized for the SI channel estimation. In this stage, Node 2 transmits a known pilot OFDM symbol to Node 1. By exploiting both the pilot symbol from Node 2 and the known SI symbol from the local transmitter, all unknown channel coefficients and phase noises are jointly estimated.

2) Data Transmission Stage: The rest OFDM symbols are utilized for the data transmissions. Each OFDM symbol in this stage from Node 2 has both the known pilots and unknown data allocated to different subcarriers. Here, by exploiting the known pilots and the SI channel estimations obtained from the SI channel estimation stage, SI phase noise is estimated and the desired data is detected.

A. SI Channel Estimation

In the SI channel estimation stage, Node 2 transmits one pilot OFDM symbol to Node 1 to estimate the SI channel. At the receiver of Node 1, with the known pilot symbol \mathbf{x}_{S} from Node 2 and the SI symbol \mathbf{x}_{I} from the transmitter of Node 1, we are going to solve a conventional joint channel and phase noise estimation problem in this stage, which has been well studied in [27], [30]–[32]. Thus, we do not consider a specific estimation algorithm for this stage and concentrate on the approximation of the channel and phase noise models.

In one OFDM symbol, there are totally *N* subcarriers, and there are 4*N* unknown parameters to be estimated, i.e., $\{H_I[n]\}_{n=0}^{N-1}$, $\{H_S[n]\}_{n=0}^{N-1}$, $\{J_I[n]\}_{n=0}^{N-1}$, and $\{J_S[n]\}_{n=0}^{N-1}$. However, we can send at most *N* pilots in the frequency-domain, which is not sufficient to generate a good estimation for these 4*N* parameters [27]. To overcome this difficulty, we obtain the simplified channel and phase noise models with much fewer parameters.

1) SI Channel Approximation: The frequency-domain SI channel $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{I}}$ is approximated as $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{I}} = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{I}}\}\)$, where $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{I}} = [h_{I}(0), h_{I}(1), \dots, h_{I}(L_{I}-1)]^{T}$ is the time-domain SI channel impulse, L_{I} ($L_{I} \ll N$) is the number of the multipath SI channel taps, and $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{I}}$ is a $N \times L_{I}$ discrete Fourier transform (DFT) matrix with each entry being $[\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{I}}]_{n,l} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}e^{-j2\pi nl/N}, 0 \le n \le N-1, 0 \le l \le L_{I}-1$. 2) SI Phase Noise Approximation: According to (4) and (5), the SI phase noise matrix $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{I}}$ is determined by vector $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}} = [J_I[0], J_I[1], \dots, J_I[N-1]]^T$. Then, $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}}$ can be approximated as $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}} \approx \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$, where $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}} = [J_I[0], \dots, J_I[K-1]]^T$ is a subvector of $\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}}$, $K \leq N - L_S - L_I$ is a constant factor, and $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}}$ is the phase noise approximation matrix with each entry being

$$[\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}}]_{n,k} = \begin{cases} 1, & n = k \le K, \\ 0, & \text{others,} \end{cases}$$
(6)
$$0 \le n \le N - 1, 0 \le k \le K - 1. \end{cases}$$

3) SoI Channel and Phase Noise Approximation: Generally, the ICI of the SoI phase noise has much smaller power than the noise floor at the receiver [24]. Thus, different from the SI phase noise approximation considering both the CPE and ICI, the frequency-domain SoI channel mixed with the SoI phase noise can be approximated as a CPE-rotated channel H_D [18], i.e.,

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{S}} \approx \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{D}} = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}\},\tag{7}$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{D}} = J_S[0] \cdot \text{diag}\{[H_S[0], H_S[1], \dots, H_S[N-1]]\}$ is the frequency CPE-rotated SoI channel matrix, $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}} = J_S[0] \cdot [h_S(0), \dots, h_S(L_S-1)]$ is the time-domain CPE-rotated SoI channel impulse, L_S ($L_S \ll N$) is the number of the SoI channel taps, and $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{S}}$ is an $N \times L_S$ DFT matrix.

Based on the approximation models above, the total number of unknown parameters in this stage is reduced to $L_I + L_S + K$. After the SI channel estimation stage, the receiver obtains the SI channel estimation $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathbf{I}}$, which is used in the next data transmission stage.

B. Data Transmission Stage



Fig. 3: Data transmission stage.

In the rest time of one two-stage frame, i.e. the data transmission stage, Node 2 transmits the mixed pilot and data OFDM symbols to Node 1. According to Fig. 2, the symbol x_S from Node

2 in this stage is expressed as

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{S}} = \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{p}}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}},\tag{8}$$

where $\mathbf{x_p} = [X_S[i_0], X_S[i_1], \dots, X_S[i_M]]^T$ is the known pilot with $\{i_m\}_{m=0}^{M-1}$ being the subcarrier indexes belonging to the pilots and M being the total number of the pilots in one OFDM symbol, $\mathbf{x_d} = [X_S[j_0], X_S[j_1], \dots, X_S[j_Q]]^T$ is the desired data with $\{j_q\}_{q=0}^{Q-1}$ being the subcarrier indexes belonging to the data and Q = N - M being the total number of data subcarriers in one OFDM symbol, and $\mathbf{S_p} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ and $\mathbf{S_d} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times Q}$ are the pilot-bearer matrix and data-bearer matrix, respectively, with their entries being

$$[\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}]_{n,q} = \begin{cases} 1, & n = j_q \\ 0, & n \neq j_q \end{cases}, \ [\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{p}}]_{n,m} = \begin{cases} 1, & n = i_m \\ 0, & n \neq i_m \end{cases}, \\ 0, & n \neq i_m \end{cases}$$
(9)
$$0 \le n \le N - 1, 0 \le m \le M - 1, 0 \le q \le Q - 1.$$

The data transmission stage is shown in Fig. 3. In this stage, $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}$ and $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$ are estimated and the desired data $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}}$ is detected. The designed approximation factor K for the SI phase noise is set as $K = M - L_S$, which satisfies $L_S + K \leq N$ and promotes an unique solution for the estimations of $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}$ and $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$ [27]. Then, we reconstruct one OFDM symbol transmitted from Node 2 as

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{S}} = \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{d}},\tag{10}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_d$ is the detected desired data, and then the reconstructed symbol $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_S$ is fed back to the joint estimation part in the next iteration. With the feedback step, the reconstructed symbol $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_S$ and the received signals on all subcarriers are exploited in the estimation step. However, it should be ware that there might be data detection errors in the detected desired data $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_d$, which introduces certain noise in the reconstruction step.

IV. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

In this section, the estimation and detection performance of the considered two-stage framework is analyzed. First, the MSE lower bound for the phase noise and channel estimation and the effective SINR upper bound for the received signal after SI cancellation are derived. Then, the BER lower bound for the detection of the desired data under the proposed framework is derived. Before the analysis, we present some assumptions adopted in this section: 1) Since we focus on the joint phase noise estimation and data detection in the second data transmission stage, it is considered that perfect CSI for the SI channel h_I is obtained at the first stage; 2) the estimation error and data detection error caused interference in the data transmission stage are simply treated as independent CSCG noises; 3) due to zero prior CSI at the transmitter, we do not consider the optimal power allocation among the carriers and thus each carrier of the OFDM symbol is allocated with identical power; and 4) the data symbols, the pilots, the phase noise, the channel, and the CSCG noise are independent of each other.

