

Antenna Positioning and Beamforming Design for Movable-Antenna Enabled Multi-user Downlink Communications

Haoran Qin, Wen Chen, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Zhendong Li, Qingqing Wu, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Nan Cheng, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Fangjiong Chen, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—This paper investigates a multiple input single output (MISO) downlink communication system in which users are equipped with movable antennas (MAs). First, We adopt a field-response based channel model to characterize the downlink channel with respect to MAs' positions. Then, we aim to minimize the total transmit power by jointly optimizing the MAs' positions and beamforming matrix. To solve the resulting non-convex problem, we employ an alternating optimization (AO) algorithm based on penalty method and successive convex approximation (SCA) to obtain a sub-optimal solution. Numerical results demonstrate that the MA-enabled communication system perform better than conventional fixed position antennas.

Index Terms—Movable antenna (MA), antenna positioning, downlink communication, alternating optimization (AO).

I. INTRODUCTION

Fueled by the exponential proliferation of wireless applications, an escalating imperative arises for enhanced capacity within forthcoming sixth-generation (6G). In pursuit of this objective, multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) has been envisioned as a pivotal enabling technology. MIMO systems have the capability to facilitate concurrent transmissions of multiple data streams by leveraging the novel degrees of freedom (DoFs) within the spatial domain. They have a wide range of application scenarios in wireless communication and also combine well with other promising technologies [1]–[3]. Nonetheless, due to the stationary deployment of antennas in conventional MIMO systems, they are subject to random and uncontrolled channel fading, hindering the full exploitation of channel variations in the spatial field.

To overcome these inherent limitations, a novel antenna system, namely fluid antenna system (FAS) was proposed in [4], which allows the antenna position to be shaped freely over a one-dimensional (1D) line. Some researches have validated that FAS, even with a limited space can achieve a larger capacity and lower outage probability than multi-antenna maximum ratio combining (MRC) system when the number of candidate ports is sufficiently large [4], [5].

H. Qin, W. Chen, Z. Li and Q. Wu are with the Department of Electronic Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China (e-mail: haoranqin@sjtu.edu.cn; wenchen@sjtu.edu.cn; lizhendong@sjtu.edu.cn).

N. Cheng is with the State Key Laboratory of Integrated Services Networks, Xidian University, Xi'an 710071, China (e-mail: nancheng@xidian.edu.cn).

F. Chen is with the School of Electronic and Information Engineering, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 510640, China (e-mail: eefjchen@scut.edu.cn).

(Corresponding author: Wen Chen.).

However, the range of movement of the antenna in the FAS is limited to a line space. To further exploit the DoFs inherent in the continuous spatial domain for enhancing the communication performance, the concept of movable antennas (MAs) has recently emerged as a novel solution. In MA-enabled systems, each antenna element is connected to a RF chain via a flexible cable, permitting its physical placement to be modified within a 2D region through the utilization of electromechanical devices, such as stepper motors [6]. Inspired by this adaptability, the channel can be reconfigured so as to enhance communication performance through the optimization of the positions of multiple MAs [7].

With the aforementioned advantages, MA has garnered significant interest in the realm of wireless communication and multiple studies on MA are currently underway [7]–[9]. For instance, the authors in [7] proposed a new MA-enabled MIMO communication system and demonstrated that the using MAs increases channel capacity compared to MIMO systems with fixed position antenna (FPA). While [8] explored the base station (BS) equipped with several MAs for boosting multi-user uplink communication performances, [9] tackled a more practical problem by modelling the motion of the MAs as discrete movements. However, the majority of current researches focus on the deployment of MAs at the BS end, while research into the implementation of MA at the user is still in an early stage.

Inspired by the preceding discussion, this paper investigates joint design of beamforming and the position of MAs for a novel MA-enabled downlink multi-user communication system, in which the BS with FPA transmits data to multiple single MA users. In particular, the MA positioning at different users and transmit beamforming at the BS are jointly optimized to minimize the BS transmit power, as well as satisfy the minimum signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) and the limited moving region constraints. Since the resulting problem is non-convex with highly coupled variables, an alternating optimisation (AO) algorithm based on successive convex approximation (SCA) and penalty method is proposed to obtain a sub-optimal solution.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

As shown in Fig. 1, a BS equipped with total N FPAs serves K users, each of whom is equipped with a single MA moving in the local region \mathcal{C}_k . We describe its position as




Fig. 1. The MA-enabled multi-user downlink communication system.

