

# Coexistence of Radar and Communication with Rate-Splitting Wireless Access

Anup Mishra\*, Israel Leyva-Mayorga\*, and Petar Popovski \*

\*Department of Electronic systems, Aalborg University, Denmark ({anmi, ilm, petarp}@es.aau.dk)

**Abstract**—This work investigates the co-existence of sensing and communication functionalities in a base station (BS) serving a communication user in the uplink and simultaneously detecting a radar target with the same frequency resources. To address inter-functionality interference, we employ rate-splitting (RS) at the communication user and successive interference cancellation (SIC) at the joint radar-communication receiver at the BS. This approach is motivated by RS’s proven effectiveness in mitigating inter-user interference among communication users. Building on the proposed system model based on RS, we derive inner bounds on performance in terms of ergodic data information rate for communication and ergodic radar estimation information rate for sensing. Additionally, we present a closed-form solution for the optimal power split in RS that maximizes the communication user’s performance. The bounds achieved with RS are compared to conventional methods, including spectral isolation and full spectral sharing with SIC. We demonstrate that RS offers a superior performance trade-off between sensing and communication functionalities compared to traditional approaches. Pertinently, while the original concept of RS deals only with digital signals, this work brings forward RS as a general method for including non-orthogonal access for sensing signals. As a consequence, the work done in this paper provides a systematic and parametrized way to effectuate non-orthogonal sensing and communication waveforms.

**Index Terms**—Performance bound, radar-communications co-existence, RS, SIC

## I. INTRODUCTION

**F**UTURE wireless networks such as beyond 5G (B5G) and sixth-generation (6G) systems are gearing up to embrace the sensing functionality [1], [2]. With growing similarities in radio resources, hardware platforms, and signal processing techniques between communication and sensing, their integration has attracted significant attention from academia and industry alike [1], [3]. This integration promises to enable myriads of use-cases for future wireless networks including (but not limited to) smart cities, remote sensing, Internet-of-things, and vehicle-to-everything connectivity [2], [3]. With that being said, a critical challenge in realizing this potential lies in managing the detrimental interference between communication and sensing while achieving an optimal performance trade-off [1], [2], [4]. To this end, previous works have explored either spectral isolation or spectral sharing with successive interference cancellation (SIC) to address this issue of interference [2]–[4]. However, spectral isolation may result in low resource efficiency, while spectral sharing with SIC is more suited to systems prioritizing sensing, as communication rates




Fig. 1: A basic joint sensing-communication setup where a base station (BS) is serving a communication user in the uplink and simultaneously sensing a radar target.

are constrained by sensing interference [2]. Thus, overcoming this challenge calls for the development of more efficient interference management strategies to ensure the seamless co-existence of the two functionalities [1], [4], [5].

One approach that has gained significant traction as a versatile interference and resource management technique for communication functionality is rate-splitting (RS) [5]–[7]. In RS, a communication user’s message is split into multiple parts which are then transmitted using superposition coding (SC) at the transmitter and decoded using SIC at the receiver [5], [6]. Building on RS, the rate-splitting multiple access (RSMA) scheme serves multiple communication users by adjusting both the message split and the power allocation to different parts of the users’ messages [6], [8]. Through this, RSMA effectively manages inter-user interference by partially decoding the interference and partially treating interference as noise [5], [8]. Such an approach allows RSMA to achieve optimal degrees-of-freedom (DoF) in the downlink, as well as the capacity region in the uplink without requiring time-sharing among users [5], [6].

Motivated by the above, in this work, we investigate the performance bound of RS in a joint sensing-communication system comprising an active, mono-static, pulsed radar and a communication user. To this end, we consider a BS with a joint radar-communication receiver serving a communication user in the uplink and simultaneously sensing a radar target; see Fig. 1. This joint receiver is capable of simultaneously estimating radar target parameters from the radar echoes and decoding the received communication signals [2], [4]. We also assume that the radar system operates without any constraints on the maximum unambiguous range. On the other hand, the communication user is employing RS at its side to

This work was supported in part by the Velux Foundation under the Villum Investigator grant WATER.

