

Joint Angle and Delay Cramér-Rao Bound Optimization for ISAC

Chao Hu, Yuan Fang, *Member, IEEE* and Ling Qiu, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we study a multi-input multi-output (MIMO) beamforming design in an integrated sensing and communication (ISAC) system, in which an ISAC base station (BS) is used to communicate with multiple downlink users and simultaneously the communication signals are reused for sensing multiple targets. Our interested sensing parameters are the angle and delay information of the targets, which can be used to locate these targets. Under this consideration, we first derive the Cramér-Rao bound (CRB) for joint angle and delay estimation. Then, we optimize the transmit beamforming at the BS to minimize the CRB, subject to the communication rate requirement and the maximum transmit power constraint. In particular, we obtain the closed-form optimal solution in the case of single-target and single-user, and in the case of multi-target and multi-user scenario, the sparsity of the optimal solution is proven, leading to a reduction in computational complexity during optimization. The numerical results demonstrate that the optimized beamforming yields excellent positioning performance and effectively reduces the requirement for a large number of antennas at the BS.

Index Terms—Beamforming design, integrated sensing and communication (ISAC), positioning, Cramér-Rao bound (CRB).

I. INTRODUCTION

Integrated Sensing and Communication (ISAC) technology is considered one of the promising key technologies for 6G, garnering significant attention from both academia and industry [1]. By integrating sensing capabilities into the conventional cellular network, ISAC opens up numerous application possibilities, such as smart factories, drone monitoring, and intelligent transportation systems. These functionalities demand the system to possess the capability of actively locating targets, a task typically achieved using radar in the past.

Hence, it becomes imperative to investigate the positioning performance of ISAC. Compared with sensing-centric waveform design, communication signal-based waveform design can usually better meet the requirements of current high-speed communication, but it needs to maintain robust sensing performance [2], [3]. To precisely and appropriately define the purpose of sensing, [4], [5] introduced the Cramer-Rao bound (CRB) as a metric for sensing performance evaluation. The CRB enables the analysis of estimation performance for the required sensing parameters. However, their estimation approach often focuses on a single angle parameter or response

matrix parameter, which fails to capture the intricate relationship between sensing and communication. Notably, a single parameter may inadequately represent the multifaceted impact of complex functions, such as positioning.

Recently, [6] investigated a multi-base station cooperative positioning ISAC system that locates target through angle and delay estimation due to their excellent positioning performance. However, the sensing metric based on these estimations is still rarely considered in ISAC systems. Although a few articles like [7], [8] explored location-centered sensing metrics, they focused on radar-communication coexistence systems, relying on existing radar systems, besides, the former merely considered the estimation of angle for simplifying formula which is not enough to achieve location, the latter only analysed the performance of bound, but did not fully research the resource allocation. It is worth noting that while [6] first adopts the joint CRB of angle and delay in ISAC and accurately describes the positioning performance, it only considers a single antenna transmitter and studies energy allocation. In reality, current base stations (BSs) typically employ multiple antennas, and distributed structures impose high synchronization requirements on the system. Therefore, this paper addresses these challenges by minimizing the CRB for estimated angle and delay under rate and energy constraints, based on a multi-antenna monostatic BS system.

Specifically, we first derive the CRB for joint angle and delay estimation, and then formulate an beamforming design problem to minimize the CRB performance, while ensuring the communication rate requirement and the maximum power constraint. In the single-target and single-user scenario, we obtain a closed-form optimal solution based on orthogonal projection. In the case of multi-target and multi-user, we prove the sparsity of the solution, which extremely simplifies computational complexity. Simulations are conducted to demonstrate the accuracy and effectiveness of our analysis and optimization, and it reveals insightful results that is deserved to be further exploited.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

In this paper, we consider an ISAC system in which a BS is equipped with uniform linear array (ULA), containing N_t transmit antennas and N_r receive antennas ($N_t \leq N_r$). The whole downlink communication block is leveraged for performing the dual tasks of multiple radar targets localization and communication data transmission, as depicted in Fig. 1 where the angle of departure is assumed being equal to the angle of arrival [4]. Let $\mathcal{K} = \{1, \dots, K\}$ denote the set of communication users (CUs), and $\mathcal{Q} = \{1, \dots, Q\}$ denote that of sensing targets. The coordinates of the BS and the q -th target are denoted as (x_0, y_0) and (x_q, y_q) , respectively, $q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

This work is supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China under Grant 2022YFB2902302.

C. Hu and L. Qiu are with the Key Laboratory of Wireless Optical Communications, Chinese Academy of Sciences, School of Information Science and Technology, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230052, China (e-mail: sa21006191@mail.ustc.edu.cn; lqiu@ustc.edu.cn).

Y. Fang is with the School of Science and Engineering (SSE) and the Future Network of Intelligence Institute (FNii), The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, Shenzhen 518172, China (e-mail:fangyuan@cuhk.edu.cn).

Y. Fang and L. Qiu are corresponding authors.




Fig. 1. An illustration of the system.