$\mathbf{u}_k = [x_k, y_k]^T \in \mathcal{C}_k$, $1 \leq k \leq K$ by establishing a 2D local coordinate system. Similarly, the position of the n -th FPA at the BS can be represented as $\mathbf{v}_n = [x_n, y_n]^T$, $1 \leq n \leq N$. During the downlink transmission from the BS to users, the received signal of the user k can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{n}_k, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{W} = [\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_K] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K}$ is the beamforming matrix at the BS, and $\mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k) \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$ denotes the channel vector between the BS and user k . $\mathbf{s} = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_K]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times 1}$ represents the transmitted signals of the users with normalized power, i.e., $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^H) = \mathbf{I}_K$. $\mathbf{n}_k = [n_1, n_2, \dots, n_N]^T \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_N)$ is the additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) at the user k with the average noise power σ^2 .

For simplicity, we focus on one quasi-static fading block and the far field-response based channel model is adopted. Consequently, the angle-of-departure (AoD), the angle-of-arrival (AoA), and the amplitude of the complex coefficient for each channel path remain constant regardless of the varying positions of the MAs [10]. We assume that the channel from the BS to the user k has L_k^t transmit paths and L_k^r receive paths. For user k , the signal propagation difference for the i -th transmit path between the n -th FPA position $\mathbf{t}^{2D} = [x_n, y_n]^T$ and original point $\mathbf{o}_t = [0, 0]^T$ can be described as $\rho_{k,i}^t(\mathbf{v}_n) = x_n \sin \theta_{k,i}^t \cos \phi_{k,i}^t + y_n \cos \theta_{k,i}^t$, where $\theta_{k,i}^t$ and $\phi_{k,i}^t$ are denoted as elevation and azimuth AoDs respectively. Thus its corresponding phase difference is $\frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \rho_{k,i}^t(\mathbf{v}_n)$, where λ is the carrier wavelength. Accordingly, we can obtain transmit field response vector (FRV) of the n -th FPA at the BS as following

$$\mathbf{g}_k(\mathbf{v}_n) = \left[e^{j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \rho_{k,1}^t(\mathbf{v}_n)}, e^{j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \rho_{k,2}^t(\mathbf{v}_n)}, \dots, e^{j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \rho_{k,L_k^t}^t(\mathbf{v}_n)} \right]^T. \quad (2)$$

Similarly, the receive FRV of the user k is given by

$$\mathbf{f}_k(\mathbf{u}_k) = \left[e^{j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \rho_{k,1}^r(\mathbf{u}_k)}, e^{j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \rho_{k,2}^r(\mathbf{u}_k)}, \dots, e^{j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \rho_{k,L_k^r}^r(\mathbf{u}_k)} \right]^T, \quad (3)$$

where $\theta_{k,j}^r$ and $\phi_{k,j}^r$ are the elevation and azimuth AoAs of the j -th receive path for user k . Moreover, we define a path response matrix (PRM) $\Sigma_k \in \mathbb{C}^{L_k^r \times L_k^t}$, and element $\Sigma_k[m, n]$ represents the channel response between the BS origin and the receiving origin, where the signal departs from the n -th

transmit path and is received at the m -th receive path. Thus, we describe the channel from the BS to the k -th receiver as following

$$\mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k) = \left(\mathbf{f}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \Sigma_k \mathbf{G}_k \right)^T, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{G}_k = [\mathbf{g}_k(\mathbf{v}_1), \mathbf{g}_k(\mathbf{v}_2), \dots, \mathbf{g}_k(\mathbf{v}_N)]$ is the field-response matrix (FRM) at the BS. Therefore, the receive SINR of the user k can be described as

$$\gamma_k = \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_k|^2}{\sum_{q=1, q \neq k}^K |\mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q|^2 + \sigma^2}, \quad \forall k. \quad (5)$$