transmit information. Building on this, we derive the sensing-communication co-existence performance bounds for RS. For the radar target, the performance bound is measured in terms of ergodic radar estimation information rate, whereas for the communication user it is ergodic data information rate [2], [4]. Moreover, we utilize the derived performance bounds to obtain the optimal power split for RS that maximizes the data information rate of the communication user. We show that by virtue of its versatile design principle, RS manages the interference between sensing and communication functionalities more efficiently, and allows to achieve a better performance trade-off between the two compared to conventional approaches of spectral isolation and spectral sharing with SIC [2]. Moreover, this work takes forward the concept of RS beyond digital signals only and puts it as a general method for including non-orthogonal access for sensing signals. Consequently, this paper provides a systematic and parametrized way to effectuate non-orthogonal sensing and communication waveforms.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL

To begin with, we outline the key assumptions made in this work, which align with those presented in [4]. It is important to note that both our system model and most of the assumptions closely follow the framework established in [4], which investigates the performance bounds for conventional approaches. Moreover, for simplicity, we restrict our focus on range estimation as we are concerned with investigating and comparing performance bounds of different approaches [2], [4]. However, the work done in this paper can be extended to other estimation parameters as well [4]. Subsequently, below, we list the key assumptions made in this work:

- Based on prior observations (since the target is being tracked), the BS is able to accurately estimate the target cross-section and to predict the range up to some error, which has a Gaussian distribution.
- Only the time portion where the radar return and communication signals overlap is considered for analysis.

Next, we delineate the signal model for the radar return of the target, and of the communication user.

### A. Signal model

We consider a system operating in the complex-baseband, where the BS is serving a communication user in the uplink and simultaneously tracking a radar target. To this end, the BS transmits a radar signal  $r(t)$  with power  $P_r$  and unit variance [4]. Moreover, the BS sets the configuration parameters for the uplink transmitter e.g., power and rate split for RS, etc.<sup>1</sup> For the radar return signal, we denote the complex combined antenna gain, radar cross-section, and propagation gain by  $a_r$ , and time-delay by  $\tau_r$ .

Next, since the communication user employs RS at the transmitter, its message is split into two parts [5]. Subsequently, the two parts are independently encoded into streams

<sup>1</sup>The relevance of this consideration will be helpful when calculating the performance measures for both the radar target and the communication user.

of unit variance,  $s_{c,1}(t)$  and  $s_{c,2}(t)$ . These streams are allocated powers  $P_{c,1}$  and  $P_{c,2}$  respectively, such that  $P_{c,1} + P_{c,2} \leq P_c$ , with  $P_c$  as the total uplink transmit power available at the communication user. While we consider one communication user here, the work done in this paper can be extended to multiple users case. Subsequently, the uplink transmit signal of the communication user,  $x(t)$ , is expressed as [5], [6]

$$x(t) = \sqrt{P_{c,1}} s_{c,1}(t) + \sqrt{P_{c,2}} s_{c,2}(t). \quad (1)$$

The complex combined antenna gain and propagation loss (amplitude) for  $x(t)$  is denoted by  $b_c$ . Thereafter, at the BS, the overall signal received by the joint radar-communication receiver is passed through a brick-wall filter matched to the bandwidth  $B$  of the system [4]. This joint radar-communications complex-baseband received signal, denoted by  $y(t)$ , can be expressed as

$$y(t) = b_c x(t) + \sqrt{P_r} a_r r(t - \tau_r) + n(t), \quad (2)$$

where  $n(t)$  is the thermal noise which is drawn from a Gaussian distribution of zero mean and variance  $\sigma_n^2 = \kappa_B T_{\text{temp}} B$ . Here,  $\kappa_B$  and  $T_{\text{temp}}$  denote the Boltzman constant and effective temperature, respectively. At the BS, the joint radar-communication receiver first decodes one stream of the communication user, then the radar return signal, and finally the other stream. Without loss of generality, we assume the decoding order to be  $s_{c,1}(t) \rightarrow r(t - \tau_r) \rightarrow s_{c,2}(t)$ . In the following, we delineate the decoding process at the BS. For ease of understanding, Fig. 2 illustrates the framework for decoding the radar and communication signals at the BS. It is worth noting that in analog-to-digital conversion at baseband, sampling requirements differ for radar and communication signals due to radar's short pulse duration and need for high range resolution. Radar requires a high sampling rate to accurately capture temporal features for precise range measurements, whereas communication signals prioritize data fidelity over longer durations. The processing of the received baseband signal requires: 1) decoding the first communication stream with the *predicted* radar return time-delay; 2) estimating the radar time-delay; and 3) decoding the second communication stream with the *estimated* radar return. These operations and




Fig. 2: Joint radar-communications system block diagram with RS at the communication user and SIC at the BS.

their corresponding sampling considerations take place in the respective blocks of Fig. 2.

