

# Modular Hypernetworks for Scalable and Adaptive Deep MIMO Receivers

Tomer Raviv and Nir Shlezinger

**Abstract**—Deep neural networks (DNNs) were shown to facilitate the operation of uplink multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) receivers, with emerging architectures augmenting modules of classic receiver processing. Current designs consider static DNNs, whose architecture is fixed and weights are pre-trained. This induces a notable challenge, as the resulting MIMO receiver is suitable for a given configuration, i.e., channel distribution and number of users, while in practice these parameters change frequently with network variations and users leaving and joining the network. In this work, we tackle this core challenge of DNN-aided MIMO receivers. We build upon the concept of *hypernetworks*, augmenting the receiver with a pre-trained deep model whose purpose is to update the weights of the DNN-aided receiver upon instantaneous channel variations. We design our hypernetwork to augment *modular* deep receivers, leveraging their modularity to have the hypernetwork adapt not only the weights, but also the architecture. Our modular hypernetwork leads to a DNN-aided receiver whose architecture and resulting complexity adapts to the number of users, in addition to channel variations, without re-training. Our numerical studies demonstrate superior error-rate performance of modular hypernetworks in time-varying channels compared to static pre-trained receivers, while providing rapid adaptivity and scalability to network variations.

**Index Terms**—Model-based deep learning, deep receivers, MIMO, hypernetworks.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Deep learning is envisioned to play a key role in enabling future wireless communication systems to meet their constantly growing demands [1]. A core aspect which is expected to greatly benefit from proper augmentation of deep learning techniques is receiver design [2]. DNNs can facilitate coping with both *model-deficiency* [3], i.e., complex channel models, as well as *algorithm-deficiency* [4], where classic receiver processing is not suitable.

Despite their potential, deployment of DNN-aided receivers, termed *deep receivers*, is subject to several challenges, arising from the fundamental differences between wireless communication and traditional deep learning domains (such as vision and natural language processing) [2], [5]. These challenges include the *dynamic nature* of wireless channels [2], [6], and the *limited compute/power resources* of wireless devices [5], [7]. The dynamic nature of wireless channels implies that the receiver task, dictated by the data distribution and the number of received messages, changes rapidly in time. This evolution can occur either on the physical level, e.g., variations in the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and channel transfer function, or

the network level, e.g., the number of users transmitting in the uplink.

A common approach to deal with dynamic channels, coined *joint learning* [8], trains the DNN over a wide range of channel conditions. Once trained, the DNN-aided receiver is deployed statically [9], namely, its weights and architecture do not vary. This form of learning seeks a non-coherent receiver at the cost of performance degradation as compared with coherent operation [5], and cannot cope with variations in the network, as its number of inputs and outputs is fixed. While static receivers can operate under some forms of channel variations by providing an estimate of the channel parameters as additional features [10], the architecture is still fixed, and cannot adapt to network variations.

An alternative approach aims at providing increased flexibility by re-training the DNN on device. Such *online learning* uses pilots [11], [12], data augmentation [13] and locally decoded messages [14] to repeatedly adapt the weights of the receiver upon channel variations. While online learning yields increased flexibility to dynamic channels, it induces notable excessive complexity due to its frequent re-training procedures. Existing approaches to facilitate online learning include: (i) Designing deep receiver architectures as a form of model-based deep learning [15], [16], using classic receiver processing as an informative and parameters-compact inductive bias [17], [18], that makes them more amenable to rapid adaptation compared to black-box DNNs [5]; (ii) Altering learning algorithms by, e.g., incorporating meta-learning to achieve fast training [19], [20], or combining Bayesian learning to mitigate overfitting on scarce data [21], [22]; (iii) Reducing online training frequency by, e.g., using dedicated mechanisms to detect when to re-train and which module requires adaptation [23].

Despite these recent advances in online learning, its excessive complexity makes it challenging to implement due to the limited resources of wireless devices [5], [7]. Moreover, the aforementioned training approaches have primarily focused on adjusting a *fixed architecture*, and are not designed to handle settings necessitating *changes in the architecture*.

From a deep learning perspective, adaptivity of DNNs can be achieved using *hypernetworks* [24]. Hypernetworks are DNNs whose outputs are utilized as the weights for another primary DNN. They have been demonstrated in [25] to achieve low generalization error across different data distributions with only a small additional complexity during inference. In wireless communications, hypernetworks have primarily been considered to adapt receivers for physical layer variations [26], [27], [28], [29]. For instance, in [27], a low-complexity

T. Raviv and N. Shlezinger are with the School of ECE, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel (e-mail: tomerraviv95@gmail.com; nirshl@bgu.ac.il).

hypernetwork was employed to adjust the parameters of a black-box channel predictor DNN, with the goal of handling non-stationary wireless channels. For detection, the work [26] proposed using hypernetworks to mitigate the necessity of retraining a DNN-based MIMO receiver for each channel realization. However, these studies have only considered changes in the channel that do not require *architectural adaptation*, which is extremely challenging and complex to realize using black-box DNNs. The usefulness of model-based deep learning for deep receivers, combined with its modularity and the ability to associate internal modules with different users, motivate integrating hypernetworks with modular architectures to yield deep receivers that rapidly adapt to variations in both the channel and the network without online training.

In this work we address this gap and propose an approach that adapts DNN-aided receivers to variations in both the channel and the network without necessitating additional retraining. We do so by fusing the modularity of model-based deep learning receiver architectures, combined with a modular hypernetwork that generates during inference the *weights* for a *varying number of modules* of a deep receiver. In doing so, we preserve the low complexity overhead of static model-based deep learning, while enjoying some level of adaptivity as offered by online learning, without its excessive compute and limitation to a fixed architecture.