For communication link, let $s_k(t)$ and $\mathbf{h}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times 1}$ denote the transmit signal and the channel vector from the BS to CU $k \in \mathcal{K}$, respectively, the former is a random variable with zero mean and unit variance, and the latter is assumed to be quasi-static and estimated perfectly. Then the received signal at CU k is expressed as

$$y_k(t) = \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{w}_k s_k(t) + \sum_{l \neq k, l \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{w}_l s_l(t) + n_k(t), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times 1}$ is the beamforming vector of the k -th CU, $n_k(t) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_k^2)$ denotes the noise at the receiver of CU k , which means that $n_k(t)$ is a circularly symmetric complex Gaussian (CSCG) random variable with zero mean and variance σ_k^2 . The corresponding achievable rate of k -th CU is given by $R = \log_2(1 + \gamma_k)$ where $\gamma_k = \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{w}_k|^2}{\sum_{l \neq k, l \in \mathcal{K}} |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{w}_l|^2 + \sigma_k^2}$, $\forall k \in \mathcal{K}$.

Next, we consider the sensing link, in which the communication signals $s_k(t)$'s are reused for sensing. Suppose that the radar processing is implemented over an interval \mathcal{T} with duration T , which is sufficiently long so that $\int_{\mathcal{T}} |s_k(t)|^2 dt = T \cdot \mathbb{E}[|s_k(t)|^2] = T$ and $\int_{\mathcal{T}} s_k(t) s_l^*(t) dt = T \cdot \mathbb{E}[s_k(t) s_l^*(t)] = 0$, $\forall k \neq l$ [6]. Then the reflected echoes received at the BS can be given in the form

$$\mathbf{r}(t) = \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_q \mathbf{a}(\theta_q) \mathbf{b}(\theta_q)^T \mathbf{w}_k s_k(t - \tau_q) + \mathbf{n}_r(t), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{n}_r(t) \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{N_r})$ denotes the complex additive white Gaussian noise, α_q is a complex amplitude capturing the effects of the target radar cross section (RCS) and the path loss for the radar propagation path between the BS and target q . θ_q is the azimuth angle of the q -th target relative to the BS, $\mathbf{b}(\theta_q) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times 1}$ and $\mathbf{a}(\theta_q) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_r \times 1}$ are transmit and receive steering vectors of the antenna array of the BS. Here, we choose the center of the ULA antennas as the reference point, which means the transmit steering vector and its derivative are expressed as $\mathbf{b}(\theta) = [e^{-j \frac{N_t-1}{2} \pi \sin \theta}, e^{-j \frac{N_t-3}{2} \pi \sin \theta}, \dots, e^{j \frac{N_t-1}{2} \pi \sin \theta}]^T$, $\dot{\mathbf{b}}(\theta) = [-j b_1 \frac{N_t-1}{2} \pi \cos \theta, \dots, j b_{N_t} \frac{N_t-1}{2} \pi \cos \theta]^T$, where b_i represents the i -th entry of $\mathbf{b}(\theta)$. The receive steering vector and its derivative have similar form. According to the symmetry, it can be easily verified that $\mathbf{b}^H \dot{\mathbf{b}} = 0$, $\mathbf{a}^H \dot{\mathbf{a}} = 0$, $\forall \theta$, where \mathbf{b} , \mathbf{a} , $\dot{\mathbf{b}}$, and $\dot{\mathbf{a}}$ denote $\mathbf{b}(\theta)$, $\mathbf{a}(\theta)$, $\dot{\mathbf{b}}(\theta)$, and $\dot{\mathbf{a}}(\theta)$, respectively. τ_q denotes the propagation delay associated with k -th signal and q -th target, and can be expressed as $\tau_q = \frac{\sqrt{(x_q - x_0)^2 + (y_q - y_0)^2}}{2c} \triangleq \frac{R_q}{2c}$, where c is the speed of electromagnetic wave.

Based on the received echo signal in (2), we then derive the joint CRB of angle and delay in the general case. Denote the $2Q \times 1$ vector of unknown target parameters as $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} \triangleq [\boldsymbol{\theta}^T, \boldsymbol{\tau}^T]^T$, with $\boldsymbol{\theta} \triangleq [\theta_1, \dots, \theta_Q]^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau} \triangleq [\tau_1, \dots, \tau_Q]^T$. For an unbiased estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}}$, the covariance matrix is lower bounded as $\mathbf{C}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}}} = \mathbb{E}\{(\hat{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}} - \boldsymbol{\varsigma})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}} - \boldsymbol{\varsigma})^H\} \geq \mathbf{C}_{\text{CRB}}$. Based on the received echo signal at the BS, the Fisher information matrix (FIM) \mathbf{F} is given in Theorem 1, and the estimation CRB is calculated by $\mathbf{C}_{\text{CRB}} = \mathbf{F}^{-1}$ [10].