### B. First Communication Stream With Predicted Radar Return Suppressed

As mentioned in Section II, since we assume the target is being tracked, we have prior knowledge of its range from previous observations, albeit with fluctuations due to an underlying random process associated with the target [4]. This range fluctuation can be translated into time-delay fluctuation which is modeled by a Gaussian distribution  $n_{\text{proc}}$  [2], [4]. Subsequently, during the  $k^{\text{th}}$  observation, the delay for the target,  $\tau_r^{(k)}$ , can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_r^{(k)} &= \tau_{r,\text{pre}}^{(k)} + n_{\tau_r,\text{proc}} \\ \tau_{r,\text{pre}}^{(k)} &= f(k; T_{\text{pri}}, \phi),\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

where  $\tau_{r,\text{pre}}$  is the predicted time-delay, and  $f(k; T_{\text{pri}}, \phi)$  is a prediction function for it. The prediction function depends on the pulse repetition interval  $T_{\text{pri}}$ , and a set of system and target parameters,  $\phi$  [4]. The variance of the time-delay function process,  $\sigma_{\tau_r,\text{proc}}^2$ , is given by

$$\sigma_{\tau_r,\text{proc}}^2 = \mathbb{E} \left\{ |n_{\tau_r,\text{proc}}|^2 \right\} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| \tau_r^{(k)} - f(k; T_{\text{pri}}, \phi) \right|^2 \right\}.\quad (4)$$

Using the predicted time-delay, the receiver seeks to mitigate interference from the radar return signal while decoding the first communication stream,  $s_{c,1}$ , by subtracting the predicted radar return from the received signal,  $y(t)$  [3], [4]. Consequently, the received signal with the predicted radar return suppressed can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{y}(t) &= b_c \sqrt{P_{c,1}} s_{c,1}(t) + b_c \sqrt{P_{c,2}} s_{c,2}(t) + \\ &\quad \sqrt{P_r} a_r [r(t - \tau_r) - r(t - \tau_{r,\text{pre}})] + n(t),\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

Note that the estimated amplitude is assumed to be equal to the actual amplitude, which is only reasonable to assume if the error in the time-delay is smaller than  $1/B$  [4]. Further, the difference between the actual radar return and predicted radar return can be approximated by a derivative for small fluctuations as

$$r(t - \tau_r) - r(t - \tau_{r,\text{pre}}) \approx \frac{\partial r(t - \tau_r)}{\partial t} n_{\tau_r,\text{proc}}.\quad (6)$$

Subsequently,  $\tilde{y}(t)$  can be approximated as

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{y}(t) &\approx b_c \sqrt{P_{c,1}} s_{c,1}(t) + b_c \sqrt{P_{c,2}} s_{c,2}(t) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{P_r} a_r \frac{\partial r(t - \tau_r)}{\partial t} n_{\tau_r,\text{proc}} + n(t).\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

Following this, the interference plus noise from the first communications stream's point of view is given by

$$\begin{aligned}n_{\text{int}+\text{n},1} &\approx b_c \sqrt{P_{c,2}} s_{c,2}(t) + \\ &\quad \sqrt{P_r} a_r \frac{\partial r(t - \tau_r)}{\partial t} n_{\tau_r,\text{proc}} + n(t),\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

and its power is given by [4], [5]

$$\sigma_{\text{int}+\text{n},1}^2 = |b_c|^2 P_{c,2} + P_r |a_r|^2 (2\pi)^2 B_{\text{rms}}^2 \sigma_{\tau_r,\text{proc}}^2 + \sigma_n^2,\quad (9)$$

where  $B_{\text{rms}}$  is the root-mean squared radar bandwidth. For the calculation of  $B_{\text{rms}}$ , please refer to [4], [9]. The relationship between the bandwidth  $B$  and  $B_{\text{rms}}$  is given by [4], [9]