We focus on uplink MIMO receivers, considering the modular DNN-aided DeepSIC architecture of [12], which is comprised of a set of modules corresponding to different users, as our main running deep receiver. For such modular architectures, we develop a lightweight hypernetwork framework that learns to generate *complete sub-modules* and weights of the architecture. The resulting modular hypernetwork allows the deep receiver to accommodate an arbitrary number of users with different time-varying channel conditions, while providing elastic inference complexity, as its number of DNNs modules is adapted to match the varying number of users. We introduce a dedicated training method that can be carried out offline based on channel measurements and simulations, without necessitating on-device adaptation. We numerically demonstrate the effectiveness of our modular hypernetwork, showing that it allows the deep receiver not only to outperform joint training in time-varying channels, but also approach the symbol error rate (SER) of computationally intensive online training, while maintaining a significantly lower complexity, as shown analytically.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section II reviews the system model. Section III presents our modular hypernetwork-based framework and analyzes its complexity. Section IV numerically evaluates the suggested framework, and Section V concludes the paper.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL

### A. Communication System

We consider an uplink block-fading MIMO digital communication system. The system supports up to  $K^{\max}$  single-antenna users, that are transmitting symbols to a base station equipped with  $N$  antennas, where  $N \geq K^{\max}$ . Each block is

comprised of  $B^{\text{tran}}$  time instances, during which the channel parameters, denoted  $\mathbf{H}[t] \sim \mathcal{H}$  for the  $t$ th block (where  $\mathcal{H}$  is the distribution of channel coefficients), are constant. We allow the number of users to change between blocks, corresponding to users joining and leaving the network. Accordingly, we denote the number of users in the block with index  $t$  by  $K[t] \in \{1, \dots, K^{\max}\}$ . Specifically, at each  $t$ th block,  $K[t]$  users simultaneously transmit  $B^{\text{tran}}$  independent messages denoted  $\mathbf{s}_i[t] = [s_i^{(1)}[t], \dots, s_i^{(K[t])}[t]] \in \mathcal{S}^{K[t]}$ , where  $i \in \mathcal{B} \triangleq \{1, \dots, B^{\text{tran}}\}$  is the symbol index within the block, and  $\mathcal{S}$  is the set of constellation points. The transmitted symbols block  $\mathbf{s}^{\text{tran}}[t] := \{\mathbf{s}_i[t]\}_{i \in \mathcal{B}}$  is divided into  $B^{\text{pilot}}$  pilots that are known to the receiver and appear first, denoted  $\mathbf{s}^{\text{pilot}}[t]$ , and  $B^{\text{info}} = B^{\text{tran}} - B^{\text{pilot}}$  information symbols, denoted  $\mathbf{s}^{\text{info}}[t]$ , that contain the digital message.

To accommodate complex and non-linear channel models, we represent the channel mapping by a generic memoryless conditional distribution. Accordingly, the corresponding received signal vector  $\mathbf{y}_i[t] \in \mathbb{C}^N$  is determined as

$$\mathbf{y}_i[t] \sim P_{\mathbf{H}[t]}(\mathbf{y}_i[t] | \mathbf{s}_i[t]), \quad (1)$$

which is subject to the unknown conditional distribution  $P_{\mathbf{H}[t]}(\cdot | \cdot)$  that depends on the current channel parameters  $\mathbf{H}[t]$ . We denote the corresponding observations of  $\mathbf{s}^{\text{pilot}}[t]$  as  $\mathbf{y}^{\text{pilot}}[t]$ , and of  $\mathbf{s}^{\text{info}}[t]$  as  $\mathbf{y}^{\text{info}}[t]$ .

The received channel outputs in (1) are processed by the receiver. We denote the mapping function of the receiver applied to any of the symbols during the  $t$ th block as  $\mathcal{F}[t] : \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{K[t]}$ , whose goal is to recover correctly each digital symbol in  $\mathbf{s}_i^{\text{info}}[t]$  from  $\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{info}}[t]$ . The number of users in each block,  $K[t]$ , is assumed to be known to the receiver.

### B. Problem Formulation

Let us denote the estimated message for all  $K[t]$  users in a given block index  $t$  as  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_i^{\text{info}}[t] := \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{info}}[t])$ , and the average computational complexity associated with the estimation of the  $B^{\text{info}}$  symbols as  $C_{\text{avg}}$ . Our objective is to minimize the SER over the information symbols, while reducing the computational overhead. Over a horizon of  $T$  blocks, this is formulated as

$$\min \frac{1}{T \cdot B^{\text{info}}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=B^{\text{pilot}}+1}^{B^{\text{tran}}} \Pr(\hat{\mathbf{s}}_i^{\text{info}}[t] \neq \mathbf{s}_i^{\text{info}}[t]),$$

while keeping  $C_{\text{avg}}$  as low as possible.

### C. Deep Receivers

We focus on MIMO receivers implemented using DNNs, i.e., deep receivers. Such receivers are parameterized at time  $t$  by the weights vector  $\Theta[t]$ , and can be trained to operate in complex and unknown channel models as in (1). Accordingly, we write the receiver processing as

$$\mathcal{F}_{\Theta[t]}[t] : \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{K[t]}, \quad (2)$$

and consider soft-output receivers that output a conditional distribution over  $\mathcal{S}^{K[t]}$  denoted  $P_{\Theta[t]}$ , such that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\Theta[t]}[t](\mathbf{y}) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}^{K[t]}} P_{\Theta[t]}(\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{y}). \quad (3)$$

The complexity of applying (2) typically scales linearly with the number of parameters in  $\Theta[t]$  [30, Ch. 11].