A. Lower Bound for Estimation MSE

In this subsection, we derive the lower bounds for the estimation MSE of $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$ and \mathbf{h}_D under the considered framework shown in Fig. 3 for the data transmission stage.

By utilizing the channel and phase noise approximation models given in (6) and (7), the received signal in (5) is rewritten as

$$y = T_{I}j_{I} + J_{S}H_{S}X_{S} + w$$

$$= T_{I}S_{I}j'_{I} + H_{D}x_{S} + e,$$
(11)

where the *m*-th row and *n*-th column entry of $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}}$ is given as $[\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}}]_{m,n} = H_I[m-n]X_I[m-n], 0 \le m \le N-1, 0 \le n \le N-1, \ldots, N-1$, and

$$\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}}(\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}} - \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}}') + (\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{D}})\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{S}} + \mathbf{w}$$
(12)

is the combination of the CSCG noise \mathbf{w} and the modeling errors introduced in (6) and (7). The power of \mathbf{e} is derived as

$$\sigma_e^2 = \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{e}\|^2] = \lambda_I E_{h_I} E_I + \lambda_S E_{h_S} E_S + \sigma_w^2, \tag{13}$$

where $E_S = \mathbb{E}[||\mathbf{x}_S||^2]$, $E_I = \mathbb{E}[||\mathbf{x}_I||^2]$, $E_{h_I} = \mathbb{E}[||\mathbf{h}_I||^2]$, and $E_{h_S} = \mathbb{E}[||\mathbf{h}_S||^2]$ are the power values of the transmitted symbol, the SI symbol, the SI channel response, and the SoI channel response, respectively, and $\lambda_I = \sum_{k=K}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}[|J_I[k]|^2]$ and $\lambda_S = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}[|J_S[k]|^2]$ are the power values of the residual SI phase noise and the residual SoI phase noise, respectively. It is observed from (13) that the existence of phase noise has introduced interference, i.e., the model approximation errors $\lambda_I E_{h_I} E_I$ and $\lambda_S E_{h_S} E_S$ (λ_I and λ_S are calculated in Appendix D in details), which degrade the estimation performance. Besides, the power values λ_I and λ_S are determined by the model of phase noise, which we will discuss in the simulation and Appendix D.

Proposition 4.1: If the desired data vector $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}}$ is detected as $\mathbf{\hat{x}}_{\mathbf{d}_{n-1}}$ in the (n-1)-th iteration of the data transmission stage, n > 1, then the estimation MSE of $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$ and $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}$ in the *n*-th iteration are lower bounded as

$$C_{n} \geq \frac{(M - L_{S})(\sigma_{e}^{2} + (1 - \lambda_{S})E_{h_{S}}d(n - 1))}{NE_{hI}E_{I}},$$

$$D_{n} \geq \frac{L_{S}(\sigma_{e}^{2} + (1 - \lambda_{S})E_{h_{S}}d(n - 1))}{NE_{S}},$$
(14)

where $C_n = \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}} - \mathbf{\hat{j}}'_{\mathbf{I}_n} \|^2 \right]$ is the estimation MSE of $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$, with $\mathbf{\hat{j}}'_{\mathbf{I}_n}$ being the estimation of $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$ in the *n*-th iteration, $D_n = \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{\hat{h}}_{\mathbf{D}_n}\|^2]$ is the estimation MSE for $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}$, with $\mathbf{\hat{h}}_{\mathbf{D}_n}$ being the estimation of $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}$ in the *n*-th iteration, and $d(n-1) = \|\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}} - \mathbf{\hat{x}}_{\mathbf{d}_{n-1}}\|^2$ is the square error between the desired data vector $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}}$ and its data detection result $\mathbf{\hat{x}}_{\mathbf{d}_{n-1}}$ in the (n-1)-th iteration.

Proof: See Appendix A.

Notice that the data detection result $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{d}_{n-1}}$ of the (n-1)-th iteration is utilized in the estimation process of the *n*-th iteration. Thus, the lower bounds for the estimation MSE of $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$ and $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}$ are related to both the noise \mathbf{e} which is independent across different iterations and the data detection square error d(n-1) which is varying over iterations.

B. Upper Bound for Effective SINR

In this section, we derive the upper bound for the effective SINR of the received signal after SI cancellation in each iteration.

According to the considered framework shown in Fig. 3, in the *n*-th iteration of the data transmission stage, n > 1, we first utilize the estimated SI channel from the SI channel estimation stage and the estimated SI phase noise $\hat{\mathbf{j}}'_{\mathbf{I}_n}$, to reconstruct the SI signal. Then, the reconstructed SI signal is used for the SI cancellation to recover the SoI from the received signal \mathbf{y} . Using (11) and the SI phase noise model approximation shown in section III-A, the received signal after SI cancellation is given as

$$\mathbf{r}_{n} = \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}^{T}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}}\hat{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathbf{I}_{n}}^{\prime})$$

= $\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}^{T}\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}}(\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}}^{\prime} - \hat{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathbf{I}_{n}}^{\prime}) + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}^{T}\mathbf{e},$ (15)

where \mathbf{r}_n is the received signal after SI cancellation in the *n*-th iteration, $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}}\hat{\mathbf{j}}'_{\mathbf{I}_n}$ is the reconstructed SI signal, $\mathbf{s} = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}^T\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}\}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}}$ is the SoI related to the desired data $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}}$, and $\mathbf{r}_n - \mathbf{s}$ denotes the residual SI. Based on the estimated SoI channel $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathbf{D}_n}$, the desired data $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}}$ is detected from \mathbf{r}_n .

The detection performance of the desired data $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}}$ is determined by the effective SNR of \mathbf{r}_n . By using the MSE lower bounds derived in (14) for $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$ and $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}$, the upper bound for the average effective SINR of \mathbf{r}_n is derived in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2: Define $\overline{\gamma}(n)$ as the average effective SINR of the receive signal \mathbf{r}_n after SI cancellation in the *n*-th iteration, then $\overline{\gamma}(n)$ is upper bounded as

$$\overline{\gamma}(n) \le \frac{(1-\lambda_S)E_{h_S}E_S}{(1+\frac{M}{N})\sigma_e^2 + \frac{MQ}{N^2}(1-\lambda_S)E_{h_S}\overline{d}(n-1)},\tag{16}$$

where E_S , E_I , E_{h_I} , E_{h_S} , λ_I and λ_S are defined in (13), and $\overline{d}(n-1) = |X_S - \hat{X}_S^{n-1}|^2$ is the square data detection error in one OFDM subcarrier, with X_S being the desired data symbol and \hat{X}_S^{n-1} being the detected X_S in the (n-1)-th iteration.

Proof: See Appendix B.