$$\gamma^2 B^2 = (2\pi)^2 B_{\text{rms}}^2,\quad (10)$$

where the scaling factor  $\gamma$  is dependent on the shape of the radar waveform's power spectral density [4]. The value of  $\gamma$  for a flat spectral wave is  $\gamma^2 = (2\pi)^2/12$ . Subsequently, the BS decodes the communication stream  $s_{c,1}$  with interference from the suppressed radar return and stream  $s_{c,2}$ . Thereafter, using SIC, the BS removes  $s_{c,1}$  to then decode the radar signal, and stream  $s_{c,2}$ . As mentioned in Section II, the analysis is for the case when there is an *overlap* between the communication signal and the radar return signal, i.e., the radar signal and the communication signal are received simultaneously [2]–[4].

### C. Radar Return Signal With Second Communication Stream As Interference

In this subsection, we derive the cramer-rao lower bound (CRLB) for the time-delay estimation of the radar signal. To this end, we consider a simple matched filter or correlation receiver for time-delay estimation [4]. Assuming perfect SIC of the first communication stream  $s_{c,1}$ ; as considered in [4] for deriving the inner bounds on performance of a joint sensing-communication system for spectral sharing with SIC; the received signal at the time-delay estimator is expressed as

$$z(t) = a_r \sqrt{P_r} r(t - \tau_r) + b_c \sqrt{P_{c,2}} s_{c,2}(t) + n(t).\quad (11)$$

It is important to note that  $s_{c,2}(t)$  and  $\tau_r$  are independent of each other. Therefore, the presence of  $b_c \sqrt{P_{c,2}} s_{c,2}(t)$  adds an independent, deterministic constant interference within the overlap period, which effectively increases the total noise variance. The CRLB for the estimation of  $\tau_r$  through the considered correlation receiver would reflect this increased noise variance. This approach is justified when the communication and radar signals overlap in the complex baseband, and the symbol duration of the communication signal is much larger than the radar pulse duration  $T$ , which is generally the case given the requirements of range resolution in radar. Additionally, this configuration can be achieved by having the BS send instructions to the communication user, as outlined at the beginning of Section II.<sup>2</sup> To derive inner bounds on the performance of the joint sensing-communication system using RS, we account for the worst-case interference introduced by the secondary communication stream to the radar signal, which is the peak power of the second communication stream in baseband. Subsequently, we derive the CRLB for time-delay estimation in the presence of the second communication stream and noise. To this end, the probability density function

<sup>2</sup>The authors wish to emphasize that when the symbol length of the communication signal is comparable to  $T$ , biased estimate of the time-delay may arise, particularly in cases where the pulse shape of the communication signal deviates from a rectangular form. Such scenarios will arise when the symbol length of the communication signal is significantly reduced, and should be investigated in future research.

of the received signal with  $\theta = \tau_r$  as the parameter of interest is given by

$$p(z(t); \theta) = \frac{1}{\pi \sigma_{\text{eff}}^2} e^{-\frac{|z(t) - a_r \sqrt{P_r} r(t - \tau_r)|^2}{\sigma_{\text{eff}}^2}}, \quad (12)$$

where  $\sigma_{\text{eff}}^2 = \sigma_n^2 + |b_c|^2 P_{c,2}$  is the combined noise variance and interference from stream  $s_{c,2}(t)$ . Note that for time-delay estimation within an overlap period, the value of  $\sigma_{\text{eff}}^2$  will be  $\sigma_n^2 + |b_c|^2 P_{c,2} |s_{c,2}|^2$ , where  $|s_{c,2}|^2$  is the peak interference from the second communication stream. However, since we are interested in the ergodic performance of the radar estimation information rate bound, we consider the expected value of  $|s_{c,2}|^2$ . Moreover, the consideration allows us analytical tractability. Subsequently, using (12), we can compute the Fisher Information, which then allows us to derive the CRLB for the estimate of  $\tau_r$  as [4], [10]

$$\sigma_{\tau_r, \text{est}}^2 \geq \left( \frac{\sigma_n^2 + |b_c|^2 P_{c,2}}{2\gamma^2 B^2 (TB) |a_r|^2 P_r} \right). \quad (13)$$