Theorem 1: The FIM \mathbf{F} for estimating $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} & \mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}} \\ \mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} & \mathbf{F}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\tau}} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \text{Re} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}'_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} & \mathbf{F}'_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}} \\ \mathbf{F}'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} & \mathbf{F}'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\tau}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}'_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} &= (\dot{\mathbf{A}}^H \dot{\mathbf{A}}) \odot (\mathbf{C}^* \mathbf{B}^H (\mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^H \mathbf{W}^H)^* \mathbf{B} \mathbf{C}) \\ &+ (\dot{\mathbf{A}}^H \mathbf{A}) \odot (\mathbf{C}^* \mathbf{B}^H (\mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^H \mathbf{W}^H)^* \dot{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{C}) \\ &+ (\mathbf{A}^H \dot{\mathbf{A}}) \odot (\mathbf{C}^* \dot{\mathbf{B}}^H (\mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^H \mathbf{W}^H)^* \mathbf{B} \mathbf{C}) \\ &+ (\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A}) \odot (\mathbf{C}^* \dot{\mathbf{B}}^H (\mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^H \mathbf{W}^H)^* \dot{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{C}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}'_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}} &= \mathbf{F}'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} \\ &= (\dot{\mathbf{A}}^H \mathbf{A}) \odot (\mathbf{C}^* \mathbf{B}^H (\mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^H \mathbf{W}^H)^* \mathbf{B} \mathbf{C}(-j\omega)) \\ &+ (\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A}) \odot (\mathbf{C}^* \mathbf{B}^H (\mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^H \mathbf{W}^H)^* \mathbf{B} \mathbf{C}(-j\omega)), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{F}'_{\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\tau}} = (\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A}) \odot (\mathbf{C}^* \mathbf{B}^H (\mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^H \mathbf{W}^H)^* \mathbf{B} \mathbf{C}). \quad (6)$$

Proof: See Appendix A. \blacksquare

III. TRANSMIT BEAMFORMING DESIGN

In this section, we form the optimization problem¹ that takes CRB and communication rate as the performance matrices. Because we are estimating a vector of parameters, the CRB is a matrix. To obtain a scalar objective function, [11] introduced several CRB-based scalar metrics for optimization. In this paper, we choose the objective function $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{CRB}})$ where $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$ denote the calculation for trace, aimed to balance the units used for different target parameters via an average sense, which yields the following optimization problem

$$\min_{\{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{k=1}^K} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{CRB}}) \quad (7a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \log_2(1 + \gamma_k) \geq \Gamma_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (7b)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{w}_k\|^2 \leq P_T, \quad (7c)$$

where Γ_k denotes the rate threshold of k -th CU, P_T is the transmit power budget, and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. Next, we analyze the problem in two cases, and give some insights about the solution to the problem.

¹What we considered is one time slot among the entire process with the previous information of angles known, so we employ the angle information as well as the delay in last slot to complete the optimization, which is based on a assumption that the target is not moving with a superhigh speed. For the initial value of parameters, it is necessary to complete the estimation of parameters which can refer to [16].

A. Single-Target and Single-User Case

In this subsection, we consider the case of one CU and one target. Taking advantage of Theorem 1 in this scenario, the $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{CRB}})$ is equal to $\frac{1}{F_{\theta,\theta}} + \frac{1}{F_{\tau,\tau}}$ on account of $F_{\tau,\theta} = F_{\theta,\tau} = 0$ with the fact² that $F_{\theta,\theta}$ and $F_{\tau,\tau}$ are $\frac{2|\alpha_1|^2}{\sigma^2} (\|\dot{\mathbf{a}}\|^2 |\mathbf{b}^H \mathbf{w}_1|^2 + \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 |\dot{\mathbf{b}}^H \mathbf{w}_1|^2)$ and $\frac{2\omega^2 |\alpha_1|^2}{\sigma^2} (\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 |\mathbf{b}^H \mathbf{w}_1|^2)$. Then, problem (7) is transformed into

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}_1} f_0(\mathbf{w}_1) \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{w}_1|^2 \geq (2^{\Gamma_1} - 1) \sigma_1^2, \quad (8b)$$

$$\|\mathbf{w}_1\|^2 \leq P_T, \quad (8c)$$

where $f_0(\mathbf{w}_1) = \frac{1}{F_{\theta,\theta}} + \frac{1}{F_{\tau,\tau}}$. Although problem (8) is non-convex and intractable due to the fractional objective function, we give a closed-form optimal solution to that in the following theorem via the orthogonal projection.

Theorem 2: Define $\mathbf{d}_x = \frac{\mathbf{b}}{\|\mathbf{b}\|}$, $\mathbf{d}_y = \frac{\dot{\mathbf{b}}}{\|\dot{\mathbf{b}}\|}$, and $\mathbf{d}_z = \frac{\mathbf{h}_1 - \mathbf{d}_x^H \mathbf{h}_1 \mathbf{d}_x - \mathbf{d}_y^H \mathbf{h}_1 \mathbf{d}_y}{\|\mathbf{h}_1 - \mathbf{d}_x^H \mathbf{h}_1 \mathbf{d}_x - \mathbf{d}_y^H \mathbf{h}_1 \mathbf{d}_y\|}$, the optimal solution \mathbf{w}_1^* to problem (8) is

$$\mathbf{w}_1^* = x_1 \mathbf{d}_x + x_2 \mathbf{d}_y + x_3 \mathbf{d}_z, \quad (9)$$

where x_1, x_2, x_3 are given systematically as follows.

- Case 1: When $\|\dot{\mathbf{a}}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\dot{\mathbf{b}}\|^2 \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} \geq 0$, we have $x_1 = \sqrt{\frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 P_T - (2^{\Gamma_1} - 1) \sigma_1^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}}$, $x_2 = \sqrt{\frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 P_T - (2^{\Gamma_1} - 1) \sigma_1^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} - \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} |x_1|^2}$, and $x_3 = \sqrt{P_T - |x_1|^2 - |x_2|^2}$.
- Case 2: When $\|\dot{\mathbf{a}}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\dot{\mathbf{b}}\|^2 \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} < 0$ and $\omega^2 \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 |x_1|^2 = \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\dot{\mathbf{b}}\|^2 \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} - \|\dot{\mathbf{a}}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2$, we have

$$x_1 = \begin{cases} x_{1,\max}, x_{1,0} > x_{1,\max}, \\ x_{1,0}, x_{1,0} \leq x_{1,\max}, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $x_{1,\max} = \sqrt{\frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 P_T - (2^{\Gamma_1} - 1) \sigma_1^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}}$ and $x_{1,0} = \sqrt{\frac{\beta_2 \lambda_1}{2(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1)}}$. $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \lambda_1$ and λ_2 are defined in the proof process aimed to simplify expatiatory formulas. x_2 and x_3 can be acquired as case 1, and the same is true below.