Notice that $\overline{d}(n-1)$ is related to the adopted modulation scheme of the desired data. First, we start with a simple case that the binary-phase-shift-keying (BPSK) modulation is adopted. Thus, we have $X_S \in \{\sqrt{E_S/N}, -\sqrt{E_S/N}\}$, and $\overline{d}(n-1)$ has two possible values corresponding to the two possible data detection results, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} S_{n-1}^{0} : \overline{d}(n-1) = 0\\ S_{n-1}^{1} : \overline{d}(n-1) = 4\frac{E_{S}}{N}, \end{cases}$$
(17)

where S_{n-1}^0 denotes the correct detection result in the (n-1)-th iteration, i.e., $\hat{X}_S^{n-1} = X_S$, and S_{n-1}^1 denotes the false detection result in the (n-1)-th iteration, i.e., $\hat{X}_S^{n-1} = -X_S$. By substituting (17) into (16), the upper bound for the effective SINR in the *n*-th iteration is derived as

$$\begin{cases} S_{n-1}^{0} : \overline{\gamma}(n) \leq \gamma_{0} = \frac{(1 - \lambda_{S})E_{S}E_{h_{S}}}{(1 + \frac{M}{N})\sigma_{e}^{2}} \\ S_{n-1}^{1} : \overline{\gamma}(n) \leq \gamma_{1}, \end{cases}$$
(18)

where γ_0 denotes the effective SINR upper bound for case S_{n-1}^0 , and

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{(1 - \lambda_S) E_{h_S} E_S}{(1 + \frac{M}{N}) \sigma_e^2 + 4 \frac{MQ}{N^2} (1 - \lambda_S) E_{h_S} E_S},$$
(19)

denotes the effective SINR upper bound for case S_{n-1}^1 .

For general modulation schemes, we consider the case that the desired data symbol $X_S \in \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_T\}$, with $p(X_S = a_i) = 1/T$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, T$. Similar to the above analysis for BPSK modulation, the square detection error $\overline{d}(n-1)$ has T^2 possible values corresponding to T^2 possible data detection results. For the case that $\hat{X}_S^{n-1} = a_j$ with the desired data $X_S = a_i$, the corresponding square detection error is given as

$$\overline{d}(n-1) = |a_i - a_j|^2, \, i, j = 1, 2, \cdots, T.$$
(20)

Then, by substituting (20) into (16), we derive the upper bound for the effective SINR of the *n*-th iteration with different detection results from the (n - 1) iteration. For the case that $\hat{X}_{S}^{n-1} = a_{j}$ with $X_{S} = a_{i}$, the effective SINR of the n-th iteration is upper bounded as

$$\overline{\gamma}(n) \le \gamma_{i,j}, \, i, j = 1, 2, \cdots, T, \tag{21}$$

where

$$\gamma_{i,j} = \frac{(1 - \lambda_S)E_{h_S}E_S}{(1 + \frac{M}{N})\sigma_e^2 + \frac{MQ}{N^2}(1 - \lambda_S)E_{h_S}|a_i - a_j|^2}$$

is the corresponding effective SINR upper bound for the case $\hat{X}_{S}^{n-1} = a_{j}$ with $X_{S} = a_{i}$.

C. Lower Bound for Data Transmission BER

In this section, by utilizing the effective SINR bound derived in section IV-B, we derive the lower bound for the BER in the data transmission stage. Similar to the analysis of the SINR upper bound, the BER lower bound is also related to the adopted modulation scheme of the desired data.

We first take the BPSK modulation under the Rayleigh fading channels as an example to analyze the corresponding BER lower bound. For the Rayleigh fading channel, the BER of the data transmission with BPSK modulation can be expressed as a function of the SINR [33], i.e.

$$P = f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{x}{1+x}} \right),$$
(22)

where P is the BER and x denotes the value of the effective SINR, with $x \ge 0$.

Proposition 4.3: For the consider two-stage framework under the Rayleigh fading channels, define P_b as the BER of the desired data with BPSK modulation, and P_b is lower bounded as

$$P_b \ge \frac{f(\gamma_0)}{1 + f(\gamma_0) - f(\gamma_1)},$$
(23)

where γ_0 and γ_1 are defined in (18) as the effective SINR upper bounds for BPSK modulation. *Proof:* See Appendix C.

Then, we investigate the universal BER lower bound valid for arbitrary modulation schemes. Consider that the desired data symbol $X_S \in \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_T\}$, with $p(X_S = a_i) = 1/T$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, T$. Similar to (22), the probability of T^2 possible detection cases can be denoted as T^2 functions of the corresponding effective SINR. That is, for the data detection result $\hat{X}_S = a_j$ with the desired data $X_S = a_i$, the corresponding detection probability can be expressed as a deterministic function of the effective SINR, i.e.

$$p(\hat{X}_S = a_j | X_S = a_i) = f_{i,j}(x), \tag{24}$$

where x is the value of the corresponding effective SINR for the case $\hat{X}_S = a_j$ with $X_S = a_i$, and the expression of the function $f_i j(\cdot)$ is determined by the adopted modulation scheme and the data transmission channel. Here, we consider the case that $f_{i,j}(x)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to x for $i \neq j$, and for i = j, $f_{i,i}(x)$ is monotonically increasing. This assumption is valid due to the intuition that when the effective SINR value denoted by x becomes larger, the correct detection probability $f_{i,i}(x)$ should be increasing, and the false detection probability $f_{i,j}(x)$ $(i \neq j)$ should be decreasing.

In the *n*-th iteration, for the data detection result $\hat{X}_S = a_j$ with the desired data $X_S = a_i$, the corresponding detection probability can be computed as

$$p(\hat{X}_{S}^{n} = a_{j}|X_{S} = a_{i}) = \sum_{q=1}^{T} p(\hat{X}_{S}^{n} = a_{j}|X_{S} = a_{i}, \hat{X}_{S}^{n-1} = a_{q})p(\hat{X}_{S}^{n-1} = a_{q}|X_{S} = a_{i}).$$
(25)

Define $\overline{\gamma}(n)|_{X_S=a_i, \hat{X}_S^{n-1}=a_q}$ as the effective SINR of *n*-th iteration when the case $\hat{X}_S^{n-1} = a_q$ with $X_S = a_i$ occurs and substitute it into (24), it follows

$$p(\hat{X}_{S}^{n} = a_{j}|X_{S} = a_{i}, \hat{X}_{S}^{n-1} = a_{q}) = f_{i,j}(\overline{\gamma}(n)|_{X_{S} = a_{i}, \hat{X}_{S}^{n-1} = a_{q}}).$$
(26)

Then, by substituting the derived effective SINR upper bounds for T^2 data detection results in (21) into (26), it follows

$$\begin{cases} p(\hat{X}_{S}^{n} = a_{j} | X_{S} = a_{i}, \hat{X}_{S}^{n-1} = a_{q}) \geq f_{i,j}(\gamma_{i,q}), i \neq j, \\ p(\hat{X}_{S}^{n} = a_{j} | X_{S} = a_{i}, \hat{X}_{S}^{n-1} = a_{q}) \leq f_{i,j}(\gamma_{i,q}), i = j. \end{cases}$$

$$(27)$$

Define $P_{i,j} = \lim_{n \to \infty} p(\hat{X}_S^n = a_j | X_S = a_i)$ as the asymptotic detection probability of the desired data in data transmission stage. Similar to the analysis for the BER of BPSK modulation in (56), we substitute (27) into (25), and $\{P_{i,j}\}_{i,j=1}^T$ should satisfy the following constrains, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} P_{i,j} \ge \sum_{q=1}^{T} f_{i,j}(\gamma_{i,q}) P_{i,q}, \ i \neq j \\ P_{i,j} \le \sum_{q=1}^{T} f_{i,j}(\gamma_{i,q}) P_{i,q}, \ i = j \\ \sum_{i=1}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{T} P_{i,j} = 1. \end{cases}$$
(28)

Define P_b as the BER of the desired data in data transmission stage, and then P_b is determined by $\{P_{i,j}\}_{i,j=1}^T$, i.e.,

$$P_b = \frac{1}{\log_2 T} \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^T \alpha(i, j) P_{i,j},$$
(29)

where $\alpha(i, j)$ is the number of bit errors caused by the data detection result $\hat{X}_S = a_j$ with the desired data $X_S = a_i$. Combing (28) and (29), we conclude that P_b is lower bounded, and the lower bound is determined by $\{P_{i,j}\}_{i,j=1}^T$ satisfying the constraints in (28).