With the obtained CRLB for time-delay estimation, we calculate the radar estimation information rate [2]–[4]. This estimation information rate is the data information rate equivalent of the communication user, and constitutes the entropy of the parameter being estimated and the entropy associated with the uncertainty of the estimation [4], [11], expressed as

$$R_{\text{est}} \leq \frac{\delta}{2T} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma_{\tau_r, \text{proc}}^2}{\sigma_{\tau_r, \text{est}}^2} \right) \quad (14)$$

where  $\delta$  is the radar duty factor, such that  $T_{\text{pri}} = T/\delta$ . Next, with the estimated time-delay, we suppress the radar signal from  $z(t)$  and estimate the second communication stream.

#### D. Second Communication Stream With Estimated Radar Return Suppressed

The received signal at the communication receiver with estimated radar return suppressed can be written as

$$\tilde{y}(t) = b_c \sqrt{P_{c,2}} s_{c,2}(t) + \sqrt{P_r} a_r [r(t - \tau_r) - r(t - \tau_{r, \text{est}})] + n(t), \quad (15)$$

where during any  $k^{\text{th}}$  observation we now have  $\tau_r^{(k)} = \tau_{r, \text{est}}^{(k)} + n_{\tau_r, \text{est}}$ , similar to the predicted radar return. Moreover, the lower bound on the variance of  $n_{\tau_r, \text{est}}$  is obtained in (13). Subsequently, the interference plus noise for  $s_{c,2}$  is

$$n_{\text{int}+n,2} \approx \sqrt{P_r} a_r \frac{\partial r(t - \tau_r)}{\partial t} n_{\tau_r, \text{est}} + n(t), \quad (16)$$

$$\sigma_{\text{int}+n,2}^2 = P_r |a_r|^2 \gamma^2 B^2 \sigma_{\tau_r, \text{est}}^2 + \sigma_n^2$$

Following this, the data information rate for the second communication stream can be calculated. To this end, in the next section we calculate the performance bounds for both the radar target and the communication user.

### III. PERFORMANCE BOUNDS

In this section, we delineate bounds on the performance of the joint sensing-communication system for the RS strategy. As mentioned earlier, we consider ergodic radar estimation information rate for the radar target and ergodic data information rate for the communication user as performance measures. To this end, the bounds are derived assuming that the radar pulse duration  $T$  is held constant [4]. Subsequently, using equations (13) and (14), the ergodic radar estimation information rate bound for the target is given by

$$R_{\text{est}}^{\text{RS}} \leq \frac{\delta}{2T} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{2\sigma_{\tau_r, \text{proc}}^2 \gamma^2 B^2 (TB) |a_r|^2 P_r}{\sigma_n^2 + |b_c|^2 P_{c,2}} \right). \quad (17)$$

Note that the bound is reached if the estimator can reach the CRLB bound. Next, the bound on the data information rate of the communication user is given by  $R_c^{\text{RS}} \leq R_{c,1} + R_{c,2}$ , where  $R_{c,1}$  and  $R_{c,2}$  are the data rates of the split parts of the communication user's message, expressed as

$$R_{c,1} = B \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{|b_c|^2 P_{c,1}}{\sigma_n^2 + P_r |a_r|^2 \gamma^2 B^2 \sigma_{\tau_r, \text{proc}}^2 + |b_c|^2 P_{c,2}} \right)$$

$$R_{c,2} = B \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{|b_c|^2 P_{c,2}}{\sigma_n^2 + P_r |a_r|^2 \gamma^2 B^2 \sigma_{\tau_r, \text{est}}^2} \right). \quad (18)$$

The inner bounds on the performance of the communication user can be obtained by varying the power split between  $P_{c,1}$  and  $P_{c,2}$  as  $P_{c,1} = (1 - \alpha)P_c$  and  $P_{c,2} = \alpha P_c$ , where  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Next, utilizing (17)–(18), we calculate the optimal  $\alpha$  for which the communication user achieves the maximum ergodic data information rate.

