

# Achievable DoF Bounds for Cache-Aided Asymmetric MIMO Communications

Mohammad Naseri Tehrani, Mohammad Javad Salehi, and Antti Tölli

Centre for Wireless Communications, University of Oulu, 90570 Oulu, Finland

E-mail: {firstname.lastname}@oulu.fi

**Abstract**—Integrating coded caching (CC) into multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) communications can significantly enhance the achievable degrees of freedom (DoF) in wireless networks. This paper investigates a practical cache-aided asymmetric MIMO configuration with cache ratio  $\gamma$ , where a server equipped with  $L$  transmit antennas communicates with  $K$  users, each having  $G_k$  receive antennas. We propose three content-aware MIMO-CC strategies: the *min-G* scheme, which treats the system as symmetric by assuming all users have the same number of antennas, equal to the smallest among them; the *Grouping* scheme, which maximizes spatial multiplexing gain separately within each user subset at the cost of some global caching gain; and the *Phantom* scheme, which dynamically redistributes spatial resources using virtual or “phantom” antenna users, bridging the performance gains of the min-G and Grouping schemes. These strategies jointly optimize the number of users,  $\Omega$ , and the parallel streams decoded by each user,  $\beta_k$ , ensuring linear decodability for all target users. Analytical and numerical results confirm that the proposed schemes achieve significant DoF improvements across various system configurations, demonstrating the potential of content-aware MIMO-CC strategies for enhancing wireless network performance.

**Index Terms**—coded caching, multicasting, MIMO communications, Degrees of freedom

## I. INTRODUCTION

Increasing demand for multimedia content, driven by applications like immersive viewing and extended reality (XR), is leading to continuous growth in mobile data traffic. Coded caching (CC) [1] has emerged as an effective solution, utilizing the onboard memory of network devices as a communication resource, especially beneficial for cacheable multimedia content. The performance gain in CC arises from multicasting well-constructed codewords to user groups of size  $t + 1$ , where the CC gain  $t$  is proportional to the cumulative cache size of all users. Originally designed for single-input single-output (SISO) setups [1], CC was later shown to be effective in multiple-input single-output (MISO) systems, demonstrating that spatial multiplexing and coded caching gains are additive [2]. This is achieved by serving multiple groups of users simultaneously with multiple multicast messages and suppressing the intra-group interference by beamforming. Accordingly, in a MISO-CC setting with  $L$  Tx antennas,  $t + L$  users can be served in parallel, and the so-called degree-of-freedom (DoF) of  $t + L$  is achievable [2], [3].

While MISO-CC has been well-studied in the literature, applying CC in multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) se-

tups has received less attention. In [4], the optimal DoF of cache-aided MIMO networks with three transmitters and three receivers were studied, and in [5], general message sets were used to introduce inner and outer bounds on the achievable DoF of MIMO-CC schemes. More recently, we studied low-complexity MIMO-CC schemes for single-transmitter setups in [6], and showed that with  $G$  antennas at each receiver, if  $\frac{L}{G}$  is an integer, the single-shot DoF of  $Gt + L$  is achievable. In [7]–[9], we proposed an improved achievable single-shot DoF bound for MIMO-CC systems, going beyond the DoF of  $Gt + L$  explored in [6]. We also designed a high-performance transmission strategy for MIMO-CC setups in [7], [9] by formulating the problem of maximizing the symmetric rate w.r.t transmit covariance matrices of the multicast signals. All aforementioned works, however, assume the same number of antennas at each receiver, which may not be the case in practice. For example, devices in 5G NR, ranging from high-performance smartphones to low-power IoT devices, are designed to meet diverse requirements—such as latency, data rates, and QoE—resulting in category-specific asymmetric antenna configurations and capabilities [10]. Despite its practical significance, the achievable single-shot DoF for scenarios where users are equipped with asymmetric antennas has remained unexplored in the MIMO-CC literature.

To address this gap, we introduce three innovative delivery schemes aimed at enhancing the achievable DoF in asymmetric MIMO-CC communication scenarios. First, we consider the *min-G* scheme, which treats the system as a symmetric setup, assuming all users have the same number of antennas, equal to the minimum among them. Next, we introduce the *grouping* strategy, which divides users into subsets based on their number of antennas and serves each subset in orthogonal dimensions. These two strategies establish a trade-off: the min-G scheme prioritizes a larger cumulative cache size at the expense of some spatial multiplexing capability, whereas the grouping scheme maximizes spatial multiplexing gain across all user subsets while compromising some of global caching gain. Moreover, the min-G and grouping schemes are complementary, each enhancing performance within specific ranges of design parameters and network configurations. To bridge this trade-off and unify the benefits of both strategies, we propose the *phantom* MIMO-CC scheme, which extends the achievable DoF of the min-G scheme across a broader



achieve  $\text{DoF}_{\text{sym}}$ , used as a basis in developing the min-G and grouping delivery schemes. The function in (5) is non-monotonic in  $\beta$ , so maximum DoF may not occur at  $\beta = G$ .

### III. THE TITLE TO BE CHANGED

#### A. min-G Scheme

The min-G scheme transforms the asymmetric MIMO-CC system into a symmetric setup by considering the effective spatial multiplexing gain of

$$\check{G} = \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} G_{(j)} \quad (6)$$

for all users, and applying the symmetric MIMO-CC scheme of [9] for both placement and delivery phases. The main idea behind this scheme is to maximize the cumulative cache size of users in the CC delivery session, i.e., to maximize the CC gain by trading off the spatial multiplexing capability of a subset of users.

**Placement phase.** Each file  $W \in \mathcal{F}$  is split into  $\check{\vartheta} = \binom{K}{K\gamma}$  subfiles  $W_{\mathcal{P}}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  can denote every subset of the users with size  $K\gamma$ . Then, at the cache memory of each user  $k$ , we store  $W_{\mathcal{P}}$  for all  $W \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{P} \ni k$ .

**Delivery phase.** We first find the optimal number of users served per transmission,  $\Omega_{\check{G}}^*$ , and the optimal number of streams per user per transmission,  $\beta_{\check{G}}^*$ , by solving

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\check{G}}^*, \beta_{\check{G}}^* &= \arg \max_{\Omega, \beta} \Omega \cdot \beta \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \beta &\leq \min \left( \check{G}, \frac{L \binom{\Omega-1}{K\gamma}}{1 + (\Omega - K\gamma - 1) \binom{\Omega-1}{K\gamma}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Then, we follow the delivery algorithm in the proof of Theorem 1 in [9], which involves splitting each subfile  $W_{\mathcal{P}}$  into  $\check{\phi} = \binom{K - K\gamma - 1}{\Omega_{\check{G}}^* - K\gamma - 1} \beta_{\check{G}}^*$  subpackets  $W_{\mathcal{P}}^q$ , and creating

$$\check{S} = \binom{K}{\Omega_{\check{G}}^*} \binom{\Omega_{\check{G}}^* - 1}{K\gamma} \quad (8)$$

transmission vectors, each delivering  $\beta_{\check{G}}^*$  parallel streams to every user within a target subset of  $\Omega_{\check{G}}^*$  users.