- Case 3: When $\|\dot{\mathbf{a}}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\dot{\mathbf{b}}\|^2 \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} < 0$ and $\omega^2 \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 |x_1|^2 > \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\dot{\mathbf{b}}\|^2 \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} - \|\dot{\mathbf{a}}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2$, we have

$$x_1 = \begin{cases} x_{1,\max}, x_{1,\text{rig1}} > x_{1,\max}, \\ x_{1,\text{rig1}}, x_{1,\text{rig1}} \leq x_{1,\max}, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $x_{1,\text{rig1}} = \sqrt{\frac{\beta_2 \lambda_1 (\sqrt{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1) \beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2})}{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1) (\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2)}}$.

²These can be obtained through Slepian-Bangs formula or Theorem 1 with the properties $\mathbf{b}^H \dot{\mathbf{b}} = 0, \mathbf{a}^H \dot{\mathbf{a}} = 0, \forall \theta$.

- Case 4: When $\|\dot{\mathbf{a}}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\dot{\mathbf{b}}\|^2 \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} < 0$ and $\omega^2 \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 |x_1|^2 < \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\dot{\mathbf{b}}\|^2 \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} - \|\dot{\mathbf{a}}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2$, we have
- $$x_1 = \begin{cases} x_{1,\max}, x_{1,\text{lef2}} \geq x_{1,\max}, \\ x_{1,\text{lef2}}, x_{1,\text{lef2}} \leq x_{1,\max} \leq x_{1,\text{rig2}}, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where $x_{1,\text{lef2}} = \sqrt{\frac{\beta_2 \lambda_1 (\sqrt{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1) \beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2})}{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1) (\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2)}}$ and $x_{1,\text{rig2}} = \sqrt{\frac{\beta_2 \lambda_1 (-\sqrt{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1) \beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2})}{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1) (\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2)}}$.

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

B. Multi-Target and Multi-User Case

We first analyze the relationship between the elements of the FIM and \mathbf{w}_k . Based on $\mathbf{r}_1 = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{n}_1$, which is defined in Appendix A, we let $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}^T$, and assume that $\dot{\mathbf{D}}_m$ is the derivative with respect to ζ_m , then

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{F}]_{mn} &= 2 \text{Re} \left\{ \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}^H}{\partial \zeta_m} \mathbf{R}^{-1} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial \zeta_n} \right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \text{Re} \left\{ \mathbf{w}_v^H \left((\mathbf{s}^* \mathbf{s}^T) \otimes \dot{\mathbf{D}}_m^H \dot{\mathbf{D}}_n \right) \mathbf{w}_v \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_v = \text{vec}(\mathbf{W})$, $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ denote the vectorization and \otimes represents the Kronecker product. Thus, the optimization problem is formulated as

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}_v} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{CRB}}) \quad (14a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \frac{|\mathbf{g}_k^H \mathbf{w}_v|^2}{\mathbf{w}_v^H \mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{w}_v + \sigma_k^2} \geq (2^{\Gamma_k} - 1), \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (14b)$$

$$\|\mathbf{w}_v\|^2 \leq P_T, \quad (14c)$$

where $\mathbf{g}_k = \mathbf{e}_k \otimes \mathbf{h}_k$ and $\mathbf{L}_k = (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{e}_k) (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{e}_k)^T \otimes \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{h}_k^H$ with \mathbf{e}_k denoting the k -th column of the identity matrix in relevant dimension and $\mathbf{1}$ representing a vector in which all elements are one. Note that problem (14) is non-convex due to the objective function and communication rate constraints in (14b) are non-convex. Based on SDR technique, by letting $\mathbf{W}_v = \mathbf{w}_v \mathbf{w}_v^H$ and dropping the rank-one constraint of \mathbf{W}_v , problem (14) is relaxed as

$$\min_{\mathbf{W}_v, \{t_q\}_{q=1}^{2Q}} \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{t} \quad (15a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F} & \mathbf{e}_q \\ \mathbf{e}_q^T & t_q \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, q = 1, \dots, 2Q, \quad (15b)$$

$$\frac{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{g}_k \mathbf{g}_k^H \mathbf{W}_v)}{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{W}_v) + \sigma_k^2} \geq (2^{\Gamma_k} - 1), \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (15c)$$

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_v) \leq P_T, \quad (15d)$$

where $\{t_q\}_{q=1}^{2Q}$ is the introduced auxiliary variables. Note that \mathbf{F} is a linear function of \mathbf{W}_v , which implies that (15) is a convex semidefinite program (SDP) and thus can be solved via standard convex optimization tools [13]. Furthermore, we present the following proposition to demonstrate the structure of the optimal solution to problem (15).