V. NUMERICAL AND SIMULATION RESULTS

This section presents the simulations for the considered two-stage joint SI cancellation and data detection framework and its theoretical BER bound. For the considered two-stage framework, we adopt the least square estimation and the maximum likelihood detection algorithms to verify its performance [1].

Two transceivers are considered to simultaneously transmit and receive the BPSK data in the same frequency-band. We set the number of OFDM subcarriers N as 1024, the length of cyclic prefix as 32, the subcarrier spacing f_{sub} as 10 kHz, and the sample time $T_s = 1/(f_{sub} \cdot N) = 10^{-7}$ s. The number of multipath SoI channel taps is $L_s = 20$, and the number of pilots in one OFDM symbol is M = 40. The phase noise at both Nodes 1 and 2 are modeled as independent identically

A. BER versus SNR and Iterations



Fig. 4: BER versus SNR under different SI cancellation methods with INR = 40 dB and $\Delta f = 10^{-4}$.

Fig. 4 compares the BER performance of the considered two-stage framework and an SI cancellation method with ICI suppression (SC-ICI) in [24]. The SC-ICI method suppresses both the CPE and ICI of the phase noise and treats the SoI as the interference in the SI cancellation process. Thus, the SI cancellation ability of SC-ICI is limited by the power of SoI. From this figure, it is first observed that the BER performance of the considered two-stage framework is close to and consistent with its theoretical BER lower bound derived in (23), which verifies our analysis in section IV and validates the feasibility of this framework. Then, it is further observed that the considered two-stage scheme outperforms the SC-ICI method under different SNR scenarios, due to the fact that the two-stage framework considers the joint SI cancellation and SoI data detection, which suppresses the SoI interference in the SI cancellation process, and thus our method is better than the SC-ICI method under certain scenarios.

The BER performance of the considered two-stage scheme versus numbers of iterations is shown in Fig. 5. From this figure, it is observed that in all scenarios with different SNRs and INRs, the BER of the considered two-stage scheme decreases and quickly converges after 4 to 6 iterations. Besides, we notice that the converged BER performance for the scenarios of SNR = 20 dB/INR = 40 dB and SNR = 30 dB/INR = 50 dB are almost identical, which implies that the BER performance is related to the ratio between the SNR and INR. We also noticed



Fig. 5: BER versus numbers of iterations under different SNR and INR with $\Delta f = 10^{-4}$.



Fig. 6: BER versus SNR under different numbers of iterations with INR = 40 dB and $\Delta f = 10^{-4}$.

that the converged BER for the scenario of SNR = 30 dB/INR = 40 dB is smaller than the other two scenarios, which implies that lager ratio between the SNR and INR leads to smaller BER.

Fig. 6 plots the BER performance of the considered two-stage scheme as a function of SNR under different numbers of iterations. From this figure, it is observed that as the SNR increases from 0 dB to 25 dB, the BER performance with only one iteration slowly drops from $10^{-0.5}$ to 10^{-1} , and the BER performance with 6 iterations, which is close to and consistent with the theoretical BER lowered bound derived in (23), significantly drops from $10^{-0.5}$ to $10^{-2.2}$. It is also observed from this figure that only 6 iterations are sufficient to achieve almost all the performance gain.

B. Estimation MSE

Fig. 7 plots the estimation MSE of the SI phase noise as a function of SNR under different numbers of iterations. From the plot, it is observed that as the SNR increases from 0 dB to 25 dB, the MSE monotonically increases from about $10^{-4.8}$ to 10^{-3} . This phenomena can be explained by the analysis in section IV-B and Appendix A: According to (32) and (43), the SI phase noise estimation MSE lower bound is proportionally related to the power of the noise **e** defined in (13), i.e., $\sigma_e^2 = \lambda_I E_{h_I} E_I + \lambda_S E_{h_S} E_S + \sigma_w^2$, and thus when the SNR becomes larger, $\lambda_S E_{h_S} E_S$ becomes larger and the estimation MSE of the SI phase noise tends to increase.

The estimation MSE of the SI phase noise is shown in Fig. 8, with different numbers of iterations and SNRs. From this figure, it is observed that in all scenarios with different SNRs, the MSE tends to decrease and converge with the increasing of iterations. Besides, we notice



Fig. 7: Estimation MSE of the SI phase noise versus SNR under different numbers of iterations, with INR = 40 dB and $\Delta f = 10^{-4}$.



Fig. 8: Estimation MSE of the SI phase noise versus numbers of iterations under different SNR, with INR = 40 dB and $\Delta f = 10^{-4}$.

that for the case with larger SNR, the SI phase noise estimation performance, in terms of the estimation MSE, has smaller gain from the iterations. For example, under the scenario with SNR = 30 dB, the converged MSE is very close to the MSE with only one iteration. In other words, the estimation performance cannot benefit from the iterations under the scenario with high SNR.

C. Phases Noise Effect



Fig. 9: BER versus Δf under different SNRs with INR = 40 dB.



Fig. 10: BER versus SNR under different Δf with INR = 40 dB.

Fig. 9 shows the simulation results for the BER of the considered scheme versus the relative bandwidth Δf under different SNRs. In all scenarios with different SNRs, as Δf increases from 10^{-5} to 10^{-2} , the BER significantly increases. This phenomena can be interpreted by the analysis



Fig. 11: Estimation MSE of the SI phase noise versus Δf under different SNR with INR = 40 dB.

of the SINR upper bound in section IV-B: The effective SINR is limited by the power of the residual SI phase noise, which increases monotonically with Δf according to the analysis in appendix D. Therefore, when Δf increases, the power of the residual SI phase noise increases with it, the effective SINR decreases with the increase of the power of the residual SI phase noise, and the BER increases with the decrease of the SINR. It is concluded that Δf is a key parameter which influences the data detection performance of the considered scheme.

Fig. 10 compares the BER of the considered scheme with its theoretical BER lower bound derived in (23), under different SNRs and Δf . From this figure, it is observed that in all scenarios with different Δf , the BER performance of the considered scheme are all highly close to and consistent with the theoretical BER lower bound. Besides, we can also observe that when Δf is smaller, the gap between the simulations and the corresponding lower bound is also smaller.