**DoF analysis.** Comparing with Section II, in the min-G scheme, we have  $S = \check{S}$ , as defined in (11). For each  $s \in [\check{S}]$ , we have  $f(s) = F/\check{\vartheta}\check{\phi}$ ,  $\Omega(s) = \Omega_{\check{G}}^*$ , and  $\beta(s) = \beta_{\check{G}}^*$ . Substituting these values in (4) and simplifying the equations, the DoF of the min-G scheme is simply given as

$$\text{DoF}_{\check{G}}^* = \Omega_{\check{G}}^* \cdot \beta_{\check{G}}^*. \quad (9)$$

In Section VI, we see that despite its simplicity, the min-G scheme provides solid performance for a wide range of network parameters due to its maximal CC gain.

#### B. Grouping Scheme

With the grouping scheme, we treat each group of users  $\mathcal{U}_{(j)}$  separately. The main rationale behind this scheme is to maximize the effect of spatial multiplexing gain for group, albeit with the cost of decreasing the cumulative cache size (i.e., the CC gain).

**Placement phase.** Data placement is done in  $J$  steps, where at each step  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , cache memories of users in group  $\mathcal{U}_{(j)}$  are filled with data. More particularly, at each step  $j$ , every file  $W \in \mathcal{F}$  is first split into  $\vartheta_{(j)} = \binom{K_{(j)}}{K_{(j)}\gamma}$  subfiles  $W_{\mathcal{P}}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  can denote every subset of the user group  $\mathcal{U}_{(j)}$  with size

$K_{(j)}\gamma$ . Then, each user  $k \in \mathcal{U}_{(j)}$  stores  $W_{\mathcal{P}}$ , for all  $W \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{P} \ni k$ .

**Delivery phase.** Data delivery is also performed in  $J$  orthogonal delivery intervals. At each interval  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , all the missing parts of data files requested by users in group  $\mathcal{U}_{(j)}$  are delivered. First, we calculate  $\Omega_{(j)}^*$  and  $\beta_{(j)}^*$  by solving

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{(j)}^*, \beta_{(j)}^* &= \arg \max_{\Omega, \beta} \Omega \cdot \beta \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \beta &\leq \min \left( G_{(j)}, \frac{L \binom{\Omega-1}{K_{(j)}\gamma}}{1 + (\Omega - K_{(j)}\gamma - 1) \binom{\Omega-1}{K_{(j)}\gamma}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Then, for the users in  $\mathcal{U}_{(j)}$ , we follow the delivery algorithm in the proof of Theorem 1 in [9]. This requires splitting each subfile  $W_{\mathcal{P}}$  into  $\phi_{(j)} = \binom{K_{(j)} - K_{(j)}\gamma - 1}{\Omega_{(j)}^* - K_{(j)}\gamma - 1} \beta_{(j)}^*$  subpackets  $W_{\mathcal{P}}^q$ , and creating

$$S_{(j)} = \binom{K_{(j)}}{\Omega_{(j)}^*} \binom{\Omega_{(j)}^* - 1}{K_{(j)}\gamma} \quad (11)$$

transmission vectors, each delivering  $\beta_{(j)}^*$  parallel streams to every user within a target subset of  $\Omega_{(j)}^*$  users.

**DoF analysis.** Following the delivery algorithm, for each transmission  $s$  in step  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , we have  $f(s) = F/\vartheta_{(j)}\phi_{(j)}$ ,  $\Omega(s) = \Omega_{(j)}^*$ , and  $\beta(s) = \beta_{(j)}^*$ . Also, as the transmission vectors in step  $j$  deliver every missing part of all users in  $\mathcal{U}_{(j)}$ , we can write

$$S_{(j)} \Omega_{(j)}^* \beta_{(j)}^* \times F/\vartheta_{(j)}\phi_{(j)} = K_{(j)}F. \quad (12)$$

Substituting these into (4), the DoF of the grouping scheme, denoted by  $\text{DoF}_{\mathcal{J}}^*$ , can be written as

$$\text{DoF}_{\mathcal{J}}^* = \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} S_{(j)} \frac{F}{\vartheta_{(j)}\phi_{(j)}} \Omega_{(j)}^* \beta_{(j)}^*}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} S_{(j)} \frac{F}{\vartheta_{(j)}\phi_{(j)}}} = \frac{1}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{K_{(j)}/K}{\Omega_{(j)}^* \beta_{(j)}^*}}, \quad (13)$$

### IV. PHANTOM MIMO-CC SCHEME

Another approach to designing the asymmetric MIMO-CC delivery scheme is the *Phantom* method, which bridges the gap between the min-G and grouping schemes. This method maximizes the coded caching (CC) gain while leveraging the excess multiplexing gain of users with more antennas than the minimum value (otherwise wasted in the min-G scheme). However, as users with fewer antennas cannot receive as many streams, a portion of their requested data must be delivered through a separate unicasting (UC) phase.

**Placement phase.** Each file  $W \in \mathcal{F}$  is split into  $\hat{\vartheta} = \binom{K}{K\gamma}$  packets  $W_{\mathcal{P}}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  represents all user subsets of size  $K\gamma$ . Then, user  $k \in [K]$  stores a packet  $W_{\mathcal{P}}$  if  $\mathcal{P} \ni k$ .

**Delivery phase.** Data delivery closely follows the delivery algorithm in the proof of Theorem 1 in the journal paper. However, adjustments are made to make it suitable for the asymmetric case.

*Step 1.* A parameter  $G_{(1)} \leq \hat{G} \leq G_{(J)}$  is selected, and two parameters  $\hat{\Omega}$  and  $\hat{\beta}$  are chosen such that

$$\hat{\beta} \leq \min \left( \hat{G}, (L - (\hat{\Omega} - K\gamma - 1)\hat{\beta}) \binom{\hat{\Omega}-1}{K\gamma} \right). \quad (14)$$

According to [9], this selection guarantees that in a network setup similar to ours but with  $\hat{G}$  antennas at each user, one can design a delivery scheme where each transmission delivers  $\hat{\beta}$  parallel streams to every user in a subset of users of size  $\hat{\Omega}$ .