#### A. Optimal Power Split

The optimal power split,  $\alpha_{\text{max}}^{\text{RS}}$ , for which the communication rate is maximum can be derived as

$$\arg \max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} R_{c,1} + R_{c,2} \quad (19)$$

To obtain  $\alpha_{\text{max}}^{\text{RS}}$ , we differentiate the sum  $R_{c,1} + R_{c,2}$  with respect to  $\alpha$  and set the derivative equal to zero, leveraging the concavity of the sum over  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Subsequently, we first calculate the derivative as

$$\frac{\partial (R_{c,1} + R_{c,2})}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{|b_c|^2 P_c}{\sigma_n^2 + \alpha |b_c|^2 P_c}$$

$$- \frac{|b_c|^2 P_c}{\sigma_n^2 + \alpha |b_c|^2 P_c + P_r |a_r|^2 \gamma^2 B^2 \sigma_{\tau_r, \text{proc}}^2}$$

$$- \frac{|b_c|^2 P_c}{\sigma_n^2 (2TB + 1) + \alpha |b_c|^2 P_c} \quad (20)$$

Equating (20) to zero results in a quadratic equation with respect to  $\alpha$ , given by

$$\left( |b_c|^2 P_c \right)^3 \alpha^2$$

$$+ 2 \left( |b_c|^2 P_c \right)^2 \sigma_n^2 \alpha + \left( \sigma_n^4 |b_c|^2 P_c \right)$$

$$- 2 \sigma_n^2 |b_c|^2 P_c P_r |a_r|^2 \gamma^2 B^2 \sigma_{\tau_r, \text{proc}}^2 TB = 0. \quad (21)$$

Solving (21), the  $\alpha$  for which communication user's rate is maximum is obtained as

$$\alpha_{\max}^{\text{RS}} = \frac{-\sigma_n^2 + |a_r| \gamma B \sigma_{\text{proc}} \sqrt{P_r T B}}{|b_c|^2 P_c}. \quad (22)$$

### B. Inner Bounds on Performance with Baseline Schemes

For comparison, we also delineate the inner bounds on the performance of the joint sensing-communication system considered in this work for isolated spectral allocation (ISA), and resource sharing with SIC only. The readers are requested to refer to [2]–[4] for a detailed discussion on the inner bounds of these approaches. Following this, the performance inner bounds for ISA are given by [4]

$$R_{\text{est}}^{\text{ISA}} \leq \frac{\delta}{2T} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{2\sigma_{\tau_r, \text{proc}}^2 \gamma^2 (1-\mu)^2 B^2 T B |a_r|^2 P_r}{\sigma_n^2} \right),$$

$$R_c^{\text{ISA}} \leq \mu B \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{|b_c|^2 P_c}{\mu \sigma_n^2} \right), \quad (23)$$

where  $\mu \in [0, 1]$  partitions the total bandwidth  $B$  into two subbands, one for the radar target,  $B_r = (1-\mu)B$ , and the other for the communication user,  $B_c = \mu B$  [4]. With this approach, each functionality operates without interference from the other.

Next, for resource sharing with SIC only, the performance bounds are obtained by considering decoding of the communication user's signal first and removing it using SIC [2]. Subsequently, the time-delay estimation is done without any interference from the communication functionality. Consequently, the inner bounds on the performance of the joint sensing-communication system with SIC is given by

$$R_{\text{est}}^{\text{SIC}} \leq \frac{\delta}{2T} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{2\sigma_{\tau_r, \text{proc}}^2 \gamma^2 B^2 (T B) |a_r|^2 P_r}{\sigma_n^2} \right)$$

$$R_c^{\text{SIC}} \leq B \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{|b_c|^2 P_c}{\sigma_n^2 + P_r |a_r|^2 \gamma^2 B^2 \sigma_{\tau_r, \text{proc}}^2} \right). \quad (24)$$

In the next section, we present the derived inner bounds on the performance of the joint sensing-communication system, comparing the outcomes achieved with rate splitting (RS), spectral isolation (ISA), and successive interference cancellation (SIC) under a specific example parameter set.