**Modular Deep Receivers:** As the number of users can change in time, we consider *modular* deep receivers, which are dividable into sub-modules that can be associated with specific users. Modular architectures arise when designing deep receivers via model-based deep learning methodologies [15], such as deep unfolding [17]. One such architecture, used as our main example, is DeepSIC proposed in [12].

A modular deep MIMO receiver supporting  $K$  users has parameters  $\Theta[t]$  that can be divided as  $\Theta[t] = \{\theta^{(k)}[t]\}_{k=1}^K$ . Each module  $\theta^{(k)}[t]$  produces the estimate of the symbol of the  $k$ th user. For instance, DeepSIC is based on soft interference cancellation MIMO detection, and operates in  $Q$  iterations. In each iteration of index  $q$ , it produces  $K$  probability mass functions over  $\mathcal{S}$ , which at the  $i$ th symbol of the  $t$ th block is denoted  $\{\hat{p}_i^{(k,q)}[t]\}$ . These probability vectors are obtained as soft estimates produced by the DNN  $\theta^{(k)}[t]$  applied to the channel output  $\mathbf{y}_i[t]$  as well as the previous estimates of the interfering symbols, namely,

$$\hat{p}_i^{(k,q)}[t] = \left\{ P_{\theta^{(k)}[t]}(s_i^{(k)}[t] | \mathbf{y}_i[t], \{\hat{p}_i^{(l,q-1)}[t]\}_{l \neq k}) \right\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}. \quad (4)$$

The output of the receiver are the soft estimates of the  $Q$ th iteration, and the estimated conditional distribution is

$$P_{\Theta[t]}(s_i[t] | \mathbf{y}[t]) = \prod_{k=1}^K P_{\theta^{(k)}[t]}(s_i^{(k)}[t] | \mathbf{y}_i[t], \{\hat{p}_i^{(l,Q-1)}[t]\}_{l \neq k}).$$

**Training Deep Receivers:** Deep receivers, being machine learning models, rely on data to learn the mapping in (2). Two main learning paradigms are considered in this context: (i) *joint learning* and (ii) *online learning*.

*Joint training* trains offline using data corresponding different channel realizations from  $\mathcal{H}$ . The DNN parameters are static, i.e., they do not change in  $t$ , and thus must be tuned for a specific network configuration, namely, for a given  $K$ . Training a deep receiver for  $K$  users is done using a data set comprised of channel inputs and outputs corresponding to such networks, given by  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{(K)} = \{(\mathbf{y}_i^{\text{train}}, \mathbf{s}_i^{\text{train}})\}_i$ . Training the parameters set  $\Theta^{(K)}$ , dictating the receiver mappings, is done by minimizing the cross-entropy loss, i.e.,

$$\Theta_{\text{joint}}^{(K)} = \arg \min_{\Theta^{(K)}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}}(\Theta^{(K)}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{(K)}), \quad (5)$$

where the cross-entropy loss is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}}(\Theta, \mathcal{D}) = -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{s}_i) \in \mathcal{D}} \log P_{\Theta[t]}(\mathbf{s}_i | \mathbf{y}_i). \quad (6)$$

Since different architectures are required for different number of users, one has to obtain parameters sets for each  $K \in [1, K^{\text{max}}]$ , namely, pre-train and maintain  $K_{\text{max}}$  DNNs.

*Online training* updates the deep receiver parameters using the pilots  $\mathcal{D}[t]$  on each block  $t$ . Training again follows the cross-entropy loss, but based on the current pilots, namely

$$\Theta_{\text{online}}^{(K[t])}[t] = \arg \min_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}}(\theta^{(k)}, \mathcal{D}[t]). \quad (7)$$

Unlike joint learning (5), online learning seeks parameters

that are suitable for the current channel, using data acquired online. As pilot data is often limited and learning must be done rapidly, one can potentially enhance stochastic gradient descent (SGD) based learning using a principled starting point obtained from previous weights or meta-learned from past channels [19], requiring the number of users to be static.

### III. HYPERNETWORK ADAPTATION OF MODULAR DEEP RECEIVERS

This section presents modular hypernetworks, combining the adaptivity and flexibility of online learning with the offline training of joint learning. We present our hypernetwork framework in Subsection III-A, analyze its online complexity in Subsection III-B, and provide a discussion in Subsection III-C.

#### A. Modular Hypernetworks

Our hypernetwork is designed to generate the weights for the deep receiver, accommodating any number of users. As we focus on modular deep receivers, the same hypernetwork can independently generate  $\theta^{(k)}$  for each user  $k$ , taking into account the channel conditions of the other users. That is, we cast that the weights for each user as a function of the context of the  $k$ th user, which includes the channel conditions of all other users  $\ell \neq k, 1 \leq \ell \leq K^{\text{max}}$ . The resulting procedure, illustrated in Fig. 1, is comprised of *user embeddings*; a *hypernetwork* that maps these embeddings into user-wise DNN modules; and a dedicated offline training procedure.

1) *User Embedding:* Hypernetworks require features of fixed dimensions that are informative of the current context [24]. Intuitively, the channel parameters  $\mathbf{H}[t]$  can provide such information. However, as the dimensions of  $\mathbf{H}[t]$  depend on  $K$  which can vary between blocks, one must seek an alternative formulation.