In this paper, we aim to minimize the transmit power of the BS by jointly optimizing the beamforming vector and the position of each user's MA. Thus the corresponding optimization problem can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(P0)} \quad & \min_{\{\mathbf{w}_k, \mathbf{u}_k\}} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{w}_k\|^2, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_k|^2}{\sum_{q=1, q \neq k}^K |\mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q|^2 + \sigma^2} \geq \gamma_k, \quad \forall k, \\ & \mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{C}_k, \quad \forall k, \end{aligned} \quad (6a) \quad (6b)$$

where constraint (6a) represents the minimum SINR requirement of each user and constraint (6b) is the limited moving region constraint of MAs. Evidently, given the non-convex nature of both constraint (6a) and the objective function, this problem is inherently non-convex and poses a challenge for direct solution.

III. JOINT ANTENNA POSITION AND BEAMFORMING DESIGN ALGORITHM

In this section, the AO algorithm based on penalty method is proposed to solve (P0). To be specific, we decompose the penalized problem into three sub-problems and alternately optimize them until the total objective function achieving convergence. In addition, the penalty factor is gradually updated until all constraints are approximately satisfied. To this end, we first introduce auxiliary variables and the original problem can be equivalently transformed into (P1) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(P1)} \quad & \min_{\{\mathbf{w}_k, \mathbf{u}_k\}} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{w}_k\|^2, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \frac{|t_{k,k}|^2}{\sum_{q=1, q \neq k}^K |t_{k,q}|^2 + \sigma^2} \geq \gamma_k, \quad \forall k, \\ & t_{k,q} = \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q, \quad \forall k, q, \\ & \mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{C}_k, \quad \forall k. \end{aligned} \quad (7a) \quad (7b) \quad (7c)$$

The variables $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}$, $\{\mathbf{u}_k\}$ are coupled with each other in newly introduced equality constraints. To address this issue, we integrate these constraints into the objective function based on the penalty function approach. In particular, we formulate

the following optimization problem by transforming these equality constraints into quadratic functions and subsequently incorporating them into the objective function as penalty terms

$$(P2) \quad \min_{\{\mathbf{w}_k, \mathbf{u}_k, t_{k,q}\}} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{w}_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\rho} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{q=1}^K \left| \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q - t_{k,q} \right|^2 \right),$$

s.t. (7a), (7c), (8a)

where $\rho > 0$ represents the penalty factor employed to penalize the deviation from equality constraints in (P1). It is noteworthy that even though the equality constraints are relaxed in (P2), as $\rho \rightarrow 0$, the solution derived from solving (P2) typically adheres to the constraints in (P1).

A. Alternating Optimization Algorithm for Solving (P2)

1) Subproblem with respect to $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}$: For any given variables $\{\mathbf{u}_k\}, \{t_{k,q}\}$, (P2) can be transformed into (P3).

$$(P3) \quad \min_{\{\mathbf{w}_k\}} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{w}_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\rho} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{q=1}^K \left| \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q - t_{k,q} \right|^2 \right). \quad (9)$$

Since this is an unconstrained quadratic convex problem, we can obtain the optimal transmit beamforming vector \mathbf{w}_k by equating the first-order partial derivative of the objective function with respect to \mathbf{w}_k to zero, which has the closed-form solution as following

$$\mathbf{w}_k^* = \frac{1}{2\rho} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \left(\sum_{q=1}^K t_{q,k} \mathbf{h}_q(u_q)^* \right), \forall k, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{2\rho} \sum_{q=1}^K \mathbf{h}_q(\mathbf{u}_q) \mathbf{h}_q(\mathbf{u}_q)^H$. Since all \mathbf{w}_k for different users in the objective function are separated from each other, they can be updated simultaneously according to the above equation.