## IV. RESULTS

In this section, we demonstrate the derived inner bounds on the performance of the joint sensing-communication system with RS. To this end, the parameters considered are delineated in Table I [4]. We assume that the signal of the communication user is received through an antenna sidelobe, leading to different radar and communications receive signal gains. Together with the antenna gains, we calculate  $|a_r|$  using [10, eq. (2.8)], whereas  $|b_c|$  is calculated using the standard free-space path-loss model. Moreover,  $\sigma_{\tau_r, \text{proc}}$  is calculated by dividing the target process standard deviation by the speed of light. We emphasize that the choice of parameters and models discussed above follows from [4] to ensure a fair comparison with the baseline techniques, ISA, and SIC. These results are readily

Table I: Simulation parameters

Parameter	Value
Bandwidth ( $B$ )	5 MHz
Frequency ( $f$ )	3 GHz
Effective Temperature	1000K
Communications range	10 km
Communications power ( $P_c$ )	100 W
Communications antenna gain	0 dBi
Communications receiver side-lobe gain	10 dBi
Radar target range	100 Km
Radar antenna gain	30 dBi
Radar Power ( $P_r$ )	100 kW
Target cross section	10 m <sup>2</sup>
Target process standard deviation	100 m
Time-Bandwidth product ( $T B$ )	100
Radar duty factor ( $\delta$ )	0.01

applicable to any cellular scenario with parameters in Table I scaled proportionally as needed. Finally, the bounds illustrated in this section are obtained by producing the convex hull of all contributing inner bounds [4].

Fig. 3 illustrates the inner bounds on the performance of the joint sensing-communication system, with an RS scheme for the communication user and SIC at the joint receiver at the BS. For comparison, ISA and resource sharing with SIC only (labeled as SIC) are used as baselines [2], [4]. We start by discussing the inner bounds of these baseline schemes first. With ISA, as  $\mu$  increases from 0 to 1, the ergodic radar estimation information rate decreases while the communication user's data information rate rises. This increase in the communication user's ergodic rate is expected since more bandwidth is allocated to it. The inner bounds with SIC are represented by the green vertical line. Points on this line are achieved by gradually increasing the communication user's transmit power from 0 to  $P_c$ . The maximum ergodic data information rate for the communication user, shown in Fig. 3, corresponds to the full transmit power  $P_c$  as described in (24). Since time-delay estimation is done after SIC of the communication signal, the radar estimation information rate remains unaffected by changes in the communication user's transmit power. However, the performance of the communication user is interference limited, stemming from the radar signal.

Turning to the RS scheme, the inner bounds are obtained by varying  $\alpha$  from 0 to 1. At  $\alpha = 0$ ,  $P_{c,2} = 0$ , so the inner bounds curve for RS begins at the upper vertex of the SIC vertical line, as both achieve the same ergodic performance measures; see equations (17), (18), and (24). As  $\alpha$  increases, the radar's ergodic estimation information rate decreases, while the communication user's ergodic data information rate rises. This results from the increased  $P_{c,2}$ , which raises the effective noise  $\sigma_{\text{eff}}^2$  for radar sensing, thus increasing the CRLB for target estimation. Consequently, the uncertainty in estimating the desired radar parameter  $\tau_r$  rises, reducing the radar's ergodic estimation information rate. In contrast, the communication user's data information rate improves due to the flexibility of the RS scheme. Splitting the message allows for the two streams to experience different interference levels:  $s_{c,1}$  countenances interference from both the predicted radar return suppressed signal and  $s_{c,2}$ , while  $s_{c,2}$  only faces




Fig. 3: Inner bound on performance measures of the radar target and communication user.

interference from the estimated radar return suppressed signal. Thus, up to a certain  $P_{c,2}$ , the total data information rate of the communication user increases. However, as  $P_{c,2}$  grows large, the rate of  $s_{c,1}$  severely declines, radar estimation information rate degrades further, and increasing interference from the estimated radar return suppressed signal causes the rate of  $s_{c,2}$  to deteriorate as well. As a result, the overall ergodic data information rate of the communication user starts decreasing after a certain value of  $\alpha$ , i.e., power split for RS.

We determine the point of change of direction for the RS curve from equation (22). For the parameters set out in Table I, the value of  $\alpha_{\max}^{\text{RS}} = 0.0071$ . The obtained value of  $\alpha_{\max}^{\text{RS}}$  is verified by obtaining the value of  $\alpha$  from Fig. 3 for which the RS curve has maximum value. We would like to emphasize that the small value of  $\alpha_{\max}^{\text{RS}}$  in this case is due the proximity of the communication user with the BS, compared to the radar target. The received signal strength of the communication user is significantly higher than the radar target's echo. Therefore, the first communication stream experiences relatively low interference from the radar target, and, in turn, less power allocation is needed to the second communication stream. The reasoning can be verified by observing the value of  $\alpha_{\max}^{\text{RS}}$  for communication range 50 km keeping other parameters the same, which comes out to be 0.18.