*Step 2.* Consider a network similar to our setup and with similar cache placement and user requests but with  $\hat{G}$  antennas at each user. Following a similar procedure as in [9], design a delivery scheme with  $S_{\text{MC}} = \binom{K}{\hat{\Omega}} \binom{\hat{\Omega}-1}{K\gamma}$  transmission vectors  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{MC}}(s)$ ,  $s \in [S_{\text{MC}}]$ , each delivering  $\hat{\beta}$  parallel streams to every user  $k$  in a subset  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s)$  of users with size  $\hat{\Omega}$ . The delivery algorithm is detailed in [9] and is not repeated here for the sake of brevity. However, in a nutshell, each subfile  $W_{\mathcal{P}}$  is split into  $\hat{\phi} = \binom{K-K\gamma-1}{\hat{\Omega}-K\gamma-1} \hat{\beta}$  smaller subpackets  $W_{\mathcal{P}}^q$ , and the transmission vectors are built as

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}(s) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s)} \sum_{W_{\mathcal{P},k}^q \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}_k(s)} \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{P},k}^q W_{\mathcal{P},k}^q, \quad (15)$$

where  $W_{\mathcal{P},k}^q$  denotes the subpacket  $W_{\mathcal{P}}^q$  of the file requested by user  $k$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{P},k}^q$  is the ZF transmit beamforming vector nulling out the interference by  $W_{\mathcal{P},k}^q$  to every stream decoded by each user  $k' \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s) \setminus (\mathcal{P} \cup \{k\})$ , and  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_k(s)$  is the set of subpackets  $W_{\mathcal{P},k}^q$  to be delivered to user  $k$  in transmission  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(s)$ , built such that  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s) \setminus \{k\}$  and the number of subpackets with the same subfile index  $\mathcal{P}$  is minimized as much as possible.

*Step 3.* For every  $k \in \mathcal{K}$ , define  $\beta_k = \min(G_k, \hat{\beta})$ . For each  $s \in [S_{\text{MC}}]$ , create a *multicast* transmission vector  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{MC}}(s)$  for the original setup using  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(s)$  in (15) as follows:

- 1) For each  $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s)$ , create  $\mathcal{M}_k(s)$  by removing  $\hat{\beta} - \beta_k$  subpackets randomly from  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_k(s)$ . Add the removed subpackets to a set  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{UC}}$  to be sent later via *unicast* transmissions.
- 2) Create  $\mathbf{x}(s)$  as

$$\mathbf{x}_{\text{MC}}(s) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s)} \sum_{W_{\mathcal{P},k}^q \in \mathcal{M}_k(s)} \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{P},k}^q W_{\mathcal{P},k}^q. \quad (16)$$

*Step 4.* Transmit all the subpackets in  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{UC}}$  with unicast transmissions. This involves creating

$$S_{\text{UC}} = \frac{|\mathcal{V}_{\text{UC}}|}{\text{DoF}_{\text{UC}}}, \quad (17)$$

transmission vectors  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{UC}}(s)$ , where

$$\text{DoF}_{\text{UC}} = \min\left(L, \sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}}} G_k\right). \quad (18)$$

**TODO: fix this part. Define  $\mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}}$ ...**

**Theorem 1.** *The transmission vectors resulting after the removal of  $\hat{\beta} - \beta_k$  subpackets of every user  $k$  are still linearly decodable by each user  $k$ .*

*Proof.* Now, we show that after the reception of each  $\mathbf{x}(s)$ , every user  $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}$  can decode  $\beta_k$  subpackets of its requested file interference-free. If users  $k \in \mathcal{U}_{(j)}$  belong to sets  $j \in \hat{\mathcal{J}}$ , where  $\hat{\mathcal{J}} = \{j \in \mathcal{J} \mid \hat{G} \leq G_{(j)}\}$ , then the spatial multiplexing gain satisfies  $\hat{G} \leq G_k$  and  $\hat{\beta} \leq G_k$ , resulting in each user being allocated  $\beta_k = \hat{\beta} = \min(G_k, \hat{\beta})$ . Consequently, no subpackets need to be removed, and linear decodability is ensured as (14). For user sets  $j \in \mathcal{J}_{\setminus \hat{\mathcal{J}}}$ , where  $G_k < \hat{G}$ , all users  $k \in \mathcal{U}_{(j)}$  are allocated  $\beta_k \leq \min(G_k, \hat{\beta})$ , which requires analysis to ensure linear decodability after removing  $\hat{\beta} - \beta_k \neq 0$  subpackets. Given the same insight outlined as [9], and the fact that  $\hat{\beta} - \beta_k$  are randomly dropped to ensure linear decodability of each user  $k$ , the maximum number

of subpackets  $W_{\mathcal{P}}^q(k)$  in  $\mathbf{x}(s)$  with the same packet index is  $\lceil \hat{\beta} / \binom{\hat{\Omega}-1}{K\gamma} \rceil$  (subpackets with the same packet index may remain after removal). On the other hand, by definition, the beamformer vector  $\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{P},k}^q$  has to null out the inter-stream interference caused by  $W_{\mathcal{P}}^q(k)$  to every stream decoded by user  $k'$  in  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s) \setminus (\mathcal{P} \cup \{k\})$  (the interference caused to other users is removed by their cache contents). Let us use  $\mathbf{U}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{G_k \times \beta_k}$  to denote the receive beamforming matrix at user  $k$  for decoding its  $\beta_k$  parallel streams. For transmission  $s$ , the *equivalent interference channel* of a subpacket  $W_{\mathcal{P}}^q(k)$  included in  $\mathbf{x}(s)$  is defined as:

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{P},k} = [\mathbf{H}_{k'}^H \mathbf{U}_{k'}]^H, \quad \forall k' \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s) \setminus (\mathcal{P} \cup \{k\}), \quad (19)$$

where  $[\cdot]$  denotes horizontal matrix concatenation. For each subpacket  $W_{\mathcal{P},k}^q$  transmitted by  $\mathbf{x}(s)$ , the interference nulling condition for its respective beamformer  $\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{P},k}^q$  requires:

$$\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{P},k}^q \in \text{Null}(\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{P},k}). \quad (20)$$