Accounting for the prospective informativeness of  $\mathbf{H}[t]$ , we construct our user embedding features by first recovering a linear least-squares estimate of the parameters, via

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}[t] = \left( (\mathbf{s}^{\text{pilot}}[t])^H \mathbf{s}^{\text{pilot}}[t] \right)^{-1} (\mathbf{s}^{\text{pilot}}[t])^H \mathbf{y}^{\text{pilot}}[t], \quad (8)$$

with  $(\cdot)^H$  denoting conjugate transpose. While we do not restrict our attention to linear channels, (8) constitutes a rough first-order estimate of the channel parameters.

The estimate in (8) is used to embed the physical conditions that each user experiences into a fixed size vector. To that end, we compose the context matrix of each user index  $\ell$  on the  $k$ th user. We differentiate between the active user  $\ell = k$ , interfering user  $\ell \neq k$  and non-existing user  $K[t] < \ell \leq K^{\text{max}}$ , constructing the embedding

$$\mathbf{u}_k^{(\ell)}[t] = \begin{cases} \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{\ell}[t] & \text{if } \ell \neq k \text{ and } \ell \leq K[t] \\ \mathbf{e}^{\text{self}} & \text{if } \ell = k \\ \mathbf{e}^{\text{pad}} & \text{if } K[t] < \ell \leq K^{\text{max}}, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}^{\text{self}}, \mathbf{e}^{\text{pad}}$  are  $N \times 1$  trainable vectors corresponding to the user itself and to non-existing users, respectively. These vectors are shared for all users' embeddings.




Fig. 1: The weights-generation pipeline of modular hypernetworks.

Based on (9), we compose the  $N \cdot K^{\max} \times 1$  context vector of the  $k$ th user, denoted  $\mathbf{u}_k^{\text{user}}[t]$ , as the concatenation of

$$\mathbf{u}_k^{\text{user}}[t] = (\mathbf{u}_k^{(1)}[t] \parallel \mathbf{u}_k^{(2)}[t] \parallel \dots \parallel \mathbf{u}_k^{(K^{\max})}[t]), \quad (10)$$

with  $\parallel$  being the concatenation operation. The size of (10) is fixed regardless of the number of instantaneous users  $K[t]$ .

2) *Hypernetwork Adaptation*: The embeddings in (10) are used to generate the parameters of the deep receivers modules associated with each user. The hypernetwork is an additional DNN with trainable parameters denoted by  $\varphi^{\text{hyper}}$ , whose mapping  $\mathcal{G}_{\varphi^{\text{hyper}}}$  transforms each user embedding into its module weights via

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}[t] = \mathcal{G}_{\varphi^{\text{hyper}}}(\mathbf{u}_k^{\text{user}}[t]). \quad (11)$$

The resulting procedure is summarized as Algorithm 1.

---

#### Algorithm 1: Modular Hypernetwork Adaptation

---

**Input:** Pilots set  $\mathcal{D}[t] = \{\mathbf{s}^{\text{pilot}}[t], \mathbf{y}^{\text{pilot}}[t]\}$ ;  
Information channel output  $\mathbf{y}^{\text{info}}[t]$ ;  
Number of users  $K[t]$ .

- 1 Estimate  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}[t]$  by (8);
  - 2 **for**  $k \in \{1, \dots, K[t]\}$  **do**
  - 3     **for**  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, K^{\max}\}$  **do**
  - 4         Calculate  $\mathbf{u}_k^{(\ell)}[t]$  by (9);
  - 5         Concatenate  $\mathbf{u}_k^{\text{user}}[t]$  using (10);
  - 6         Get parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}[t]$  from  $\varphi^{\text{hyper}}$  via (11);
  - 7 Set deep receiver  $\Theta_{\text{hyper}}^{(K[t])}[t] \leftarrow \{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}[t]\}_{k=1}^{K[t]}$
  - 8 **return**  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}^{\text{info}}[t] = \mathcal{F}_{\Theta_{\text{hyper}}^{(K[t])}[t]}(\mathbf{y}^{\text{pilot}}[t])$
- 

We note that the number of weights in each module can generally depend on the number of users  $K[t]$ . For instance, in DeepSIC each module accounts for the  $K[t] - 1$  interfering symbols as in (4). As the hypernetworks is a DNN with a fixed number of output neurons, we set its output size to be  $|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K^{\max})}[t]|$ . Then, for each  $k$ th user, we calculate the inferred parameters via (11), by taking the  $|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K[t])}[t]|$  first outputs as the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}[t]$  of the  $k$ th user in the  $t$ th block. We run the hypernetwork for each context vector  $\mathbf{u}_k^{\text{user}}[t]$ , yielding the entire parameters set  $\Theta_{\text{hyper}}^{(K[t])}[t] = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}[t]\}_{k=1}^{K[t]}$ .

3) *Hypernetwork Training*: The trainable parameters of the modular hypernetwork are the DNN weights  $\varphi^{\text{hyper}}$ , and the embedding vectors  $\mathbf{e}^{\text{self}}$ ,  $\mathbf{e}^{\text{pad}}$ . They are designed to be trained offline, as in joint training, i.e., using the datasets  $\{\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{(K)}\}_{K=2}^{K^{\max}}$ , comprised of multiple input-output blocks for different values of  $K$ .