Fig. 11 shows the estimation MSE of the SI phase noise versus Δf under different SNRs. It is observed from this figure that in all scenarios with different SNRs, as Δf increases from 10^{-5} to 10^{-2} , the estimation MSE significantly increases. Besides, we can also observe that in the scenario with larger SNR, the estimation MSE is less sensitive to the variation of Δf . For example, when Δf increases from 10^{-5} to 10^{-2} , for the case with SNR = 0 dB, the MSE increases from about 10^{-5} to 10^{-3} , while for the case with SNR = 25 dB, the MSE only increases from about $10^{-3.1}$ to about $10^{-2.8}$.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a two-stage framework is considered to jointly suppress the strong SI and detect the desired data for a FD two-way OFDM system. The first stage is the SI channel estimation, wherein the joint channel and phase noise estimation is proposed to obtain the estimation of SI channel. The second stage is the data transmission, wherein an iterative structure with feed back is proposed to jointly detect the desired data and estimate the unknown SoI channel and SI phase noise. The estimation MSE lower bounds for the channel and phase noise in each iteration are first derived. Then, by subsisting the MSE lower bounds into the SINR expression that related to the channel and phase noise estimation MSE, the upper bound of the SINR in each iteration is computed. Finally, by exploiting the transition information of the detection errors between two adjacent iterations, we derive the closed-form expression of the BER lower bound for BPSK modulation and then extend the analysis to a more general case with arbitrary modulation schemes. The derived universal BER lower bound is also independent of any specific estimation and detection methods. In the future, we will further investigate the joint SI cancellation and data detection for the multi-antenna FD systems.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.1

According to the considered framework shown in Fig. 3, in the *n*-th iteration of the data transmission stage, n > 1, we utilize the known \mathbf{x}_{I} , \mathbf{h}_{I} , and the reconstructed symbol $\mathbf{\hat{x}}_{\mathbf{S}_{n-1}} = \mathbf{S}_{p}\mathbf{x}_{p} + \mathbf{S}_{d}\mathbf{\hat{x}}_{d_{n-1}}$, where $\mathbf{\hat{x}}_{d_{n-1}}$ is the detection results of \mathbf{x}_{d} in the (n - 1)-th iteration, to estimate \mathbf{j}'_{I} and \mathbf{h}_{D} . Thus, it indicates that the estimation performance in the *n*-th iteration is affected by the data detection result in the (n - 1)-th iteration.

In the *n*-th iteration, by using (8) and (10), the received signal in (11) is rewritten as

$$y = T_{I}S_{I}j'_{I} + H_{D}\hat{x}_{S_{n-1}} + H_{D}(x_{S} - \hat{x}_{S_{n-1}}) + e$$

$$= T_{I}S_{I}j'_{I} + H_{D}\hat{x}_{S_{n-1}} + H_{D}S_{d}(x_{d} - \hat{x}_{d_{n-1}}) + e.$$
(30)

It is easy to observe that the detection error between the desired data symbol \mathbf{x}_{d} and the corresponding detection result $\mathbf{\hat{x}}_{d_{n-1}}$ from (n - 1)-th iteration will introduce certain noise in the estimation step of the n-th iteration. Thus, we rewrite the received signal in (30) as

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}} + \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{D}} \mathbf{\hat{x}}_{\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{n}-1}} + \mathbf{z},\tag{31}$$

where $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{d}_{n-1}})$ is the combined noise for the estimation of $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$ and $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}$ in the *n*-th iteration, and $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{N \times 1}, \frac{1}{N}\sigma_z^2\mathbf{I}_{N \times N})$, with

$$\sigma_z^2 = \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{z}\|^2]$$

= $\sigma_e^2 + (1 - \lambda_s) E_{h_s} d(n-1).$ (32)

Then, the parameter vector θ_1 , which contains all the unknown parameters to be estimated, is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1} = \left[\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{re}}^{T}, \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{im}}^{T}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{re}}^{T}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{im}}^{T}\right]^{T},$$
(33)

where

$$\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{re}}' = \mathfrak{R}\{\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}}'\}, \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{im}}' = \mathfrak{I}\{\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}}'\},$$

$$\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{re}} = \mathfrak{R}\{\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}\}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{im}} = \mathfrak{I}\{\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}\}.$$
(34)

The Fisher information matrix for θ_1 is given as [34]

$$\Gamma_{\theta_1} = -\mathbf{E} \left[\Delta_{\theta}^{\theta} \ln p(\mathbf{y}|\theta_1) \right], \tag{35}$$

where $\Delta_{\theta}^{\theta} f \triangleq \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} \right]^{T}$ denotes the second order partial derivative of function f with respect to vector θ .

Using (31), the conditional possibility density function of y given θ_1 is derived as

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) = \frac{1}{(\pi\sigma_z^2)^N} \times \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{\sigma_z^2}(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{u})^H(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{u})\right\},\tag{36}$$

where \mathbf{u} is defined from (31) as

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}$$
(37)
= $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}} + \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{D}} \mathbf{\hat{x}}_{\mathbf{S}_{n-1}}.$

By substituting (37) into (36), Γ_{θ_1} is calculated as

$$\Gamma_{\theta_1} = \frac{2}{\sigma_z^2} \mathbf{E} \left[\Re \left[\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \theta_1} \right)^H \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \theta_1^T} \right] \right], \tag{38}$$

where

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \theta_1^T} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{Ire}}^{\prime T}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{Iim}}^{\prime T}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{Dre}}^T} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{Dim}}^T} \end{bmatrix},\tag{39}$$

and by using (37), the partial derivative of **u** with respect to θ_1 is calculated by parts as

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{re}}}^{T}} = \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}}, \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{im}}}^{T}} = j \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}},$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{re}}}^{T}} = \text{diag} \{ \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{d}_{n-1}} \} \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{S}},$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{im}}}^{T}} = j \text{diag} \{ \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{d}_{n-1}} \} \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{S}}.$$
(40)

Then, the fisher information matrix of $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{l}}$, which is a sub-matrix of Γ_{θ_1} , is calculated as

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}}'} = \frac{2N}{\sigma_z^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\Re \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{re}}}'} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{re}}}'} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{re}}}'} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{rm}}}'} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{rm}}}'} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{rm}}}'} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{rm}}}'} \\ \end{bmatrix} \right\} \right]$$

$$= \frac{2N}{\sigma_z^2} \begin{bmatrix} \Re \{ \mathbf{C}_{K \times K} \} & -\Im \{ \mathbf{C}_{K \times K} \} \\ \Im \{ \mathbf{C}_{K \times K} \} & \Re \{ \mathbf{C}_{K \times K} \} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(41)$$

where the designed approximation factor K for the SI phase noise in the data transmission stage is set as $K = M - L_S$ (this is explained in section III-B in details). The lower bound for the estimation MSE of $\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}$ in the *n*-th iteration is given as

$$C_n = \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}} - \mathbf{\hat{j}}'_{\mathbf{I}_n}\|^2] \ge \operatorname{tr}\{\Gamma_{\mathbf{j}'_{\mathbf{I}}}^{-1}\} = \frac{\sigma_z^2}{N}\operatorname{tr}\{\mathbf{C}^{-1}\},\tag{42}$$

where

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}})^{H}\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}}]$$

= $E_{h_{I}}E_{I} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{K \times K}.$ (43)

Similarly, the fisher information of h_D is given as

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{h}\mathbf{D}} = \frac{2N}{\sigma_z^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\Re \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{e}}}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{e}}}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{e}}}} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{m}}}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{e}}}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{m}}}} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{e}}}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^H}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{m}}}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{m}}}} \end{bmatrix} \right\} \right]$$

$$= \frac{2N}{\sigma_z^2} \begin{bmatrix} \Re \{\mathbf{D}_{L_S \times L_S}\} & -\Im \{\mathbf{D}_{L_S \times L_S}\} \\ \Im \{\mathbf{D}_{L_S \times L_S}\} & \Re \{\mathbf{D}_{L_S \times L_S}\} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(44)$$

with the lower bound for the estimation MSE of h_D in the *n*-th iteration given as

$$D_n = \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}} - \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathbf{D}_n}\|^2] \ge \operatorname{tr}\{\Gamma_{\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}}^{-1}\} = \frac{\sigma_z^2}{N}\operatorname{tr}\{\mathbf{D}^{-1}\},\tag{45}$$

where

$$\mathbf{D} = \mathbb{E}[(\operatorname{diag}\{\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{p}}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{d}_{n-1}}\}\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{S}})^{H}\operatorname{diag}\{\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{p}}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{d}_{n-1}}\}\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{S}}]$$

$$= E_{S} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{L_{S} \times L_{S}}.$$
(46)

By using (32), and substituting (43) into (42) and (46) into (45), we prove Proposition 4.1.