Proposition 1: The optimal \mathbf{W}_v^* obtained to (15) is expressed as

$$\mathbf{W}_v^* = \mathbf{U}_T \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{U}_T^H, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbf{U}_T \triangleq [\mathbf{B}, \hat{\mathbf{B}}]^*$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^{2Q \times 2Q}$ is a positive semidefinite matrix.

Proof: See Appendix C. \blacksquare

Note that Proposition 1 gives a low computational complexity method to obtain the optimal solution to problem (15). In particular, the optimization in problem (15) can equivalently be performed over $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ instead of \mathbf{W}_v so that the optimization dimension reduces from N_r to $2Q$ for usually $N_r \gg Q$. After obtaining the optimal solution to problem (15), we can acquire the rank-one solution to problem (14) through Gaussian randomization or eigenvalue decomposition [17].

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, the numerical results are provided to clarify the previous analysis and the validity of beamforming. We set the BS equipped with $N_t = 16$ and $N_r = 20$ antennas, serving $K = 3$ CUs and locating $Q = 3$ radar targets. The interval between adjacent antennas of the BS is half-wavelength. Carrier frequency is set as 6 GHz [6]. The angles of the CUs and targets are set in the range $[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$. The overall power budget is $P_T = 20$ dBm and the noise variances are set as $\sigma_k^2 = -90$ dBm, $\sigma^2 = -10$ dBm. For single-target and single-user case, the line of sight (LoS) model is considered for the channel from the BS to the CU with the path loss -70 dB. For multi-target and multi-user case, the communication channel is set as Rayleigh fading like [4].




Fig. 2. The transmit beampattern for single-target and single-user case, where the target and CU are located respectively at azimuth angles 0° and 40° .

Fig. 2 shows the resultant beampatterns where $\Gamma_1 = 7.5$ bps/Hz. When the communication rate constraint can not be satisfied which means (8) is not feasible, the energy is no longer allocated to the CU, and the best sensing performance can be obtained, apparently it is not the optimal solution to problem (8), but a forced scheme when the communication rate is not capable to be fulfilled. It is shown that not only does the optimal closed-form solution acquire a good sensing performance, it also guarantees the communication performance, even though its sensing performance is slightly lower than inactive's. Compared with the scheme that uses the term "only θ " to represent the beamforming in [4], the optimal closed-form solution obtained through the method in this paper almost coincides with it in Fig. 2, which indicates that the proposed method in this paper takes into account the angle estimation performance while ensuring the delay estimation performance.

Fig. 3 show the relationship between CRB of the estimated parameters and total transmitted energy, where "CRB(u)" represents the lower bound on the estimate of the Cartesian coordinates of the targets, and its definition is as follows: $\text{CRB}(\mathbf{u}) = [\text{Tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{J}}^{-1})]^{1/2}$. $\tilde{\mathbf{J}} = (\frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial \mathbf{u}}) \mathbf{F} (\frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial \mathbf{u}})^T$ is derived by the chain rule, and \mathbf{u} is a vector containing the coordinates of all the targets. From Fig. 3(a) and Fig. 3(b), it can be seen that the parameter estimation performance of the beamforming scheme proposed in this paper is significantly better than that of the two linear beamforming schemes [15], zero-forcing (ZF) and maximum-ratio transmission (MRT), and is close to the ideal situation "sensing only" which is obtained without the rate constraints. When the number of antennas increases, the angle estimation performance can be better improved, since this improves the resolution of array to the angle, while the delay and positioning estimation performance in Fig. 3(c) are little improved, which shows the necessity of joint parameters estimation. Synthesize the above analysis, the proposed beamforming scheme can effectively reduce the dependence of the BS on the number of antennas and achieve excellent position estimation performance with low power consumption.

Fig. 4 shows the impact of CUs at different locations on the compromise between sensing and communication performance. It can be seen that as the angle increases (meaning the distance between CU and targets increases), the same communication rate will cause more serious loss of estimation performance. It is worth noting that increasing the communication requirement in the 10° direction will improve the angle estimation performance, because the CU and the sensing target overlap in the beam energy domain, but the positioning estimation performance of the targets is still decreased, since the delay estimation performance is not improved.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper focused on the beamforming optimization problem that aims to maximize the sensing performance while adhering to communication rate and energy constraints. We derived the CRB for joint angle and delay estimation. Specifically, we obtained the optimal beamforming for single-target and single-user case, and analysed the structure of the solution to the beamforming optimization problem over multi-target and multi-user case for computational complexity reduction. It is observed that a single parameter is insufficient to describe the positioning function adequately, prompting further investigation into the impact of CU distribution on positioning performance, which presents an intriguing avenue for future research.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Taking the discrete Fourier transform (DFT) for the reflected data received at the BS, the frequency-domain expression of (2) can be obtained in the form [9]

$$\mathbf{r}_1(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_q \mathbf{a}(\theta_q) b(\theta_q)^T \mathbf{w}_k e^{-j\omega \tau_q} s_k(\omega) + \mathbf{n}_1(\omega), \quad (17)$$

where $s_k(\omega)$ represents the DFT of $s_k(t)$, $\mathbf{n}_1(\omega) \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{R})$ is the form of noise in frequency domain, $\mathbf{R} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{N_r}$.




Fig. 3. The estimation CRB versus P_T .