Specifically, for each channel input-output block observed during training, the forward pass follows Algorithm 1. The channel parameters are first approximated using least-squares estimation (8), the user embedding are generated via (9), and thereafter the parameters  $\Theta_{\text{hyper}}^{(K)}[t]$  are obtained. We use conventional deep learning based on SGD-based learning, while computing the gradients by backpropagation through the deep receiver, the hypernetwork DNN, and trainable embeddings. The loss that guides the training procedure is the cross-entropy (6), namely, it seeks to approach

$$\underset{\varphi^{\text{hyper}}, \mathbf{e}^{\text{self}}, \mathbf{e}^{\text{pad}}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{K=2}^{K^{\max}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}} \left( \{\mathcal{G}_{\varphi^{\text{hyper}}}(\mathbf{u}_k^{\text{user}}[t])\}_{k=1}^K, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{(K)} \right),$$

where the dependence on the embedding vectors  $\mathbf{e}^{\text{self}}$ ,  $\mathbf{e}^{\text{pad}}$  is encapsulated in the embedding vectors via (9).

#### B. Complexity Analysis

Given the considerable resource and latency expenditure associated with re-training, one of the aims of our modular hypernetworks is to support adaptation for the instantaneous channel without the computational burden of online training. To quantify this gain, we analyze the average per-block computational complexity of online learning as compared to our modular hypernetwork approach.

In our analysis we introduce the following symbols:

- *Training complexity*  $\kappa_{\text{T}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , representing the computational effort in training a DNN with parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  using, e.g., conventional SGD-based training.
- *Inference complexity*  $\kappa_{\text{I}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , representing the computational effort of running an inference once through a neural network with parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ .

For DNNs, both training and inference complexity scale linearly with the number of weights and the data size [30, Ch. 11]. Thus, for a block comprised  $B^{\text{pilot}}$  pilots and  $B^{\text{info}}$  information symbols, we write  $\kappa_{\text{T}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \alpha_{\text{T}}|\boldsymbol{\theta}|B^{\text{pilot}}$  and  $\kappa_{\text{I}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \alpha_{\text{I}}|\boldsymbol{\theta}|B^{\text{info}}$  for some  $\alpha_{\text{T}}, \alpha_{\text{I}} > 0$  that represent the effort of processing a single symbol using a single parameter in training or inference, respectively. Note that as training involves numerous forward passes and gradient updates, it holds that  $\alpha_{\text{T}} \gg \alpha_{\text{I}}$ . For simplicity (and also corresponding to the common practice in unfolded architectures [12], [17]), we assume that each module has the same number of parameters, such that  $|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}[t]| = \frac{1}{K}|\Theta^{(K)}[t]|$  for each  $k$ .

Using the above notations, we can characterize the computational savings in terms of average per-block inference

complexity of modular hypernetworks compared to online learning, as stated in the following proposition

**Proposition 1.** Consider the transmission of scalar symbols  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{C}$  with pilots holding  $B^{\text{pilot}} > K^{\text{max}}$ . Then, the ratio in the average per-block complexity of online learning and modular hypernetwork adaptation when using a modular architecture with  $|\boldsymbol{\theta}|$  parameters per each module with  $K$  users satisfies

$$\frac{C_{\text{avg}}^{\text{Hyper}}}{C_{\text{avg}}^{\text{Online}}} = \frac{\alpha_{\text{I}}(|\boldsymbol{\theta}|B^{\text{info}} + |\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{\text{hyper}}|) + \mathcal{O}(NB^{\text{pilot}})}{(\alpha_{\text{T}}B^{\text{pilot}} + \alpha_{\text{I}}B^{\text{info}})|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}. \quad (12)$$

*Proof.* On each block, online learning involves re-training  $K$  modules with  $|\boldsymbol{\theta}|$ , and inference using a DNN with  $|\boldsymbol{\theta}|K$  parameters, hence  $C_{\text{avg}}^{\text{Online}} = (\alpha_{\text{T}}B^{\text{pilot}} + \alpha_{\text{I}}B^{\text{info}})|\boldsymbol{\theta}|K$ .

The modular hypernetwork infers with the same architecture (at complexity  $\alpha_{\text{I}}B^{\text{info}}|\boldsymbol{\theta}|K$ ) without any online training. Instead, it uses  $K$  hypernetwork runs, each with complexity  $\alpha_{\text{I}}|\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{\text{hyper}}|$ , and the least squares estimate (8) from  $B^{\text{pilot}}$  measurements, at complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(NB^{\text{pilot}}K)$  as  $N \geq K$ . Taking the ratio proves the proposition.  $\square$

The characterization of the excessive complexity of the considered forms of adaption in Proposition 1 accommodates all computations carried out online. One can obtain a more concise (yet faithful) approximation of the complexity-per-block savings assuming the following expected properties:

- P1 Training on the pilots is notably more computationally intensive than detection, i.e.,  $\alpha_{\text{T}}B^{\text{pilot}} \gg \alpha_{\text{I}}B^{\text{info}}$ .
- P2 Computing the linear least-squares features (8) is substantially less complex compared to the subsequent application of the hypernetwork and the DNN.

When P1-P2 hold, the complexity ratio in Proposition 1 simplifies to the following corollary:

**Corollary 1.** Under P1-P2, Proposition 1 implies that

$$\frac{C_{\text{avg}}^{\text{Hyper}}}{C_{\text{avg}}^{\text{Online}}} \approx \frac{\alpha_{\text{I}}B^{\text{info}}}{\alpha_{\text{T}}B^{\text{pilot}}} \left( 1 + \frac{|\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{\text{hyper}}|}{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|B^{\text{info}}} \right).$$

Corollary 1 reveals that, when the (expected) properties P1-P2 are satisfied, as long as the hypernetwork is not dramatically more complex compared to the modules it outputs, then  $\frac{C_{\text{avg}}^{\text{Hyper}}}{C_{\text{avg}}^{\text{Online}}} \ll 1$ . Namely, our proposed modular hypernetwork framework is likely to be notably less complex during each block compared to online training.