APPENDIX B

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.2

Using (15), the average effective SINR of \mathbf{r}_n is given as [27]

$$\overline{\gamma}(n) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{s}\|^2]}{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{r}_n - \mathbf{s}\|^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{s} - \hat{\mathbf{s}}_n\|^2]}$$
(47)

where $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{\mathbf{n}} = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}^T \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{S}} \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathbf{D}_n}\} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}}$ is defined as the estimated SoI based on $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathbf{D}_n}$. It is noticed from (47) that the detection of the desired data $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}}$ from \mathbf{r}_n is interferenced by two factors, i.e., the residual SI $\mathbf{r}_n - \mathbf{s}$, and the SoI estimation error $\mathbf{s} - \hat{\mathbf{s}}_n$ introduced by the channel estimation error between $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathbf{D}_n}$ and $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}$. To compute (47), the power of the SoI is calculated based on (7) as

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{s}\|^{2}] = \mathbb{E}[\|\operatorname{diag}\{\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}^{T}\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{D}}\}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{d}}\|^{2}]$$

$$= \frac{Q}{N}(1 - \lambda_{S})E_{h_{S}}E_{S},$$
(48)

the power of the residual SI is calculated based on (15) as

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{r}_{n} - \mathbf{s}\|^{2}] = \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}^{T}\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{I}}(\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{I}}' - \mathbf{\hat{j}}_{\mathbf{I}_{n}}') + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}}^{T}\mathbf{e}\|^{2}]$$

$$= \frac{Q}{N}E_{h_{I}}E_{I}C_{n-1} + \frac{Q}{N}\sigma_{e}^{2},$$
(49)

and the power of the error between s and \hat{s}_n is calculated as

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{s} - \hat{\mathbf{s}}_{\mathbf{n}}\|^2] = \frac{Q}{N} D_n E_S.$$
(50)

By substituting (48), (49), and (50) into (47), $\overline{\gamma}(n)$ is first derived as

$$\overline{\gamma}(n) = \frac{(1 - \lambda_S)E_{h_S}E_S}{C_n E_{h_I} E_I + D_n E_S + \sigma_e^2},\tag{51}$$

where E_S , E_I , E_{h_I} , E_{h_S} , λ_I and λ_S are defined in (13).

It can be observed in (51) that after SI cancellation, the power of the residual receiver noise, which corresponds to the terms in the denominator of (51), can be divided into two parts: the

first part σ_e^2 comes from the parameters approximation error in (13), and is fixed across different iterations; and the second part $C_n E_{h_I} E_I + D_n E_S$ is from the noise introduced by the estimation MSE C_n and D_n . The derivation of the effective SINR upper bound is based on the utilization of the lower bounds for C_n and D_n in (14). It is observed that to compute $d(n-1) = ||\mathbf{x_d} - \hat{\mathbf{x}_{d_{n-1}}}||^2$ in (14), a total of Q data symbols in the desired data vector $\mathbf{x_d}$ along with their all possible detection results in $\hat{\mathbf{x}_{d_{n-1}}}$ should be considered, which is too complicated.

Since identical power is allocated to each OFDM subcarrier in the SI OFDM symbol and in the transmitted OFDM symbol from Node2, it's valid to consider that the received signal on all OFDM subcarriers statically have the identical data detection performance and the identical effective SINR. Therefore, we can omit the subcarrier indexes for the data symbols, and analyze the effective SINR of arbitrary subcarrier in the sequel. Similar to the definition of d(n - 1)in (14), we define $\overline{d}(n - 1) = |X_S - \hat{X}_S^{n-1}|^2$ as the square data detection error in one OFDM subcarrier, with X_S being the desired data symbol and \hat{X}_S^{n-1} being the detected X_S in the (n-1)-th iteration. By substituting $d(n - 1) = Q\overline{d}(n - 1)$ into (14), we have

$$\frac{1}{Q}C_n \ge \frac{(M-L_S)(\frac{1}{Q}\sigma_e^2 + (1-\lambda_S)E_{h_S}\overline{d}(n-1))}{NE_{h_I}E_I},$$

$$\frac{1}{Q}D_n \ge \frac{L_S(\frac{1}{Q}\sigma_e^2 + (1-\lambda_S)E_{h_S}\overline{d}(n-1))}{NE_S}.$$
(52)

By substituting (52) into (51), we derive the upper bound for the effective SINR of \mathbf{r}_n and prove Proposition 4.2.

APPENDIX C

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.3

By utilizing the two data detection results S_{n-1}^0 and S_{n-1}^1 for the BPSK modulation defined in (17), the BER in the *n*-th iteration, n > 1, is given as

$$P_{n} = p(S_{n}^{1})$$

$$= p(S_{n-1}^{0})p(S_{n}^{1}|S_{n-1}^{0}) + P(S_{n-1}^{1})p(S_{n}^{1}|S_{n-1}^{1})$$

$$= (1 - P_{n-1})p(S_{n}^{1}|S_{n-1}^{0}) + P_{n-1}p(S_{n}^{1}|S_{n-1}^{1}),$$
(53)

where P_n is the BER in the *n*-th iteration. Using (22), the conditional probability $p(S_n^1|S_{n-1}^0)$ and $p(S_n^1|S_{n-1}^1)$ is given as

$$p(S_n^1|S_{n-1}^0) = f(\gamma_{S_0}(n)), \ p(S_n^1|S_{n-1}^1) = f(\gamma_{S_1}(n)),$$
(54)

where $\gamma_{S_0}(n)$ and $\gamma_{S_1}(n)$ represent the effective SINR in the *n*-th iteration under the two cases S_{n-1}^0 and S_{n-1}^1 , respectively. By calculating the partial derivation of the BER function f(x) with respect to *x*, it is ready to see that f(x) is monotonically decreasing with respect to *x*. By using the effective SINR upper bound γ_0 and γ_1 derived in (18) for the two cases, we have that $f(\gamma_{S_0}(n))$ and $f(\gamma_{S_1}(n))$ are lower bounded, i.e.,

$$f(\gamma_{S_0}(n)) \ge f(\gamma_0), \ f(\gamma_{S_1}(n)) \ge f(\gamma_1).$$
 (55)

Define $P_b = \lim_{n \to \infty} P_n$. By substituting (54) into (53) and let $n \to \infty$, we can first obtain

$$P_{b} = \lim_{n \to \infty} (1 - P_{n-1}) f(\gamma_{S_{0}}(n)) + \lim_{n \to \infty} P_{n-1} f(\gamma_{S_{1}}(n))$$

= $(1 - P_{b}) f(\gamma_{S_{0}}(\infty)) + P_{b} f(\gamma_{S_{1}}(\infty)).$ (56)

By substituting (55) into (56), P_b is proved to be lower bounded, i.e.,

$$P_{b} \ge (1 - P_{b})f(\gamma_{0}) + P_{b}f(\gamma_{1})$$

$$\ge \frac{f(\gamma_{0})}{1 + f(\gamma_{0}) - f(\gamma_{1})},$$
(57)

which completes the proof.