Finally, when all the power is allocated to  $P_{c,2}$ , the communication user's ergodic performance is worse than that of ISA and SIC approaches. The left end point of the RS curve demonstrates that doing sensing by treating entire communication signal as interference is detrimental to both sensing and communication performance. Nevertheless, RS scheme achieves significantly better inner bounds on performance of the joint sensing-communication system than ISA and SIC up to a certain power split, which can be utilized to achieve better performance trade-off between the two functionalities.

## V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

In this paper, we provided a novel approach based on RS at the communication user and SIC at the BS for producing joint sensing-communications performance inner bounds. With

ergodic radar estimation information rate as the performance measure for the radar target, and ergodic data information rate for the communication user, inner bounds on performance with RS are investigated and compared with that of baseline schemes; spectral isolation, and spectral sharing with SIC. We demonstrated that RS efficiently manages the interference between the sensing and communication functionalities and achieved a larger inner bound than the baseline approaches up to a certain power split. With the BS aware of and able to control radar and communication parameters and constraints, the operating region can be determined for the joint system depending on its requirements. Additionally, we derive a closed-form expression for the optimal power split that maximizes the ergodic data information rate of the communication user. As a consequence, while the original concept of RS deals only with digital signals, this work puts forth RS as a general method for including non-orthogonal access for sensing signals. Resultantly, we provided a systematic and parametrized way to effectuate non-orthogonal sensing and communication waveforms.

Building on this work, future research can explore two main directions. The first is extending the current model to multiple users, which would require optimizing user grouping (including the radar target), power allocation and decoding order for RS, incorporating multi-antenna settings, etc. The second direction involves expanding the system model to case of comparable pulse duration of radar and symbol length of the communication user. The authors are currently exploring both directions to evaluate RS performance for joint sensing-communication systems across various configurations.

## REFERENCES

- [1] F. Liu *et al.*, "Integrated sensing and communications: Toward dual-functional wireless networks for 6G and beyond," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1728–1767, 2022.
- [2] X. Mu, Z. Wang, and Y. Liu, "NOMA for integrating sensing and communications toward 6G: A multiple access perspective," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 316–323, 2024.
- [3] C. Ouyang *et al.*, "On the performance of uplink ISAC systems," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 1769–1773, 2022.
- [4] A. R. Chiriyath *et al.*, "Inner bounds on performance of radar and communications co-existence," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 464–474, 2016.
- [5] A. Mishra, Y. Mao, O. Dizdar, and B. Clerckx, "Rate-splitting multiple access for 6G—Part I: Principles, applications and future works," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 26, no. 10, pp. 2232–2236, 2022.
- [6] B. Clerckx, H. Joudeh, C. Hao, M. Dai, and B. Rassouli, "Rate splitting for MIMO wireless networks: A promising PHY-layer strategy for LTE evolution," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 98–105, May 2016.
- [7] A. Mishra *et al.*, "Rate-splitting multiple access for downlink multiuser MIMO: Precoder optimization and PHY-layer design," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, pp. 1–1, 2021.
- [8] Y. Mao, B. Clerckx, and V. O. K. Li, "Rate-splitting multiple access for downlink communication systems: bridging, generalizing, and outperforming SDMA and NOMA," *EURASIP J. Wireless Commun. Netw.*, vol. 2018, no. 1, p. 133, May 2018.
- [9] D. W. Bliss and S. Govindasamy, *Adaptive Wireless Communications*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [10] M. Richards, J. Scheer, and W. Holm, *Principles of Modern Radar*, ser. Principles of Modern Radar. SciTech Pub., 2010, no. vb. 3. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.dk/books?id=nD7tGAAACA>
- [11] D. W. Bliss, "Cooperative radar and communications signaling: The estimation and information theory odd couple," in *Proc. IEEE Radar Conference*, 2014, pp. 0050–0055.