### C. Discussion

Both our proposed modular hypernetwork, as well as existing online learning and joint learning approaches, are strategies for handling the dynamic nature of wireless scenarios. In well-known and relatively static test channels, one can train the deep receiver offline and, as long as the training channel remains valid, reliably detect data transmitted over the test channel. However, if the observed channel is dynamic, such as under MIMO settings where users join and leave the network, each experiencing time-varying conditions, then continuous adaptation of both the architecture and weights of the deep receiver is necessary. Straightforward online training, though,




Fig. 2: Block-varying SNR profiles,  $K[t] = 14$ .

demands a large number of labeled pilots and incurs significant latency and complexity overhead due to the need for training during each coherence duration.

Our proposed hypernetwork-based approach offers a middle ground between the joint and online methods. It presumes access to a dataset from closely related channels, although not identical to the one encountered during testing, and performs training offline. At test time, it requires only a small number of pilots and limited overhead to produce weights without any additional training. Thereby, it enables continuous adaptation of the architecture, which elastically matches the current network, as well the weights to match the channel, at lower computational costs than online training.

As modular hypernetworks rely on offline training, they share some of the limitations associated this learning paradigm. For instance, it requires for a large quantity of labeled data from channels similar to that observed on deployment. Being applied in settings that substantially differ from those observed in training leads to performance degradation, as noted in Section IV, although it still outperforms joint learning. Furthermore, our hypernetwork may struggle to scale effectively to scenarios involving a few hundred users due to the exponentially growing space of possible mappings, as dictated by the input and output sizes. This can be possibly tackled by utilizing hypernetworks that do not output the weights directly, but more compact correction terms, see, e.g., context modulation techniques [31]. These extensions are left for future research.

## IV. NUMERICAL EVALUATIONS



### A. Experimental Setup

**Learning Methods:** We compare the following schemes: (i) *Joint Learning*, that trains offline a set of weights for each different users configuration; (ii) *Online Learning* from pilots; and (iii) our proposed *Modular Hypernetworks*. The learning rates are  $1 \cdot 10^{-3}$  for joint and online learning, and  $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$  for the hypernetwork. The number of Adam iterations is set as 100 for the joint and the online methods, and to 25 for the hypernetwork. This implies that  $\alpha_{\text{T}} > 100\alpha_{\text{I}}$ . These values were set empirically to ensure convergence<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>The source code used in our experiments is available at <https://github.com/tomerraviv95/adapting-detectors-using-hypernetworks>

TABLE I: Runtime over  $T = 100$  blocks

Learning Method	Average Runtime
Joint learning	2 [s]
Online learning	300 [s]
Modular hypernetwork	3.1 [s]



(a) SER vs. block index for  $K[t] = 8$ .(b) SER vs. block index for  $K[t] = 14$ .Fig. 3: Synthetic channel, time-invariant  $K[t]$ .

**Architecture:** We compare the learning methods for training the modular DeepSIC architecture [12]. We unroll  $Q = 3$  iterations with user-specific DNN-modules comprised of two fully-connected (FC) layers with sizes  $(N + K[t] - 1) \times 16$  and  $16 \times 2$  having ReLU activations in-between, thus  $|\theta| = 16(N + K[t] + 1) + 18$  (including bias). These values were chosen as a trade-off between its expressiveness and performance. The hypernetwork is composed of two hidden layers of sizes  $N \cdot K^{\max} \times 64$ ,  $64 \times 32$  with intermediate ReLU activations, and a linear output layer of size  $16(N + K^{\max} - 1)$ , corresponding to the parameters of a single module. The number of hypernetwork parameters is thus  $|\varphi^{\text{hyper}}| = 64 \cdot (N \cdot K^{\max} + 1) + 32 \cdot 65 + 33 \cdot (16(N + K^{\max} + 1) + 18)$  (including bias).

**Channels:** We employ a dynamic linear channel model for all evaluations. The input-output relationship of the considered memoryless Gaussian MIMO channel is

$$\mathbf{y}_i[t] = \mathbf{H}[t]\mathbf{s}_i[t] + \mathbf{w}_i[t], \quad (13)$$

where  $\mathbf{H}[t]$  is a  $N \times K[t]$  channel matrix, and  $\mathbf{w}_i[t]$  is white Gaussian noise. We consider two different settings of  $\mathbf{H}[t]$ : (i) *Synthetic* channels, where  $\mathbf{H}[t]$  models spatial exponential received power decay with a different per-user SNR, and its

(a) SER vs. block index for  $K[t] = 8$ .(b) SER vs. block index for  $K[t] = 14$ .Fig. 4: COST 2100 channel, time-invariant  $K[t]$ .



entries are given by  $(\mathbf{H})_{n,k} = \sqrt{SNR_k} \cdot e^{-|n-k|}$ , for each  $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and  $k \in \{1, \dots, K[t]\}$ . The SNRs profiles of each user are varying with the block index (but are constant at each block), as illustrated in Fig. 2. (ii) *COST2100* channel, generated from the geometry-based stochastic model of [32]. The channel represents multiple users moving at speeds in  $0 - 5$  [m/s] in a semi-urban environment with an operating frequency of 300[MHz] with mixed urban and rural features. Semi-urban environments often have propagation characteristics that are more complex than in purely rural or urban environments, due to the varied types of obstacles and open areas. Succeeding on this scenario requires high adaptivity, since there is considerable variability in the channels observed in different blocks.