Note that for a given user index  $k$  and packet index  $\mathcal{P}$ , the definition in (19) applies to each subpacket  $W_{\mathcal{P}}^q(k)$  transmitted by  $\mathbf{x}(s)$ , regardless of the subpacket index  $q$ . Now, to ensure that each user  $k$  can decode all  $\beta_k \leq G_k$  parallel streams  $W_{\mathcal{P},k}^q$  sent to it with  $\mathbf{x}(s)$ , it is essential that transmit beamformers  $\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{P},k}^q$  are linearly independent. The bottleneck for successfully decoding subpackets with the same packet index  $\mathcal{P}$  arises because the number of such subpackets,  $\hat{\beta} / \binom{\hat{\Omega}-1}{K\gamma}$ , must be limited by the dimensions of  $\text{Null}(\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{P},k})$ . From (19),  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{P},k}$  is constructed by concatenating  $\hat{\Omega} - K\gamma - 1$  matrices  $\mathbf{H}_{k'}^H \mathbf{U}_{k'}$ , each of size  $L \times \beta_{k'}$ . Thus,  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{P},k} \in \mathbb{C}^{\sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s) \setminus (\mathcal{P} \cup \{k\})} \beta_{k'} \times L}$ . Using  $\text{nullity}(\cdot)$  to denote the dimensions of the null space, we can use the rank-nullity theorem [11] to write

$$\text{nullity}(\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{P},k}) = L - \text{rank}(\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{P},k}) = L - \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s) \setminus (\mathcal{P} \cup \{k\})} \beta_{k'}.$$

So, for successful decoding of subpackets with the same packet index, we should have

$$\hat{\beta} \leq (L - \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s) \setminus (\mathcal{P} \cup \{k\})} \beta_{k'}) \binom{\hat{\Omega}-1}{K\gamma}. \quad (21)$$

However, R.H.S of (22) is equal or smaller than the R.H.S of (14), since

$$\sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s) \setminus (\mathcal{P} \cup \{k\})} \beta_{k'} \leq (\hat{\Omega} - K\gamma - 1) \hat{\beta} \quad (22)$$

which, together with  $\beta_k \leq \hat{\beta}$  and the basic decoding criteria of  $\beta_k \leq G_k$ , ensures the linear decodability per user.  $\square$

**DoF analysis.** A portion of the missing subpackets,  $F$ , is delivered over  $s \in [S_{\text{MC}}]$  transmission intervals via MIMO-CC to users  $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s)$ , while the remaining subpackets are transmitted over  $s \in [S_{\text{UC}}]$  intervals using MIMO-UC to users  $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{UC}}(s)$ . Thus, the total transmissions are  $S = S_{\text{MC}} + S_{\text{UC}}$ . The transmitted subpackets in the MIMO-CC and MIMO-UC phases are  $F_{\text{MC}}$  and  $F_{\text{UC}}$ , respectively.

**Lemma 1.** *To calculate the achievable DoF of the asymmetric MIMO in the phantom scheme, we define it as the average number of concurrent users served during the delivery phase, which includes both MIMO-CC and MIMO-UC steps. Thus, the DoF is calculated as follows:*

$$\text{DoF}_{\text{ph}} = \frac{F_{\text{MC}} + F_{\text{UC}}}{S_{\text{MC}} + S_{\text{UC}}}, \quad (23)$$



*Proof.* Let us start with (3), and expand it to:

$$\text{DoF}_{\text{ph}} = \frac{\sum_{s \in [S_{\text{MC}}]} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s)} \beta_k(s) + \sum_{s \in [S_{\text{UC}}]} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{UC}}(s)} \beta_k(s)}{S_{\text{MC}} + S_{\text{UC}}}, \quad (24)$$

where we initially split  $S$  into  $S_{\text{MC}}$  and  $S_{\text{UC}}$  in the summations, then substitute the file size  $f(s) = F/\Theta$  and remove it from the fraction, leading to (24). Moreover, the total streams across all users over multicast intervals,  $\sum_{s \in [S_{\text{MC}}]} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}(s)} \beta_k(s)$ , and unicast intervals,  $\sum_{s \in [S_{\text{UC}}]} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{UC}}(s)} \beta_k(s)$ , amount to  $F_{\text{MC}}$  and  $F_{\text{UC}}$ , respectively.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** *Given the asymmetric MIMO-CC setup with design parameters  $K_{(j)}$ ,  $\beta_{(j)}$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ ,  $\hat{\beta}$  and  $\hat{\Omega} = |\mathcal{K}(s)|$  satisfying the linear decodability condition in Theorem 1, the achievable DoF of the phantom delivery scheme is given by:*

$$\text{DoF}_{\text{ph}} = \frac{\hat{\Omega} \cdot \hat{\beta}}{1 + \frac{\hat{\Omega}}{K \cdot L} \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\setminus \hat{\mathcal{J}}}} \left( (\hat{\beta} - \beta_{(j)}) \cdot K_{(j)} \right)}. \quad (25)$$

*Proof.* By assuming  $\hat{\Omega}$  users out of a total  $K$  users are served by MIMO-CC delivery over consecutive time slots, the number of MIMO-CC delivery transmissions is given by:

$$S_{\text{MC}} = \binom{K}{\hat{\Omega}} \cdot \binom{\hat{\Omega} - 1}{K\gamma}. \quad (26)$$

Assuming the delivery scheme, for any given  $t$  and  $\hat{\Omega}$ ,  $K$  and the number of parallel streams received at each user set  $\mathcal{U}_{(j)}$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , the total missing subpackets is:

$$\begin{aligned} F &= K \cdot \binom{K-1}{K\gamma} \cdot \binom{K-K\gamma-1}{\hat{\Omega}-K\gamma-1} \cdot \hat{\beta}, \\ &= K \cdot \binom{K-1}{\hat{\Omega}-1} \cdot \binom{\hat{\Omega}-1}{K\gamma} \cdot \hat{\beta}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Given (26) and (27), the number of subpackets transmitted during the MIMO-CC delivery phase denoted by  $F_{\text{MC}}$  is:

$$F_{\text{MC}} = \binom{K-1}{\hat{\Omega}-1} \binom{\hat{\Omega}-1}{K\gamma} \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} (\beta_{(j)} \cdot K_{(j)}), \quad (28)$$

Moreover, the number of transmitted subpackets by the MIMO-UC delivery phase denoted by  $F_{\text{UC}}$  is:

$$F_{\text{UC}} = \binom{K-1}{\hat{\Omega}-1} \binom{\hat{\Omega}-1}{K\gamma} \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\setminus \hat{\mathcal{J}}}} \left( (\hat{\beta} - \beta_{(j)}) \cdot K_{(j)} \right) \quad (29)$$

where the delivered subpackets within both delivery schemes, i.e.,  $F_{\text{UC}} + F_{\text{MC}}$ , match the total missing subpackets  $F$ .