APPENDIX D

PHASE NOISE MODELING AND COMPUTATION OF THE RESIDUAL PHASE NOISE POWER

In the simulation of this paper, according to many previous works [24], we simply model the phase noise as Wiener process [18], with $\sigma^2 = 4\pi\Delta f/N$ being the variance and Δf being the relative bandwidth of the phase noise, which reflects the quality of the oscillator [24].

From (4) and (13), we notice that the power of the frequency-domain SI phase noise and SoI phase noise are determined by the phase noise $\theta_R(t)$ in the receiver of Node 1, the phase noise $\theta_I(t)$ in the transmitter of Node 1, and the phase noise $\theta_S(t)$ in the transmitter of Node 2.

For simplify, we consider the case that all the oscillators at the transceivers of Nodes 1 and 2 have identical quality, and thus $\theta_R(t)$, $\theta_I(t)$, and $\theta_S(t)$ have the same variance σ_{θ}^2 . Both the

cases with two separate oscillators and one common oscillator at one transceiver are considered in the following analysis.

1) Separate Oscillators: Under the case that two separate oscillators are adopted at one transceiver, $\theta_R(t)$, $\theta_I(t)$, and $\theta_S(t)$ are independent of each other [25]. Using (4), the power of the frequency-domain SI phase noise in the *k*-th OFDM subcarrier is calculated as [18]

$$\mathbb{E}[|J_{I}[k]|^{2}] = \frac{1}{N^{2}} \sum_{p=0}^{N-1} \sum_{q=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}[e^{j(\theta_{I}(pT_{s}-t_{I})-\theta_{I}(qT_{s}-t_{I}))}]\mathbb{E}[e^{j(\theta_{R}(pT_{s})-\theta_{R}(qT_{s}))}]e^{-j\frac{2\pi}{N}k(p-q)}$$

$$= \frac{1}{N^{2}} \sum_{p=0}^{N-1} \sum_{q=0}^{N-1} e^{-\sigma_{\theta}^{2}|p-q|}e^{-j\frac{2\pi}{N}k(p-q)}$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} + \frac{2}{N^{2}} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (N-n)e^{-n\sigma_{\theta}^{2}} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi kn}{N}\right).$$
(58)

By using (58), the power of the residual SI phase noise, i.e., λ_I defined in (13), is given as

$$\lambda_{I} = \sum_{k=K}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}[|J_{I}[k]|^{2}]$$

$$= 1 - \frac{K}{N} + \frac{2}{N^{2}} \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (N-n) e^{-n\sigma_{\theta}^{2}} \sum_{k=K}^{N-1} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi kn}{N}\right) \right\}.$$
(59)

Since all oscillators are considered to have identical quality, the power of the SoI phase noise in the k-th OFDM subcarrier, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[|J_S[k]|^2]$, is identical to $\mathbb{E}[|J_I[k]|^2]$. Then, by substituting K = 1 into (59), the power of the residual SoI phase noise, i.e., λ_S defined in (13), is given as

$$\lambda_{S} = 1 - \frac{1}{N} + \frac{2}{N^{2}} \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (N-n) e^{-n\sigma_{\theta}^{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi kn}{N}\right) \right\}$$
$$= \frac{1}{N^{2}} \left[2 \frac{e^{-(N+1)\sigma_{\theta}^{2}} - (N+1)e^{-\sigma_{\theta}^{2}} + N}{\left(e^{-\sigma_{\theta}^{2}} - 1\right)^{2}} - N \right].$$
(60)

2) Common Oscillator: Under the case that one common oscillator is adopted at one transceiver, $\theta_S(t)$ is still independent of $\theta_R(t)$ and $\theta_I(t)$, while $\theta_R(t) = \theta_I(t)$. Since the relationship between $\theta_S(t)$ and $\theta_R(t)$ in this case is the same as the above separate oscillators case, it follows that λ_S have the identical value in both the separate oscillators case and common oscillator case.

Under the common oscillator case, the power of the frequency SI phase noise in the k-th

OFDM subcarrier is first computed as

$$\mathbb{E}[|J_{I}[k]|^{2}] = \frac{1}{N^{2}} \sum_{p=0}^{N-1} \sum_{q=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}[e^{j(\theta_{1}^{p,q} + \theta_{2}^{p,q})}]e^{-j\frac{2\pi}{N}k(p-q)},$$
(61)

where $\theta_1^{p,q} = \theta_I(pT_s) - \theta_I(qT_s)$, and $\theta_2^{p,q} = \theta_I(pT_s - t_I) - \theta_I(qT_s - t_I)$. To simplify the analysis, we assume $p \ge q$ without loss of generality. If $t_I > NT_s$, for any $p, q \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1\}$, we have $t_I \ge (p-q)T_s$, and $qT_s - t_I < pT_s - t_I < qT_s < pT_s$. Thus, $\theta_1^{p,q}$ and $\theta_2^{p,q}$ are independent of each other, and thus $\mathbb{E}[|J_I[k]|^2]$ and λ_I are also identical to their values in the above separate oscillators case.

If $t_I < NT_s$, for $p, q \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1\}$, some of them still satisfy $t_I > (p-q)T_s$ and the others satisfy $t_I \le (p-q)T_s$. When $t_I \le (p-q)T_s$, we have that $qT_s - t_I < qT_s < pT_s - t_I < pT_s$, which means there is an overlap between $\theta_1^{p,q}$ and $\theta_2^{p,q}$. When $t_I \le (p-q)T_s$, to capitulate the SI phase noise power with this overlap , we rewrite $\theta_1^{p,q} + \theta_2^{p,q}$ as the sum of three independent item, i.e.,

$$\theta_1^{p,q} + \theta_2^{p,q} = [\theta_I(qT_s) - \theta_I(qT_s - t_I)] + 2[\theta_I(pT_s - t_I) - \theta_I(qT_s)] + [\theta_I(pT_s) - \theta_I(pT_s - t_I)].$$
(62)

Then, according to the above analysis, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{j(\theta_1^{p,q}+\theta_2^{p,q})}] = \begin{cases} e^{-\sigma_\theta^2|p-q|}, & p-q < \alpha_I, \\ e^{-\sigma_\theta^2(|\alpha_I|+|p-q-\alpha_I|)}, & p-q \ge \alpha_I, \end{cases}$$
(63)

where $\alpha_I = \lfloor t_I/T_s \rfloor$ is the relative SI transmission delay. By substituting (62) into (61), the power of the frequency SI phase noise is calculated as

$$\mathbb{E}[|J_{I}[k]|^{2}] = \frac{2}{N^{2}} \sum_{p=0}^{N-1} \sum_{q>p-\alpha_{I}}^{N-1} e^{-\sigma_{\theta}^{2}|p-q|} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi k(p-q)}{N}\right) - \frac{1}{N^{2}} e^{-\sigma_{\theta}^{2}\alpha_{I}} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi k\alpha_{I}}{N}\right) + \frac{2}{N^{2}} \sum_{p=0}^{N-1} \sum_{q\leq p-\alpha_{I}}^{N-1} e^{-\sigma_{\theta}^{2}(|\alpha_{I}|+|p-q-\alpha_{I}|)} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi k(p-q)}{N}\right).$$
(64)

REFERENCES

- M. He and C. Huang, "Self-interference cancellation and data detection for full-duplex communications," in 2019 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM), Dec. 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [2] A. C. Cirik, Y. Rong, and Y. Hua, "Achievable rates of full-duplex MIMO radios in fast fading channels with imperfect channel estimation," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 62, no. 15, pp. 3874–3886, Aug. 2014.