Fig. 4. Normalized CRB of parameters at different angles, where the targets are located at azimuth angles $-30^\circ, 0^\circ, 15^\circ$, respectively, and the CUs are at azimuth angles $10^\circ, 40^\circ, 80^\circ$, respectively.

[9], \mathbf{I} represents the identity matrix. Considering the actual signal pulse shaping and calculation simplification, we set $s_k(\omega) = 1$. To simply notation, we denote $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}(\theta_1), \dots, \mathbf{a}(\theta_Q)]$, $\mathbf{B} = [\mathbf{b}(\theta_1), \dots, \mathbf{b}(\theta_Q)]$, $\mathbf{C} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{c})$, $\mathbf{c} = [\alpha_1 e^{-j\omega\tau_1}, \dots, \alpha_Q e^{-j\omega\tau_Q}]^T$, $\mathbf{W} = [\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_K]$, $\mathbf{s} = [1, \dots, 1]^T$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times 1}$, then, (17) can be rewritten as $\mathbf{r}_1 = \mathbf{ACB}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{n}_1$. Using the Slepian-Bangs formula [10], for the complex observation vector $\mathbf{r}_1 \sim \mathcal{CN}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{R})$, in which $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{ACB}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s}$, the (m, n) -th element of FIM \mathbf{F} is

$$[\mathbf{F}]_{mn} = \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{R}^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial \zeta_m} \mathbf{R}^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial \zeta_n} \right) + 2 \text{Re} \left\{ \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}^H}{\partial \zeta_m} \mathbf{R}^{-1} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial \zeta_n} \right) \right\}. \quad (18)$$

Since the covariance matrix \mathbf{R} does not depend on the parameters to be estimated, we only have to worry about the second term in (18). Let $\dot{\mathbf{B}} \triangleq [\frac{\partial \mathbf{b}(\theta_1)}{\partial \theta_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial \mathbf{b}(\theta_Q)}{\partial \theta_Q}]$ and $\dot{\mathbf{A}} \triangleq [\frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\theta_1)}{\partial \theta_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\theta_Q)}{\partial \theta_Q}]$, it follows that $\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial \theta_q} = \dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{e}_q \mathbf{e}_q^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{A} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{e}_q \mathbf{e}_q^T \dot{\mathbf{B}}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s}$, $\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial \tau_q} = (-j\omega) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{e}_q \mathbf{e}_q^T \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s}$, where \mathbf{e}_q denotes the q -th column of \mathbf{I}_Q . Taking the submatrix $\mathbf{F}_{\theta, \theta}$ for example, then

$$[\mathbf{F}_{\theta, \theta}]_{pq} = 2 \text{Re} \left\{ \text{Tr} \left(\dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{e}_p \mathbf{e}_p^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{A} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{e}_p \mathbf{e}_p^T \dot{\mathbf{B}}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \right)^H \times \mathbf{R}^{-1} \left(\dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{e}_q \mathbf{e}_q^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{A} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{e}_q \mathbf{e}_q^T \dot{\mathbf{B}}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \right) \right\}, \quad (19)$$

next take one of the four product terms in (19), note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left(\left(\dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{e}_p \mathbf{e}_p^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \right)^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \left(\dot{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{e}_q \mathbf{e}_q^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \right) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{e}_p^T \left(\dot{\mathbf{A}}^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \right) \mathbf{e}_q \mathbf{e}_q^T \left(\mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^H \mathbf{W}^H \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{C}^H \right) \mathbf{e}_p \\ &= \left(\dot{\mathbf{A}}^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{A}} \right)_{pq} \left(\mathbf{C}^* \mathbf{B}^H \left(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^H \mathbf{W}^H \right)^* \mathbf{B} \mathbf{C} \right)_{pq}, \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{X}_{pq} denotes (p, q) -th element of \mathbf{X} . The other three matrix product terms in (19) have similar forms. And $\mathbf{R} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{N_r}$, hence, $\mathbf{F}_{\theta, \theta} = \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \text{Re}(\mathbf{F}'_{\theta, \theta})$, with $\mathbf{F}'_{\theta, \theta}$ given in (4). Similar to the steps above, we can obtain the results given in (5) and (6), respectively, in which \odot represents the Hadamard (element-wise) product. As a result, the Theorem 1 is proved.

APPENDIX B PROOF OF THEOREM 2

First of all, the optimal solution to problem (8) satisfies $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{b}, \dot{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{h}_1\}$, and the basic idea of that is to project the beamforming onto direction directly related to the target function and constraint which dominate the directions needing to be illuminated. Hence, the optimal \mathbf{w}_1 can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{w}_1 = x_1 \mathbf{d}_x + x_2 \mathbf{d}_y + x_3 \mathbf{d}_z, \quad x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (21)$$

for $\text{span}\{\mathbf{d}_x, \mathbf{d}_y, \mathbf{d}_z\} = \text{span}\{\mathbf{b}, \dot{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{h}_1\}$ as well as the orthogonal bases and the objective function's constitution. What needs illustration is that $\text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_M\}$ denotes the linear space composed of the linear combination of the vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_M$. It's apparent that the optimum is reached when the energy constraint gets equality causing the power budget being fully utilized, i.e., $x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 = P_T$. When the communication rate constraint is active, which equivalentl means problem (8) is feasible, the optimum is fulfilled when the achievable rate constraint being a equation since the power that increased the communication rate could be economized for sensing, it yields $|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{w}_1|^2 = (2^{\Gamma_1} - 1) \sigma_1^2$. Substitute (21) into problem (8) which can be rewritten as