The remaining  $F_{\text{UC}}$  subpackets from the MIMO-CC phase are delivered within the MIMO-UC delivery:

$$S_{\text{UC}} = \frac{F_{\text{UC}}}{\text{DoF}_{\text{UC}}}, \quad (30)$$

where the DoF for the MIMO-UC delivery, denoted as  $\text{DoF}_{\text{UC}}$ , is given by:

$$\text{DoF}_{\text{UC}} = \min \left( L, \sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}}} G_k \right). \quad (31)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}} = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\setminus \hat{\mathcal{J}}}} \mathcal{U}_{(j)}$  (equals  $\bigcup_{s \in [S_{\text{UC}}]} \mathcal{K}_{\text{UC}}(s)$ ) represents the set of users served during the MIMO-UC phase, and

$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}}} G_k$  is the sum of their spatial multiplexing gains. Assuming the user set  $\mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}}$  is sufficiently large  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}}} G_k \geq L$ , the DoF simplifies to:

$$\text{DoF}_{\text{UC}} = L, \quad (32)$$

Notably, as shown in (30) and (31), each user decodes the received messages linearly over intervals inversely proportional to  $\text{DoF}_{\text{UC}}$ , which reflects the effective channel rank. The number of streams per user,  $\text{DoF}_{\text{UC}}/|\mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}}| = L/|\mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}}|$ , is assumed to ensure it does not exceed  $\min_{k \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}}} (G_k)$ , thereby conforming to the physical constraints of all users in the set. Consequently, the delivery time  $T_{\text{UC}}$  in (30), remains consistent with the feasible allocation of streams.

By substituting the expressions for the number of transmitted files and the corresponding durations for the MIMO-CC and MIMO-UC phases in (23), we obtain:

$$\text{DoF}_{\text{ph}} = \frac{K \cdot \binom{K-1}{\hat{\Omega}-1} \cdot \hat{\beta}}{\binom{K}{\hat{\Omega}} + \frac{\binom{K-1}{\hat{\Omega}-1}}{L} \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\setminus \hat{\mathcal{J}}}} \left( (\hat{\beta} - \beta_{(j)}) \cdot K_{(j)} \right)}, \quad (33)$$

and after simplification, the proof is completed.  $\square$

## V. ASYMMETRIC MIMO-CC DELIVERY: DOF COMPARISON

Building on the achievable DoF analysis developed for the three proposed delivery schemes, we can now systematically compare their performance and establish the straightforward conditions under which one scheme outperforms the others. By analyzing system parameters such as  $t$ ,  $\Omega$ ,  $K$ , and the number of parallel streams received by the  $J$  user sets, we identify distinct regions where each scheme achieves a higher DoF gain in the asymmetric MIMO-CC setup. This analysis provides a clear framework for selecting the most efficient delivery scheme based on system constraints and parameters by comparing:

- 1)  $\text{DoF}_{\text{grouping}} \stackrel{?}{\geq} \text{DoF}_{\text{min-G}}$ ,
- 2)  $\text{DoF}_{\text{grouping}} \stackrel{?}{\geq} \text{DoF}_{\text{phantom}}$ ,
- 3)  $\text{DoF}_{\text{min-G}} \stackrel{?}{\geq} \text{DoF}_{\text{phantom}}$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Moreover, assuming  $J = 2$ , then the user set  $\mathcal{U}_{(1)}$  is sufficiently large such that:*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_{(1)}} G_k = G_{(1)} \cdot K_{(1)} \geq L,$$

*the DoF for the MIMO-UC phase simplifies to (32). Therefore, the general conditions outlined above can be written in the closed form as:*

- 1)  $\text{DoF}_{\text{grouping}} \stackrel{?}{\geq} \text{DoF}_{\text{min-G}}: \frac{G_{(2)}}{G_{(1)}} \stackrel{?}{\geq} \frac{2 \cdot K_{(2)}}{K_{(1)}} + 1$  (34)
- 2)  $\text{DoF}_{\text{phantom}} \stackrel{?}{\geq} \text{DoF}_{\text{min-G}}:$

$$\hat{\Omega} \cdot \hat{G} - G_{(1)} \cdot t - L \stackrel{?}{\geq} \left( \frac{2 \cdot K_{(1)}}{K} + \frac{G_{(1)} \cdot t_{(1)}}{L} \right) \cdot \hat{\Omega} \cdot (\hat{G} - G_{(1)}) \quad (35)$$

$$3) \text{ DoF}_{\text{grouping}} \stackrel{?}{\geq} \text{DoF}_{\text{phantom}}: \\ L \cdot K + \gamma \cdot (K_{(1)}^2 \cdot G_{(1)} + K_{(2)}^2 \cdot G_{(2)}) \\ \stackrel{?}{\geq} \frac{K^2 \cdot L \cdot \Omega \cdot \hat{G}}{K \cdot L + K_{(1)} \cdot \Omega \cdot (\hat{G} - G_{(1)})}. \quad (36)$$

*Proof.* The proof of each condition is straightforward and if  $L$  is sufficiently larger than  $G_{(j)}$ ,  $\forall j$ , then one can simply consider  $\beta_k = G_{(j)}$ , for  $k \in \mathcal{U}_{(j)}$ , with  $j \in \mathcal{J}_{\setminus \hat{\mathcal{J}}}$ , and  $\beta_k = \hat{\beta} = \hat{G}$ , for  $k \in \mathcal{U}_{(j)}$ , with  $j \in \hat{\mathcal{J}}$ . For the grouping and min- $G$  schemes, the achievable DoF expressions reach the maximum DoF given as  $G_{(j)} \cdot t_{(j)} + L$  (with  $\beta_k^* = G_{(j)}$  and  $\Omega^* = (L/G_{(j)} + K_{(j)} \cdot \gamma)$  for  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ ) and  $G_{(1)} \cdot t + L$  (with  $\beta_k^* = G_{(1)}$ ,  $k \in \mathcal{U}_{(1)}$  and  $\Omega^* = (L/G_{(1)} + K \cdot \gamma)$ ), respectively. For the phantom scheme, the maximum DoF is achieved by selecting  $\Omega \in \{t + 1, \dots, \hat{\Omega}\}$ , with  $\hat{G} \in \{G_{(1)}, G_{(1)} + 1, \dots, G_{(2)}\}$ , ensuring linear decodability via Theorem 1,  $L/G_{(j)} \in \mathbb{N}$  for  $j \in \mathcal{J}_{\setminus \hat{\mathcal{J}}}$ , (from (5)), for  $j \in \hat{\mathcal{J}}$ . A straightforward algebraic manipulation compares the DoF terms, completing the proof.  $\square$