2) Subproblem with $\{t_{k,q}\}, \forall k, q$: For any given beamforming vector $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}$ and the MA's position $\{\mathbf{u}_k\}$, we solve (P2) with constraint (7a) to optimize auxiliary variables $\{t_{k,q}\}$. It is not difficult to observe that the auxiliary variables of different users are separated from each other, so the resulting problem can be split into K independent parallel subproblems to be solved at the same time. In particular, by ignoring constant items, the corresponding subproblem for user k can be simplified to

$$(P4) \quad \min_{\{t_{k,q}, \forall q\}} \sum_{q=1}^K |\bar{t}_{k,q} - t_{k,q}|^2,$$

s.t. $\frac{|t_{k,k}|^2}{\sum_{q=1, q \neq k}^K |t_{k,q}|^2 + \sigma^2} \geq \gamma_k, \quad (11a)$

where $\bar{t}_{k,q} = \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q$, $k, q = 1, 2, \dots, K$. (P4) is a non-convex quadratic constrained quadratic programming

problem (QCQP) with only one constraint. Nonetheless, [11] has demonstrated that this non-convex problem exhibit strong duality, implying that the optimal solution can be determined through the Lagrangian duality method. Let $\lambda_k \geq 0, \forall k$ represent the dual variables, then the Lagrangian duality function corresponding to (P4) is expressed as follows

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda_k, \{t_{k,q}\}) = (1 - \lambda_k) |t_{k,k}|^2 + \sum_{q=1, q \neq k}^K (1 + \lambda_k \gamma_k) |t_{k,q}|^2 - 2 \sum_{q=1}^K \text{Re} \{ \bar{t}_{k,q} t_{k,q}^* \}. \quad (12)$$

Thus, the associated dual function can be written as $\mathcal{G}(\lambda_k) = \inf_{\{t_{k,q}\}} \mathcal{L}(\lambda_k, \{t_{k,q}\})$. By setting the first-order partial derivative of the Lagrangian function in (12) with respect to λ_k to zero, we can derive the optimal solution that minimizes $\mathcal{L}(\lambda_k, \{t_{k,q}\})$ as following

$$t_{k,k}^* = \frac{\bar{t}_{k,k}}{1 - \lambda_k}, \quad t_{k,q}^* = \frac{\bar{t}_{k,q}}{1 + \lambda_k \gamma_k}, \quad q \neq k. \quad (13)$$

When the constraint in (11a) satisfies the equation, by substituting the derived $t_{k,k}^*, t_{k,q}^*$ back (11a), this equality constraint can be transformed into another form as follows

$$\mathcal{F}(\lambda_k) = \frac{|\bar{t}_{k,k}|^2}{(1 - \lambda_k)^2} - \gamma_k \sum_{q=1, q \neq k}^K \frac{|\bar{t}_{k,q}|^2}{(1 + \lambda_k \gamma_k)^2} - \gamma_k \sigma^2 = 0. \quad (14)$$

It is easy to observe that $\mathcal{F}(\lambda_k)$ is a monotonically increasing function of λ_k in the region $0 \leq \lambda_k < 1$, so we can obtain the optimal duality variable by the bisection search [12]. However, if the constraint equation in (11a) doesn't hold, i.e., $\lambda_k = 0$, Eq. (13) degenerate to $t_{k,q}^* = \bar{t}_{k,q}, \forall k, q$.

3) Subproblem with $\{\mathbf{u}_k\}$: For any given variables $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}, \{t_{k,q}\}$, the antenna position $\{\mathbf{u}_k\}$ can be optimized by solving (P2) with constraint (7c). Given that the position variables for each user $\{\mathbf{u}_k\}$ are mutually independent, (P5) can be decomposed into parallel subproblems. For user k , the respective subproblem is as follows:

$$(P5) \quad \min_{\mathbf{u}_k} \sum_{q=1}^K \left| \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q - t_{k,q} \right|^2,$$

s.t. $\mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{C}_k, \forall k. \quad (15a)$