- [3] C. Psomas, M. Mohammadi, I. Krikidis, and H. A. Suraweera, "Impact of directionality on interference mitigation in full-duplex cellular networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 487–502, 2017.
- [4] E. Ahmed and A. M. Eltawil, "All-digital self-interference cancellation technique for full-duplex systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 3519–3532, Jul. 2015.
- [5] Y. Hua, P. Liang, Y. Ma, A. C. Cirik, and Q. Gao, "A method for broadband full-duplex MIMO radio," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 19, no. 12, pp. 793–796, Dec. 2012.
- [6] V. Syrjala, M. Valkama, L. Anttila, T. Riihonen, and D. Korpi, "Analysis of oscillator phase-noise effects on self-interference cancellation in full-duplex OFDM radio transceivers," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 2977–2990, June 2014.
- [7] H. Alves, T. Riihonen, and H. A. Suraweera, Full-Duplex Communications for Future Wireless Networks. Springer, 2020.
- [8] A. Sabharwal, P. Schniter, D. Guo, D. W. Bliss, S. Rangarajan, and R. Wichman, "In-band full-duplex wireless: Challenges and opportunities," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 32, no. 9, pp. 1637–1652, Sep. 2014.
- [9] E. Everett, M. Duarte, C. Dick, and A. Sabharwal, "Empowering full-duplex wireless communication by exploiting directional diversity," in 2011 Conference Record of the Forty Fifth Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers (ASILOMAR), Nov. 2011, pp. 2002–2006.
- [10] E. Everett, A. Sahai, and A. Sabharwal, "Passive self-interference suppression for full-duplex infrastructure nodes," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 680–694, Feb. 2014.
- [11] M. Duarte, A. Sabharwal, V. Aggarwal, R. Jana, K. K. Ramakrishnan, C. W. Rice, and N. K. Shankaranarayanan, "Design and characterization of a full-duplex multiantenna system for wifi networks," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 1160–1177, Mar. 2014.
- [12] J. I. Choi, M. Jain, K. Srinivasan, P. Levis, and S. Katti, "Achieving single channel, full duplex wireless communication," in *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual international conference on Mobile computing and networking*, Sep. 2010, pp. 1–12.
- [13] M. Chung, M. S. Sim, D. K. Kim, and C. Chae, "Compact full duplex MIMO radios in D2D underlaid cellular networks: From system design to prototype results," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 16601–16617, Sep. 2017.
- [14] M. Duarte and A. Sabharwal, "Full-duplex wireless communications using off-the-shelf radios: Feasibility and first results," in 2010 Conference Record of the Forty Fourth Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers, Nov. 2010, pp. 1558–1562.
- [15] M. Duarte, C. Dick, and A. Sabharwal, "Experiment-driven characterization of full-duplex wireless systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 12, pp. 4296–4307, Dec. 2012.
- [16] E. Ahmed, A. M. Eltawil, and A. Sabharwal, "Self-interference cancellation with nonlinear distortion suppression for full-duplex systems," in 2013 Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers, Nov. 2013, pp. 1199–1203.
- [17] A. Sahai, G. Patel, C. Dick, and A. Sabharwal, "On the impact of phase noise on active cancellation in wireless full-duplex," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 4494–4510, Nov. 2013.
- [18] X. Quan, Y. Liu, S. Shao, C. Huang, and Y. Tang, "Impacts of phase noise on digital self-interference cancellation in full-duplex communications," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 65, no. 7, pp. 1881–1893, Apr. 2017.
- [19] A. Sahai, G. Patel, and A. Sabharwal, "Asynchronous full-duplex wireless," in 2012 Fourth International Conference on Communication Systems and Networks (COMSNETS 2012), Jan. 2012, pp. 1–9.
- [20] S. Shao, X. Quan, Y. Shen, and Y. Tang, "Effect of phase noise on digital self-interference cancellation in wireless full duplex," in 2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), May 2014, pp. 2759–2763.
- [21] A. Sahai, G. Patel, C. Dick, and A. Sabharwal, "Understanding the impact of phase noise on active cancellation in wireless

full-duplex," in 2012 Conference Record of the Forty Sixth Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers (ASILOMAR), Nov. 2012, pp. 29–33.

- [22] V. Syrjälä, K. Yamamoto, and M. Valkama, "Analysis and design specifications for full-duplex radio transceivers under rf oscillator phase noise with arbitrary spectral shape," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 65, no. 8, pp. 6782–6788, Aug. 2016.
- [23] T. Riihonen, P. Mathecken, and R. Wichman, "Effect of oscillator phase noise and processing delay in full-duplex OFDM repeaters," in 2012 Conference Record of the Forty Sixth Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers (ASILOMAR), Nov. 2012, pp. 1947–1951.
- [24] E. Ahmed and A. M. Eltawil, "On phase noise suppression in full-duplex systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1237–1251, Mar. 2015.
- [25] J. Choi, S. Kim, J. Lee, and Y. Kim, "Joint channel and phase noise estimation for full-duplex systems using the EM algorithm," in 2015 IEEE 81st Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC Spring), May 2015, pp. 1–5.
- [26] R. Li, A. Masmoudi, and T. Le-Ngoc, "Self-interference cancellation with phase-noise suppression in full-duplex systems," in 2015 IEEE 26th Annual International Symposium on Personal, Indoor, and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC), Aug. 2015, pp. 261–265.
- [27] Q. Zou, A. Tarighat, and A. H. Sayed, "Compensation of phase noise in OFDM wireless systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 5407–5424, Nov. 2007.
- [28] J. Bai, M. He, and C. Huang, "Self-interference channel estimation for full-duplex MIMO-OFDM systems with phase noise," in 2018 IEEE International Conference on Communications Workshops (ICC Workshops), May 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [29] X. Xiong, X. Wang, T. Riihonen, and X. You, "Channel estimation for full-duplex relay systems with large-scale antenna arrays," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 15, no. 10, pp. 6925–6938, 2016.
- [30] D. D. Lin, R. A. Pacheco, T. J. Lim, and D. Hatzinakos, "Joint estimation of channel response, frequency offset, and phase noise in OFDM," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing.*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 3542–3554, Sep. 2006.
- [31] T.-J. Lee and Y.-C. Ko, "Channel estimation and data detection in the presence of phase noise in MIMO-OFDM systems with independent oscillators," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 9647–9662, June 2017.
- [32] Z. Wang, P. Babu, and D. P. Palomar, "Effective low-complexity optimization methods for joint phase noise and channel estimation in OFDM," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing.*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 3247–3260, June 2017.
- [33] N. Shein, "Error probability for transmission of M-ary equicorrelated signals over a phase-incoherent rayleigh-fading channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 449–450, Jul. 1965.
- [34] T.-J. Lee and Y.-C. Ko, "Channel estimation and data detection in the presence of phase noise in mimo-ofdm systems with independent oscillators," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 9647–9662, 2017.