## VI. SIMULATION RESULTS

TABLE I: DoF of Asymmetric MIMO-CC Schemes for  $G_{(1)} = 2$ ,  $G_{(2)} = 4$ ,  $L = 12$ ,  $\gamma = 0.04$ , for  $(K_1, K_2)$ : a) (25, 75), b) (50, 50), c) (75, 25)

		DoF <sub>phantom</sub>						DoF <sub>min-G</sub> *	DoF <sub>grouping</sub> * = 20.36	
$\hat{\beta}$ or $\beta_k$	$\Omega$	5	6	7	8	9	10	10	7	6
2		10	12	14	16	18	20	20	14	-
3		13.58	16.00	18.33	20.57	-	-	-	-	-
4		16.55	19.20	21.68	-	-	-	-	-	24

(a)

		DoF <sub>phantom</sub>						DoF <sub>min-G</sub> *	DoF <sub>grouping</sub> * = 17.78	
$\hat{\beta}$ or $\beta_k$	$\Omega$	5	6	7	8	9	10	10	8	5
2		10	12	14	16	18	20	20	16	-
3		12.41	14.40	16.26	18	-	-	-	-	-
4		14.12	16.00	17.68	-	-	-	-	-	20

(b)

		DoF <sub>phantom</sub>						DoF <sub>min-G</sub> *	DoF <sub>grouping</sub> * = 17.45	
$\hat{\beta}$ or $\beta_k$	$\Omega$	5	6	7	8	9	10	10	9	4
2		10	12	14	16	18	20	20	18	-
3		11.43	13.09	14.61	16	-	-	-	-	-
4		12.31	13.71	14.93	-	-	-	-	-	16

(c)

Numerical results are generated for two user sets ( $J = 2$ ) under various combinations of  $t$ ,  $L = 12$ ,  $G_{(1)} = 2$ ,  $G_{(2)} = 4$ ,  $\Omega$ ,  $\hat{G}$ , and  $G_k = G_{(j)}$ ,  $\forall k$ , based on the user set  $\mathcal{U}_{(j)}$ ,  $j \in [2]$ , to which the  $k$ -th user belongs. The user set sizes are chosen such that the coded caching gain  $(K_{(j)} \cdot \gamma) \in \mathbb{N}$  remains an integer throughout the analysis.

TABLE II: DoF of MIMO-CC Schemes for  $G_{(1)} = 2, G_{(2)} = 4, L = 12, K = 500$

$\gamma$	$(K_1, K_2)$	DoF <sub>phantom</sub> *	DoF <sub>min-G</sub> *	DoF <sub>grouping</sub> *
0.1	(10,490)	180.17	112	162.86
	(20,480)	156.65	112	138.78
	(30,470)	138.56	112	124.48
	(40,460)	124.22	112	115.02
	(50,450)	112.57	112	108.31
	(60,440)	112	112	103.30
0.04	(50,450)	66.51	52	58.95
	(75,425)	58.41	52	52.75
	(100,400)	52.08	52	48.72
	(125,375)	52	52	45.91
0.01	(100,400)	25.26	22	23.33
	(200,300)	22	22	20
	(400,100)	22	22	19.05

In Table I, we illustrate the impact of user sets and other design parameters on the achievable DoF for each proposed scheme in asymmetric MIMO-CC systems. As observed, min- $G$  represents a special case of the phantom scheme, and both the phantom and grouping schemes can surpass the DoF gain of min- $G$  as well as each other, depending on the specific design parameters, consistent with conditions 1, 2, and 3 in lemma 2. Moreover, Table Ia, Ib, Ic shows that the phantom scheme's DoF values vary depending on  $\hat{G}$  and  $\Omega$ , while adhering to the linear decodability criterion outlined in Theorem 1.

In Table II, we assess the achievable DoF values offered by the proposed schemes. The analysis highlights the remarkable scalability of the achievable DoF in the proposed designs as both user set sizes (network scales) and the design parameter  $\gamma$  (cc-gain) increase. In Table II, it is evident that the DoF gap for the grouping scheme becomes significantly more pronounced as the user set sizes and  $\gamma$  increase for  $K_{(1)} < K_{(2)}$ . Additionally, for larger values of  $\gamma$ , the DoF of the phantom scheme surpasses that of min- $G$  when there is a greater disparity between the user set sizes, unlike for smaller values of  $\gamma$ . Furthermore, the phantom scheme demonstrates the potential to marginally exceed the DoF of the grouping scheme during the analysis. On the other hand, for  $K_{(1)} \geq K_{(2)}$ , the DoF of the phantom or min- $G$  schemes exceeds that of the grouping scheme. Altogether, the proposed schemes provide remarkable flexibility by considering both network and design parameters. They enable seamless scheduling to switch between schemes, maximizing the DoF for asymmetric MIMO-CC systems while addressing the limitations of individual approaches.

## VII. CONCLUSION

This paper addresses the practically challenging scenario of asymmetric MIMO-CC, highlighting the critical importance of DoF analysis in such setups. It introduces three innovative schemes—min- $G$ , grouping, and phantom—each offering distinct advantages. Analytical and simulation results demonstrate their effectiveness across various network configurations, paving the way for future research and practical applications.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. A. Maddah-Ali and U. Niesen, "Fundamental limits of caching," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2856–2867, 2014.
- [2] S. P. Shariatpanahi, G. Caire, and B. Hossein Khalaj, "Physical-Layer Schemes for Wireless Coded Caching," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2792–2807, 2019.
- [3] S. P. Shariatpanahi, S. A. Motahari, and B. H. Khalaj, "Multi-server coded caching," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 7253–7271, 2016.
- [4] Y. Cao, M. Tao, F. Xu, and K. Liu, "Fundamental Storage-Latency Tradeoff in Cache-Aided MIMO Interference Networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 5061–5076, 2017.
- [5] Y. Cao and M. Tao, "Treating Content Delivery in Multi-Antenna Coded Caching as General Message Sets Transmission: A DoF Region Perspective," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 3129–3141, 2019.
- [6] M. J. Salehi, H. B. Mahmoodi, and A. Tölli, "A Low-Subpacketization High-Performance MIMO Coded Caching Scheme," in *Proc. ITG Workshop Smart Antennas*, 2021, pp. 427–432.
- [7] M. Naseri-Tehrani, M. Salehi, and A. Tölli, "Multicast transmission design with enhanced DoF for MIMO coded caching systems," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust., Speech, Signal Processing*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 9101–9105.
- [8] M. N. Tehrani, M. J. Salehi, and A. Tölli, "Enhanced Achievable DoF Bounds for Cache-Aided MIMO Communication Systems," in *2024 IEEE 25th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 61–65.
- [9] M. Naseri-Tehrani, M. Salehi, and A. Tölli, "Cache-Aided MIMO Communications: DoF Analysis and Transmitter Optimization," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.15743>
- [10] E. Dahlman, S. Parkvall, and J. Skold, *5G NR: The next generation wireless access technology*. Academic Press, 2020.
- [11] C. D. Meyer and I. Stewart, *Matrix analysis and applied linear algebra*. SIAM, 2023.