Since $\left| \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q - t_{k,q} \right|^2 = \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q \mathbf{w}_q^H \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k) - 2 \text{Re} \left\{ \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q t_{k,q}^* \right\} + |t_{k,q}|^2$, the objective function in (P5) can be transformed to Eq. (16), where we define

$$\mathbf{B}_k \triangleq \sum_q \mathbf{G}_k, \quad \mathbf{C}_{k,q} \triangleq \mathbf{B}_k^* \mathbf{w}_q \mathbf{w}_q^H \mathbf{B}_k^T, \quad \mathbf{d}_{k,q} \triangleq \mathbf{B}_k^* \mathbf{w}_q,$$

$$\xi(i, j, k) \triangleq \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} (\rho_{k,i}^r(\mathbf{u}_k) - \rho_{k,j}^r(\mathbf{u}_k)),$$

$$f_1(i, j, k, q) \triangleq 2 |\mathbf{C}_{k,q}(i, j)| \cos(\xi(i, j, k) + \angle \mathbf{C}_{k,q}(i, j)),$$

$$f_2(l, k, q) \triangleq 2 |t_{k,q}| |d_{k,q}^l| \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \rho_{k,l}^r(\mathbf{u}_k) + \angle d_{k,q}^l - \angle t_{k,q}\right).$$

To tackle the resulting non-convex problem, the successive convex approximation (SCA) method is employed to optimize

$$g(\mathbf{u}_k) = \sum_{q=1}^K \left(\mathbf{C}_{k,q}(1,1) + \mathbf{C}_{k,q}(2,2) + \cdots + \mathbf{C}_{k,q}(L_r, L_r) + \sum_{i=1}^{L_r-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{L_r} f_1(i, j, k, q) - \sum_{l=1}^{L_r} f_2(l, k, q) + |t_{k,q}|^2 \right) \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x_k^2} = \frac{4\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \sum_{q=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^{L_r} f_2(l, k, q) \sin^2 \theta_{k,l}^r \cos^2 \phi_{k,l}^r - \frac{4\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \sum_{q=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{L_r-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{L_r} f_1(i, j, k, q) (\sin \theta_{k,i}^r \cos \phi_{k,i}^r - \sin \theta_{k,j}^r \cos \phi_{k,j}^r)^2 \quad (17)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial y_k^2} = \frac{4\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \sum_{q=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^{L_r} f_2(l, k, q) \cos^2 \theta_{k,l}^r - \frac{4\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \sum_{q=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{L_r-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{L_r} f_1(i, j, k, q) (\cos \theta_{k,i}^r - \cos \theta_{k,j}^r)^2 \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x_k \partial y_k} &= \frac{4\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \sum_{q=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^{L_r} f_2(l, k, q) \sin \theta_{k,l}^r \cos \theta_{k,l}^r \cos \phi_{k,l}^r - \frac{4\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \sum_{q=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{L_r-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{L_r} f_1(i, j, k, q) \sin \theta_{k,i}^r \cos \phi_{k,i}^r (\cos \theta_{k,i}^r - \cos \theta_{k,j}^r) \\ &+ \frac{4\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \sum_{q=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{L_r-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{L_r} f_1(i, j, k, q) \sin \theta_{k,j}^r \cos \phi_{k,j}^r (\cos \theta_{k,i}^r - \cos \theta_{k,j}^r) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

the position of the MA for the k -th user. Drawing upon Taylor's theorem, we can construct a quadratic surrogate function that serves as a global upper bound for the objective function. Given the provided local point \mathbf{u}_k^i in the i -th iteration, an upper bound can be obtained as $g(\mathbf{u}_k) \leq g(\mathbf{u}_k^i) + \nabla g(\mathbf{u}_k^i)^T (\mathbf{u}_k - \mathbf{u}_k^i) + \frac{\delta_k}{2} (\mathbf{u}_k - \mathbf{u}_k^i)^T (\mathbf{u}_k - \mathbf{u}_k^i)$, which is achieved through the introduction of a positive real number δ_k such that $\delta_k \mathbf{I}_2 \succeq \nabla^2 g(\mathbf{u}_k)$. Since $\|\nabla^2 g(\mathbf{u}_k)\|_F^2 \leq \|\nabla^2 g(\mathbf{u}_k)\|_F^2 = \left(\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x_k^2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x_k \partial y_k}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial y_k^2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial y_k \partial x_k}\right)^2$, the δ_k can be selected by calculating the Frobenius norm of the Hessian matrix of $g(\mathbf{u}_k)$. According to Eq. (17)-Eq. (19), we obtain the δ_k as following:

$$\delta_k = \frac{16\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \sum_{q=1}^K \left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_r} |t_{k,q}| |d_{k,q}^l| + \sum_{i=1}^{L_r-1} \sum_{j=1}^{L_r} |\mathbf{C}_{k,q}(i, j)| \right). \quad (20)$$