The symbols are generated i.i.d. from a binary phase shift keying (BPSK) constellation. Unless stated otherwise, each of the  $T = 100$  blocks is composed of  $B^{\text{pilot}} = 800$  pilot symbols, and  $B^{\text{info}} = 15,200$  information symbols, i.e.,  $B^{\text{tran}} = 16,000$  symbols. To obtain the weights for the joint and hypernetwork-based methods, we train offline with 100,000 symbols per each  $K \in \{2, \dots, K^{\max}\}$ .

## B. Weights Only Adaptation

We begin by evaluating SER for two configurations that only require weights adaptation, i.e.,  $K[t]$  remains fixed. In the first, the number of antennas is set to  $N = K^{\max} = 12$  and  $K[t] = 8$  and in the second  $N = K^{\max} = 20$  and  $K[t] = 14$ .

**Synthetic Channel:** The aggregated SER performance is reported in Fig. 3. We observe that joint learning fails to adapt the receiver for each given channel profile. Online learning



(a)  $K[t] \in \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$ .(b)  $K[t] \in \{14, 15, 16, 17, 18\}$ .Fig. 5: Synthetic channel, time-varying  $K[t]$ .

outperforms joint learning by a factor of  $\times 2$  continuously, by adapting for each channel realization. Our modular hypernetwork is able to track, and even slightly surpasses online training, while reducing its complexity overhead. Specifically, by Corollary 1, the complexity saving here holds  $\frac{C_{\text{Hyper}}}{C_{\text{Online}}^{\text{avg}}} < 0.2$ , for both configurations. These savings are translated to even more substantial latency reduction, as reported in Table I (where all runtimes are evaluated on the same RTX3060 GPU). There, we note that the runtime of modular hypernetworks is comparable to joint learning, and is over  $100\times$  faster than online training.

**COST2100 Channel:** We next consider the COST 2100 channel with SNR of 12 dB for all users. Fig. 4 reports the average SER vs. block index over  $T = 100$  blocks. The main conclusion highlighted above is confirmed in this more realistic setting. We systematically observe that modular hypernetworks strike a balance between joint and online learning, while reducing the overall complexity.

### C. Architecture & Weights Adaptation

Next, we allow the number of users to randomly change across transmission. Specifically, in the first configuration the number of antennas is set to  $N = 12$  with  $K[t] \in \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$ , and in the second  $N = 20$  with  $K[t] \in \{14, 15, 16, 17, 18\}$ . To accommodate different number of users, joint learning has to train offline on all users combinations, resulting in weights for each  $K[t]$ , and increasing the memory footprint by an order of  $K^{\max}$ . In contrast, modular hypernetworks maintain a single DNN for a given  $K^{\max}$ .

(a)  $K[t] \in \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$ .(b)  $K[t] \in \{14, 15, 16, 17, 18\}$ .Fig. 6: COST2100 channel, time-varying  $K[t]$ .

**Synthetic Channel:** The average SER for the synthetic channel model is depicted in Fig. 5. We note that even when not only the weights, but also the architecture itself is required to vary, our modular hypernetwork can still closely match online learning. For a high number of users, all methods seem to achieve a similar performance. These results are consistent with the ones in Fig. 3.

**COST2100 Channel:** In Fig. 6 we report the SER vs.  $t$  for COST2100. There, we observe that the performance of the modular hypernetwork is yet better than joint learning, while improving the complexity (but not the performance) of online learning by over  $\times 5$  less computational overhead.

To evaluate performance across a broad range of SNRs, we measure the aggregated average SER over the transmission of  $T = 100$  using different SNR values (that dictate the variance Gaussian noise vector  $w_i[t]$  in (13)). As observed in Fig. 7, our method matches the SER performance of the online training scheme across small to medium SNRs, and is performing better than joint learning in medium-to-high SNRs, yet with smaller complexity and memory footprint.

While modular hypernetworks are based on offline training (as in joint learning), their performance also depends on the pilots (as in online learning), from which the features used to set the weights are extracted. Therefore, we next evaluate the effect of varying number of pilots, and robustness to limited pilots. To that aim, we consider the COST 2100 scenario with 12 dB SNR,  $K[t] \in \{14, 15, 16, 17, 18\}$ , and  $N = 20$ , employing the same hyperparameters as previously used, but varying the number of pilots each for each  $T = 100$  blocks transmission. We observe in Fig. 8 that modular hypernetworks




Fig. 7: COST 2100 channel, aggregated SER.




Fig. 8: SER vs  $B^{\text{pilot}}$ , COST 2100 channel.

can outperform online learning in the small data regime. However, as the available training data grows, our approach does not benefit from additional pilots, similarly to joint learning. Accordingly, the notable complexity reduction of modular hypernetworks comes at the cost of some performance loss compared to online learning.

## V. CONCLUSION

We proposed modular hypernetworks to rapidly adapt deep receivers to channel and network variations. This is achieved by training offline an architecture that generates DNN modules online. We provide a complexity analysis, and empirically demonstrate the ability of our approach to provide online adaptation that can approach online training, with similar complexity of pre-trained receivers.