## VIII. APPENDIX

**Example 1.** In this example, the delivery algorithm in [9, Theorem.1] is reviewed in a particular network setup with  $K = 10$  users, two user sets  $J = 2$ ,  $G_{(1)} = 2$ ,  $G_{(2)} = 4$ ,  $K_{(1)} = 10$ ,  $K_{(2)} = 10$ ,  $\gamma = 1$ , and  $L = 4$ . For this setup, consider the proposed schemes in Sections (III), (IV) and assuming each user requests files  $A, B, C, \dots$ , while we illustrate only a single sample transmission vector per scheme.

1) *min-G scheme:* First obtain  $\check{G} = 2$ ,  $K\check{\gamma} = 2$  and insert to (7) to get design parameters  $\Omega_{\check{G}}^* = 4$ ,  $\beta_{\check{G}}^* = 2$ . Then, for the cache-placement phase compute  $\check{\vartheta} = \binom{10}{2}$ , and  $\check{\phi} = 14$ , hence,  $\check{S} = 3\binom{10}{4}$ . For each  $s \in [\check{S}]$ , we have  $f(s) = F/\check{\vartheta}\check{\phi}$ ,  $\Omega(s) = \Omega_{\check{G}}^* = 4$ , and  $\beta(s) = \beta_{\check{G}}^* = 2$ . Substituting these values in (4) and simplifying the equations, the DoF of the min-G scheme is simply given as  $\text{DoF}_{\check{G}}^* = \Omega_{\check{G}}^* \cdot \beta_{\check{G}}^* = 8$ . Then, the target user set  $\mathcal{K}$  with  $|\mathcal{K}| = \Omega_{\check{G}}^* = 4$ . Let us focus on the first transmission ( $s = 1$ ) for the user set  $\mathcal{K} = \{1, 2, 3, 6\}$ , and use  $A, B, C$  and  $F$  to denote the files requested by users 1,2,3,6, respectively. To construct transmission vectors for target user sets in  $\mathcal{K}$ , we use packet index sets as  $P_k = \{\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{K} \setminus \{k\}, |\mathcal{P}| = 2\}$ , therefore,  $P_1 = \{23, 26, 36\}$ ,  $P_2 = \{13, 36, 16\}$ ,  $P_3 = \{12, 16, 26\}$ , and  $P_6 = \{12, 13, 23\}$  (braces for packet indices are removed here in text for notational simplicity but used in transmission vectors). Also,  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{P},k} = \{W_{\mathcal{P},k}^1, W_{\mathcal{P},k}^2\}$  for each  $k \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{P} \in P_k$ . The next step is to select  $\beta = 4$  subpackets for every user  $k$  to be included in each transmission. Without loss of generality, let us assume  $A_{\{23\}}^1, A_{\{26\}}^1, B_{\{13\}}^1, B_{\{16\}}^1, C_{\{12\}}^1, C_{\{16\}}^1, F_{\{12\}}^1$  and  $F_{\{23\}}^1$  are selected for the first transmission, and the rest of the subpackets are left for the other transmissions. Then, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(1) = & \mathbf{w}_{\{23\},1}^1 A_{\{23\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{26\},1}^2 A_{\{26\}}^1 \\ & + \mathbf{w}_{\{13\},2}^1 B_{\{13\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{16\},2}^1 B_{\{16\}}^1 \\ & + \mathbf{w}_{\{12\},3}^1 C_{\{12\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{16\},3}^1 C_{\{16\}}^1 \\ & + \mathbf{w}_{\{12\},6}^1 F_{\{12\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{23\},6}^1 F_{\{23\}}^1, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

2) *Grouping scheme:* First classify users into  $J = 2$  groups, each with  $K_{(j)}\gamma = 1$ ,  $j \in [J]$  and insert  $G_{(1)} = 2$  and  $G_{(2)} = 4$  to (10) to get design parameters ( $\Omega_{(1)}^* = 3$ ,  $\beta_{(1)}^* = 2$ ) and ( $\Omega_{(2)}^* = 2$ ,  $\beta_{(2)}^* = 4$ ). Then, for the cache-placement phase compute  $\vartheta_{(1)} = \vartheta_{(2)} = 5$ ,  $\phi_{(1)} = 6$ , and  $\phi_{(2)} = 4$ . hence,  $\check{S}_{(1)} = 20$  and  $\check{S}_{(2)} = 10$ . for each transmission  $s$  in step  $j \in [2]$ , we have  $f(s) = F/\vartheta_{(j)}\phi_{(j)}$ ,  $\Omega(s) = \Omega_{(j)}^*$ , and  $\beta(s) = \beta_{(j)}^*$ . Substituting these values in (13) and simplifying the equations, the DoF of the grouping scheme is simply given as  $\text{DoF}_{\mathcal{J}}^* = 6.86$ . Then, the target user sets  $\mathcal{K}(s)$  with  $|\mathcal{K}(s)| = \Omega_{(1)}^* = 3$ , for  $1 \leq s \leq 20$  and with  $|\mathcal{K}(s)| = \Omega_{(2)}^* = 2$ , for  $21 \leq s \leq 30$ . Let us focus on the first transmission per group, i.e.,  $s = 1$  and  $s = 21$  for the user sets  $\mathcal{K}(1) = \{1, 2, 3\}$ , and  $\mathcal{K}(21) = \{6, 7\}$ , respectively, where  $(A, B, C)$  and  $(F, G)$  to denote the files requested by users 1–3 and 6–7, respectively. To construct transmission vectors for target user sets in  $\mathcal{K}(s)$ , we use packet index sets as  $P_k = \{\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(s) \setminus \{k\}, |\mathcal{P}| = 1\}$ ,