In this way, (P5) is reduced to (P6).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(P6)} \quad \min_{\mathbf{u}_k} \quad & g(\mathbf{u}_k^i) + \nabla g(\mathbf{u}_k^i)^T (\mathbf{u}_k - \mathbf{u}_k^i) \\ & + \frac{\delta_k}{2} (\mathbf{u}_k - \mathbf{u}_k^i)^T (\mathbf{u}_k - \mathbf{u}_k^i), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{C}_k. \end{aligned} \quad (21a)$$

Since the objective function of (P6) is a quadratic convex function with respect to \mathbf{u}_k , ignoring the constraints leads to a closed-form solution with the global minimum solution $\mathbf{u}_k^* = \mathbf{u}_k^i - \frac{\nabla g(\mathbf{u}_k^i)}{\delta_k}$. If \mathbf{u}_k^* satisfies the constraints in (P6), then it is the optimal solution to problem (P6). Otherwise, since the antenna moving region \mathcal{C}_k is a linear region, thus the problem is a quadratic programming (QP) problem and a local solution can be obtained by using CVX.

B. Update Penalty Coefficient

Considering that the equality constraints in (P1) should be held when our proposed algorithm converged. Therefore, the

penalty coefficient is gradually decreased as following $\rho := c\rho$, $0 < c < 1$, where c is a constant scaling factor.

Drawing upon the derivations presented above, the proposed algorithm for joint antenna position and beamforming design is summarized in **Algorithm 1** straightforwardly. In the inner layer, the optimization variables $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}$, $\{t_{k,q}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{u}_k\}$ are alternately updated until convergence of the objective function is achieved. In the outer layer, an indicator ξ is defined as $\xi = \max \left\{ \left| \mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}_k)^H \mathbf{w}_q - x_{k,q} \right|^2, \forall k, q \right\}$ and the penalty coefficient ρ is updated until ξ is below a threshold.

Algorithm 1 Joint antenna position and beamforming design algorithm

- 1: **repeat**
 - 2: **repeat**
 - 3: Obtain the transmit precoders by solving (P3).
 - 4: Obtain the auxiliary variables by solving (P4).
 - 5: Obtain the optimal antenna position by solving (P6).
 - 6: **until** The fractional decrease of the objective value is below a threshold ε_1 .
 - 7: Update the penalty coefficient ρ .
 - 8: **until** The constraint violation ξ is below a threshold ε_2 .
-

IV. SIMULATION RESULTS

In the simulations, we contemplate a scenario in which a BS with FPA array comprising $N = 16$ elements serves K users, each of whom is equipped with a single MA. The distance between user k and the BS is assumed to be a random variable following uniform distributions from 20 to 100 meters (m). The moving region for MAs at each user is set as a square area of size $A \times A$. Assuming that all users have the same number of transmit and receive paths, i.e., $L_k^t = L_k^r = 10$, $1 \leq k \leq K$. Set the PRM of each user is a diagonal matrix with each diagonal element following distribution $\mathcal{CN}(0, c_0 d_k^{-\alpha}/L)$, where $c_0 = -40$ dB denotes the expected value of the average channel gain




Fig. 2. Transmit power versus the minimum required SINR




Fig. 3. Transmit power versus the number of users.




Fig. 4. Transmit power versus the normalized region size for MA.

at the reference distance of 1 m, and $\alpha = 2.8$ represents the path-loss exponent. The noise variance of each user is set to -80 dBm. The elevation and azimuth AoAs/AoDs are assumed to be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) variables following the uniform distribution over $[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$.

We consider three baseline schemes for comparison. (1) FPA: the antenna of each user is fixed at the origin of its local coordinate system. (2) Alternating position selection (APS): the receive area is quantized into discrete locations with equal distance $D = \lambda/2$. (3) Maximum channel power (MCP): the MA of each user is deployed at the position which maximizes its channel power.