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. Dai, R. Jiao, F. Adachi, H. V. Poor, and L. Hanzo, "Deep learning for wireless communications: An emerging interdisciplinary paradigm," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 133–139, 2020.
- [2] C.-X. Wang, M. Di Renzo, S. Stanczak, S. Wang, and E. G. Larsson, "Artificial intelligence enabled wireless networking for 5g and beyond: Recent advances and future challenges," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 16–23, 2020.
- [3] O. Simeone, *Machine learning for engineers*. Cambridge university press, 2022.
- [4] H. L. M. Kee, N. Ahmad, M. A. M. Izhar, K. Anwar, and S. X. Ng, "A review on machine learning for channel coding," *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 89 002–89 025, 2024.
- [5] T. Raviv, S. Park, O. Simeone, Y. C. Eldar, and N. Shlezinger, "Adaptive and flexible model-based ai for deep receivers in dynamic channels," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, 2024.
- [6] F. A. Aoudia and J. Hoydis, "End-to-end learning for OFDM: From neural receivers to pilotless communication," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 1049–1063, 2021.
- [7] G. Zhu, D. Liu, Y. Du, C. You, J. Zhang, and K. Huang, "Toward an intelligent edge: Wireless communication meets machine learning," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 19–25, 2020.
- [8] T. O'Shea and J. Hoydis, "An introduction to deep learning for the physical layer," *IEEE Trans. on Cogn. Commun. Netw.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 563–575, 2017.
- [9] J. Xia, D. Deng, and D. Fan, "A note on implementation methodologies of deep learning-based signal detection for conventional MIMO transmitters," *IEEE Trans. Broadcast.*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 744–745, 2020.
- [10] M. Honkala, D. Korpi, and J. M. Huttunen, "DeepRx: Fully convolutional deep learning receiver," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 3925–3940, 2021.
- [11] N. Shlezinger, N. Farsad, Y. C. Eldar, and A. J. Goldsmith, "ViterbiNet: A deep learning based Viterbi algorithm for symbol detection," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 3319–3331, 2020.
- [12] N. Shlezinger, R. Fu, and Y. C. Eldar, "DeepSIC: Deep soft interference cancellation for multiuser MIMO detection," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 1349–1362, 2021.
- [13] T. Raviv and N. Shlezinger, "Data augmentation for deep receivers," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 8259–8274, 2023.
- [14] S. Schibisch, S. Cammerer, S. Dörner, J. Hoydis, and S. ten Brink, "Online label recovery for deep learning-based communication through error correcting codes," in *Proc. IEEE ISWCS*, 2018.
- [15] N. Shlezinger, Y. C. Eldar, and S. P. Boyd, "Model-based deep learning: On the intersection of deep learning and optimization," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 115 384–115 398, 2022.
- [16] N. Shlezinger and Y. C. Eldar, "Model-based deep learning," *Foundations and Trends® in Signal Processing*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 291–416, 2023.
- [17] A. Balatsoukas-Stimming and C. Studer, "Deep unfolding for communications systems: A survey and some new directions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.05774*, 2019.
- [18] A. Zappone, M. Di Renzo, and M. Debbah, "Wireless networks design in the era of deep learning: Model-based, AI-based, or both?" *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 67, no. 10, pp. 7331–7376, 2019.
- [19] T. Raviv, S. Park, O. Simeone, Y. C. Eldar, and N. Shlezinger, "Online meta-learning for hybrid model-based deep receivers," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 10, pp. 6415–6431, 2023.
- [20] S. Park, H. Jang, O. Simeone, and J. Kang, "Learning to demodulate from few pilots via offline and online meta-learning," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 69, pp. 226 – 239, 2020.
- [21] M. Zecchin, S. Park, O. Simeone, M. Kountouris, and D. Gesbert, "Robust Bayesian learning for reliable wireless AI: Framework and applications," *IEEE Trans. on Cogn. Commun. Netw.*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 897–912, 2023.
- [22] T. Raviv, S. Park, O. Simeone, and N. Shlezinger, "Uncertainty-aware and reliable neural MIMO receivers via modular Bayesian deep learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02436*, 2023.
- [23] N. Uzlauer, T. Raviv, N. Shlezinger, and K. Todros, "Concept drift detection for deep learning aided receivers in dynamic channels," in *Proc. IEEE SPAWC*, 2024.
- [24] D. Ha, A. Dai, and Q. V. Le, "Hypernetworks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.09106*, 2016.
- [25] T. Galanti and L. Wolf, "On the modularity of hypernetworks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 10 409–10 419, 2020.



- [26] M. Goutay, F. A. Aoudia, and J. Hoydis, "Deep hypernetwork-based MIMO detection," in *Proc. IEEE SPAWC*, 2020.
- [27] G. Liu, Z. Hu, L. Wang, H. Zhang, J. Xue, and M. Matthaiou, "A hypernetwork based framework for non-stationary channel prediction," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, 2024, early access.
- [28] E. Nachmani and L. Wolf, "Hyper-graph-network decoders for block codes," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [29] K. Pratik, R. A. Amjad, A. Behboodi, J. B. Soriaga, and M. Welling, "Neural augmentation of Kalman filter with hypernetwork for channel tracking," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2021.
- [30] R. Zadeh, H. Li, B. He, M. Lublin, and Y. Perez, "CME 323: Distributed algorithms and optimization [lecure notes]," *Stanford*, 2015.
- [31] X. Ni, G. Revach, and N. Shlezinger, "Adaptive KalmanNet: Data-driven Kalman filter with fast adaptation," in *Proc. IEEE ICASSP*, 2024.
- [32] L. Liu, C. Oestges, J. Poutanen, K. Haneda, P. Vainikainen, F. Quitin, F. Tufvesson, and P. De Doncker, "The COST 2100 MIMO channel model," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 92–99, 2012.