therefore,  $P_1 = \{2, 3\}$ ,  $P_2 = \{1, 3\}$ ,  $P_3 = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $P_6 = \{7\}$  and  $P_7 = \{6\}$ . Also,  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{P},k} = \{W_{\mathcal{P},k}^1, W_{\mathcal{P},k}^2\}$  for each  $\mathcal{P} \in P_k$  and  $k \in \mathcal{K}(s)$ , where  $1 \leq s \leq 21$ , and  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{P},k} = \{W_{\mathcal{P},k}^1, W_{\mathcal{P},k}^2, W_{\mathcal{P},k}^3, W_{\mathcal{P},k}^4\}$  for each  $\mathcal{P} \in P_k$  and  $k \in \mathcal{K}(s)$ , where  $21 \leq s \leq 30$ . The next step is to select  $\beta_{(1)}^* = 2$  and  $\beta_{(2)}^* = 4$  subpackets for users in group 1 and 2 to be included in each transmission, respectively. Without loss of generality, let us assume  $A_{\{2\}}^1, A_{\{3\}}^1, B_{\{1\}}^1, B_{\{3\}}^1, C_{\{1\}}^1, C_{\{2\}}^1, F_{\{7\}}^q, q \in [4]$  and  $G_{\{6\}}^q, q \in [4]$  are selected for the first transmissions per group, and the rest of the subpackets are left for the other transmissions. Then, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(1) &= \mathbf{w}_{\{2\},1}^1 A_{\{2\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{3\},1}^1 A_{\{3\}}^1 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{1\},2}^1 B_{\{1\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{3\},2}^1 B_{\{3\}}^1 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{1\},3}^1 C_{\{1\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{2\},3}^2 C_{\{2\}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(21) &= \mathbf{w}_{\{7\},6}^1 F_{\{7\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{7\},6}^2 F_{\{7\}}^2 + \mathbf{w}_{\{7\},6}^3 F_{\{7\}}^3 + \mathbf{w}_{\{7\},6}^4 F_{\{7\}}^4 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{6\},7}^1 G_{\{6\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{6\},7}^2 G_{\{6\}}^2 + \mathbf{w}_{\{6\},7}^3 G_{\{6\}}^3 + \mathbf{w}_{\{6\},7}^4 G_{\{6\}}^4 \end{aligned}$$

3) *Phantom scheme*: First consider  $\hat{G} = 4, K\gamma = 2$ . Given the linear decodability of all users assuming  $\hat{G} = 4$  (14), we select design parameters  $\hat{\Omega} = 4, \hat{\beta} = 3$ . Then, for the cache-placement phase compute  $\hat{\nu} = \binom{10}{2}$ , and  $\hat{\phi} = 21$ , hence,  $S_{\text{MC}} = 3 \binom{10}{4}$ ,  $F_{\text{MC}} = 90 \binom{9}{2}$ ,  $F_{\text{UC}} = 10 \binom{9}{2}$ . Also, since  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{UC}}} G_k = 10$ ,  $\text{DoF}_{\text{UC}} = \min(4, 10) = 4 = L$ , and  $S_{\text{UC}} = \frac{F_{\text{UC}}}{L} = 270$ . Substituting the values in (23),  $\text{DoF}_{\text{ph}} = 6.86$ . Then, the target user set  $\mathcal{K}$  with  $|\mathcal{K}| = \Omega_{\hat{G}}^* = 4$ . Let us focus on one sample transmission ( $s = 1$ ) for the user set  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}} = \{1, 2, 6\}$ , and use  $A, B$ , and  $F$  to denote the files requested by users 1,2,6, respectively. Then after all multicasting phase is completed, it is followed by a sample unicasting transmission ( $s = 1$ ) for the user set  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{UC}} = \{1, 2\}$ , and use  $A$ , and  $B$ , to denote the undelivered files from multicasting case requested by users 1 and 2, respectively. To construct transmission vectors for target user sets in  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{MC}}$ , we use packet index sets as  $P_k = \{\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{K} \setminus \{k\}, |\mathcal{P}| = 2\}$ , therefore,  $P_1 = \{23, 26, 36\}$ ,  $P_2 = \{13, 36, 16\}$ , and  $P_6 = \{12, 13, 23\}$ . Also,  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{P},k} = \{W_{\mathcal{P},k}^1, W_{\mathcal{P},k}^2, W_{\mathcal{P},k}^3, W_{\mathcal{P},k}^4\}$  for each  $k \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{P} \in P_k$ . The next step is to select  $\beta = 4$  subpackets for every user  $k$  to be included in each transmission. Without loss of generality, let us assume  $A_{\{23\}}^1, A_{\{26\}}^1, A_{\{36\}}^1, A_{\{23\}}^2, B_{\{13\}}^1, B_{\{16\}}^1, B_{\{36\}}^1, B_{\{13\}}^2, F_{\{12\}}^1, F_{\{13\}}^1, F_{\{23\}}^1$ , and  $F_{\{12\}}^2$  are selected for the first transmission, and the rest of the undelivered subpackets for users with smaller antennas (in user set  $j = 1$  with  $G_k = G_{(1)}, k \in \mathcal{U}_{(1)}$ ) are left for the unicasting transmissions. Then, we have two possible multicasting and unicasting transmission vectors:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}(1) &= \mathbf{w}_{\{23\},1}^1 A_{\{23\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{26\},1}^1 A_{\{26\}}^1 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{36\},1}^1 A_{\{36\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{23\},1}^2 A_{\{23\}}^2 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{13\},2}^1 B_{\{13\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{16\},2}^1 B_{\{16\}}^1 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{36\},2}^1 B_{\{36\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{13\},2}^2 B_{\{13\}}^2 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{12\},6}^1 F_{\{12\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{23\},6}^1 F_{\{23\}}^1 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{13\},6}^1 F_{\{13\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{23\},6}^2 F_{\{23\}}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

then after removing  $\hat{\beta} - \beta_k$  subpackets from each user  $k$  (outlined in the Section IV), in  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(1)$ , we obtain  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{MC}}(1)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{\text{MC}}(1) &= \mathbf{w}_{\{23\},1}^1 A_{\{23\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{26\},1}^1 A_{\{26\}}^1 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{13\},2}^1 B_{\{13\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{16\},2}^1 B_{\{16\}}^1 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{12\},6}^1 F_{\{12\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{23\},6}^1 F_{\{23\}}^1 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{13\},6}^1 F_{\{13\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{23\},6}^2 F_{\{23\}}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Once Multicasting phase is completed, one sample unicasting phase is constructed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{\text{UC}}(1) &= \mathbf{w}_{\{36\},1}^1 A_{\{36\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{23\},1}^2 A_{\{23\}}^2 \\ &+ \mathbf{w}_{\{36\},2}^1 B_{\{36\}}^1 + \mathbf{w}_{\{13\},2}^2 B_{\{13\}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$