Fig. 2 shows the total BS transmit power required for the considered schemes versus the users' minimum required SINR values. Under the assumption $K = 6$ and $A = 2\lambda$, it is observed that the power increases as the SINR threshold increases, which means the BS needs more transmit power to meet the more stringent user quality of service requirements. Meanwhile, when the SINR is the same, our proposed algorithm can save more power than the three baseline schemes.

Fig. 3 studies the relationship between the transmit power and the number of users in different schemes under the setup $A = 2\lambda$, SINR=10 dB. It can be seen that as the number of users increases, the transmit power also increases for all schemes. This is attribute to the fact that the BS needs to consume more energy to mitigate the mutual interference between users. In addition, when the number of users increases, our proposed algorithm has better gain and the gap between the MA and FA and MCP schemes become larger.

Finally, Fig. 4 describes the change of transmit power with the normalized sizes for moving region under the setup $K = 6$, SINR=10 dB. It can be seen that as the size increases, our proposed algorithm decreases rapidly and stabilizes when $A = 2\lambda$. This is because that larger moving region brings more flexibility of MAs to reconfigure the channel, so that users can receive a stronger signal. In addition, the stabilisation at $A = 2\lambda$ implies that significant performance improvements can be achieved even when the antenna is moved within a relatively small area.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we investigate joint antenna location and beamforming design for MA-enabled multi-user downlink

communication system, in which multiple single MA users are served by a BS equipped with a FPA array. First, we characterize the multi-user downlink channel with respect to the position of each user's MA. Then, we formulate an optimization problem to minimize the BS transmit power under the constraints of the minimum SINR and limited antenna moving regions. To solve this non-convex problem, an AO algorithm based on penalty method and SCA was developed to obtain a suboptimal solution. Numerical simulation results validate the proposed algorithm for MA-enabled downlink multi-user communication systems can save more power compared to FPA based systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Zhang, W. Chen, Q. Wu, Z. Li, X. Zhu, and J. Yuan, "Intelligent omni surfaces assisted integrated multi target sensing and multi user MIMO communications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06605*, 2023.
- [2] X. Zhu, W. Chen, Z. Li, Q. Wu, Z. Zhang, K. Wang, and J. Li, "RIS-aided spatial scattering modulation for mmwave MIMO transmissions," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, 2023, early access, doi: 10.1109/TCOMM.2023.3314636.
- [3] F. Wang, W. Chen, H. Tang, and Q. Wu, "Joint optimization of user association, subchannel allocation, and power allocation in multi-cell multi-association OFDMA heterogeneous networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 65, no. 6, pp. 2672–2684, Jun. 2017.
- [4] K.-K. Wong, A. Shojaefard, K.-F. Tong, and Y. Zhang, "Fluid antenna systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 1950–1962, Mar. 2021.
- [5] K. K. Wong, A. Shojaefard, K.-F. Tong, and Y. Zhang, "Performance limits of fluid antenna systems," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 2469–2472, Nov. 2020.
- [6] L. Zhu, W. Ma, and R. Zhang, "Movable antennas for wireless communication: Opportunities and challenges," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02331*, 2023.
- [7] W. Ma, L. Zhu, and R. Zhang, "MIMO capacity characterization for movable antenna systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, 2023, early access, doi:10.1109/TWC.2023.3307696.
- [8] Z. Xiao, X. Pi, L. Zhu, X.-G. Xia, and R. Zhang, "Multiuser communications with movable-antenna base station: Joint antenna positioning, receive combining, and power control," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09512*, 2023.
- [9] Y. Wu, D. Xu, D. W. K. Ng, W. Gerstacker, and R. Schober, "Movable antenna-enhanced multiuser communication: Optimal discrete antenna positioning and beamforming," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02304*, 2023.
- [10] L. Zhu, W. Ma, and R. Zhang, "Modeling and performance analysis for movable antenna enabled wireless communications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05325*, 2022.
- [11] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004.
- [12] Q. Wu and R. Zhang, "Joint active and passive beamforming optimization for intelligent reflecting surface assisted SWIPT under QoS constraints," *IEEE J.Sel.Areas Commun.*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 1735–1748, Aug. 2020.