$$\min_{|x_1|^2, |x_2|^2, |x_3|^2} f_1 \quad (22a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } |x_1|^2 |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2 + |x_2|^2 |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2 + |x_3|^2 |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 = (2^{\Gamma_1} - 1) \sigma_1^2 \quad (22b)$$

$$|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2 + |x_3|^2 = P_T, \quad (22c)$$

where $f_1 = \frac{\sigma^2}{2|\alpha_1|^2} \left(\frac{1}{\|\dot{\mathbf{a}}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 |x_1|^2 + \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\dot{\mathbf{b}}\|^2 |x_2|^2} + \frac{1}{\omega^2 \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 |x_1|^2} \right)$. For simplicity, we let $\beta_1 = \|\dot{\mathbf{a}}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2$, $\beta_2 = \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\dot{\mathbf{b}}\|^2$, $\beta_3 = \omega^2 \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \|\mathbf{b}\|^2$. We first get the relationship between $|x_1|^2$ and $|x_2|^2$ through (22b) and (22c), that is $|x_2|^2 = \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 P_T - (2^{\Gamma_1} - 1) \sigma_1^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} - \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_y|^2} |x_1|^2 \triangleq \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 |x_1|^2$, according to which we can not noly

calculate x_2 and x_3 after we obtain x_1 as case 1, but also obtain the range of $|x_1|^2$ that locates in $(0, \tilde{x}_{1,\max}]$ where $\tilde{x}_{1,\max} = \frac{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 P_T - (2^{\Gamma_1} - 1)\sigma_1^2}{|\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_z|^2 - |\mathbf{h}_1^H \mathbf{d}_x|^2}$.

Substitute $|x_2|^2 = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 |x_1|^2$ into f_1 , the objective function only contains one variable, which is given by $f_1(|x_1|^2) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2|\alpha_1|^2} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_2 \lambda_1 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2) |x_1|^2} + \frac{1}{\beta_3 |x_1|^2} \right)$, the first-order derivate of f_1 with respect to $|x_1|^2$ is

$$\frac{\partial f_1(|x_1|^2)}{\partial |x_1|^2} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2|\alpha_1|^2} \frac{g_1(|x_1|^2)}{\left(\beta_2 \lambda_1 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2) |x_1|^2 \right) \beta_3 |x_1|^4} \quad (23)$$

where $g_1(|x_1|^2) = (\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1)(\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2) |x_1|^4 + 2\beta_2 \lambda_1 (\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1) |x_1|^2 - \beta_2^2 \lambda_1^2$. Clearly, if $\beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2 \geq 0$, the optimal solution is $\left(|x_1|^2 \right)^* = \tilde{x}_{1,\max}$ for f_1 decreasing monotonously with $|x_1|^2$. When $\beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2 < 0$, there are three cases to be analysed, if $\beta_3 = \beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1$, the only root of g_1 is $\frac{\beta_2 \lambda_1}{2(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1)} \triangleq \tilde{x}_{1,0}$, we have $\lim_{|x_1|^2 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\partial f_1(|x_1|^2)}{\partial |x_1|^2} < 0$.

Therefore, we have $\left(|x_1|^2 \right)^* = \tilde{x}_{1,0}$ if $\tilde{x}_{1,0} \leq \tilde{x}_{1,\max}$, and $\left(|x_1|^2 \right)^* = \tilde{x}_{1,\max}$ if $\tilde{x}_{1,0} > \tilde{x}_{1,\max}$. When $\beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2 < 0$ and $\beta_3 > \beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1$, the right root of g_1 is $\frac{\beta_2 \lambda_1 (\sqrt{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1)\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2})}{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1)(\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2)} \triangleq \tilde{x}_{1,\text{rig1}}$, we have $\left(|x_1|^2 \right)^* = \tilde{x}_{1,\text{rig1}}$ if $\tilde{x}_{1,\text{rig1}} \leq \tilde{x}_{1,\max}$, and $\left(|x_1|^2 \right)^* = \tilde{x}_{1,\max}$ if $\tilde{x}_{1,\text{rig1}} > \tilde{x}_{1,\max}$. When $\beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2 < 0$ and $\beta_3 < \beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1$, the left root of g_1 is $\frac{\beta_2 \lambda_1 (\sqrt{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1)\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2})}{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1)(\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2)} \triangleq \tilde{x}_{1,\text{lef2}}$ and the right root of g_1 is $\frac{\beta_2 \lambda_1 (-\sqrt{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1)\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2})}{(\beta_2 \lambda_2 - \beta_1)(\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \beta_2 \lambda_2)} \triangleq \tilde{x}_{1,\text{rig2}}$. Since $g_1 < 0$ when $|x_1|^2 \in (0, \tilde{x}_{1,\text{lef2}}) \cup (\tilde{x}_{1,\text{rig2}}, +\infty)$ and $g_1 > 0$ when $|x_1|^2 \in (\tilde{x}_{1,\text{lef2}}, \tilde{x}_{1,\text{rig2}})$, we have $\left(|x_1|^2 \right)^* = \tilde{x}_{1,\max}$ if $\tilde{x}_{1,\text{lef2}} \geq \tilde{x}_{1,\max}$, and $\left(|x_1|^2 \right)^* = \tilde{x}_{1,\text{lef2}}$ if $\tilde{x}_{1,\text{lef2}} < \tilde{x}_{1,\max} \leq \tilde{x}_{1,\text{rig2}}$. If $\tilde{x}_{1,\text{rig2}} < \tilde{x}_{1,\max}$, we need compare $f_1(\tilde{x}_{1,\text{lef2}})$ with $f_1(\tilde{x}_{1,\max})$, the optimal solution between $\tilde{x}_{1,\text{lef2}}$ and $\tilde{x}_{1,\max}$ is determined by the smaller objective value. This results in the solutions in Theorem 2, which completes the proof.

APPENDIX C

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

We know that FIM and \mathbf{W}_v are connected by \mathbf{B} and $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ on account of Theorem 1. Decompose $\mathbf{W}_v^* = \Omega_{U_T} \mathbf{W}_v^* + \Omega_{U_T}^\perp \mathbf{W}_v^*$, in which Ω_{U_T} denotes the orthogonal projection onto the subspace spanned by the columns of \mathbf{U}_T in (16) and $\Omega_{U_T}^\perp = \mathbf{I} - \Omega_{U_T}$. According to the analysis of [14], the

columns of the optimal \mathbf{W}_v^* belong to the subspace spanned by the columns of \mathbf{U}_T , that is to say, $\Omega_{U_T}^\perp \mathbf{W}_v^* = 0$. Hence, the optimal beamforming covariance matrix can be given by

$$\mathbf{W}_v^* = \Omega_{U_T} \mathbf{w}_v \mathbf{w}_v^H \Omega_{U_T} = \mathbf{U}_T \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{U}_T^H, \quad (24)$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda} = (\mathbf{U}_T^H \mathbf{U}_T)^{-1} \mathbf{U}_T^H \mathbf{w}_v \mathbf{w}_v^H \mathbf{U}_T (\mathbf{U}_T^H \mathbf{U}_T)^{-1}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Liu, Y. Cui, C. Masouros, J. Xu, T. X. Han, Y. C. Eldar, and S. Buzzi, "Integrated sensing and communications: Toward dual-functional wireless networks for 6G and beyond," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1728-1767, Jun. 2022.
- [2] W. Zhou, R. Zhang, G. Chen, and W. Wu, "Integrated sensing and communication waveform design: A survey," *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 3, pp. 1930-1949, Oct. 2022.
- [3] C. Sturm and W. Wiesbeck, "Waveform design and signal processing aspects for fusion of wireless communications and radar sensing," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 99, no. 7, pp. 1236-1259, May 2011.
- [4] F. Liu, Y.-F. Liu, A. Li, C. Masouros, and Y. C. Eldar, "Cramér-Rao bound optimization for joint radar-communication beamforming," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 70, pp. 240-253, Dec. 2022.
- [5] Y. Xiong, F. Liu, Y. Cui, W. Yuan, T. X. Han, and G. Caire, "On the fundamental tradeoff of integrated sensing and communications under Gaussian channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, early access, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.1109/TIT.2023.3284449.
- [6] Y. Huang, Y. Fang, X. Li, and J. Xu, "Coordinated power control for network integrated sensing and communication," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 71, no. 12, pp. 13361-13365, Dec. 2022.
- [7] Z. Cheng, B. Liao, S. Shi, Z. He, and J. Li, "Co-design for overlaid MIMO radar and downlink MISO communication systems via Cramér-Rao bound minimization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 67, no. 24, pp. 6227-6240, Dec. 2019.
- [8] T. Tian, T. Zhang, L. Kong, G. Cui, Q. Shi, and Y. Deng, "Performance of localization estimation rate for radar-communication system," in *Proc. IEEE Radar Conf.*, 2019, pp. 1-6.
- [9] M. Wax and A. Leshem, "Joint estimation of time delays and directions of arrival of multiple reflections of a known signal," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 45, no. 10, pp. 2477-2484, Oct. 1997.
- [10] S. M. Kay, *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing: Estimation Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, 1993.
- [11] E. Tohidi, M. Coutino, S. P. Chepuri, H. Behrooz, M. M. Nayebi, and G. Leus, "Sparse antenna and pulse placement for colocated MIMO radar," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 579-593, Feb. 2019.
- [12] Z. Xiang and M. Tao, "Robust beamforming for wireless information and power transmission," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 372-375, Aug. 2012.
- [13] M. Grant and S. Boyd, "CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming (web page and software)," <http://cvxr.com/cvx/>, Apr. 2010.
- [14] J. Li, L. Xu, P. Stoica, K. W. Forsythe, and D. W. Bliss, "Range compression and waveform optimization for MIMO radar: A Cramér-Rao bound based study," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 218-232, Jan. 2008.
- [15] E. A. Jorswieck, E. G. Larsson, and D. Danev, "Complete characterization of the Pareto boundary for the MISO interference channel," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 10, pp. 5292-5296, Oct. 2008.
- [16] M. F. Keskin, H. Wymeersch, and V. Koivunen, "MIMO-OFDM joint radar-communications: Is ICI friend or foe?," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics in Signal Process.*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1393-1408, Nov. 2021.
- [17] Z.-Q. Luo, W.-K. Ma, A. M.-C. So, Y. Ye, and S. Zhang, "Semidefinite relaxation of quadratic optimization problems," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 20-34, May 2010.