

Sum-Rate Maximization for Pinching Antenna-assisted NOMA Systems with Multiple Dielectric Waveguides

Shaokang Hu, *Member, IEEE*, Ruotong Zhao, *Student Member, IEEE*, Yihuan Liao, *Member, IEEE*, Derrick Wing Kwan Ng, *Fellow, IEEE*, and Jinhong Yuan, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—This paper investigates the resource allocation design for a pinching antenna (PA)-assisted multiuser multiple-input single-output (MISO) non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) system featuring multiple dielectric waveguides. To enhance model accuracy, we propose a novel frequency-dependent power attenuation model for dielectric waveguides in PA-assisted systems. By jointly optimizing the precoder vector and the PA placement, we aim to maximize the system’s sum-rate while accounting for the power attenuation across dielectric waveguides. The design is formulated as a non-convex optimization problem. To effectively address the problem at hand, we introduce an alternating optimization-based algorithm to obtain a suboptimal solution in polynomial time. Our results demonstrate that the proposed PA-assisted system not only significantly outperforms the conventional system but also surpasses a naive PA-assisted system that disregards power attenuation. The performance gain compared to the naive PA-assisted system becomes more pronounced at high carrier frequencies, emphasizing the importance of considering power attenuation in system design.

I. INTRODUCTION

The upcoming sixth-generation (6G) communication network is anticipated to deliver ultra-fast data transmission and seamless connectivity [1]. To fulfill the stringent quality inherent in service (QoS) requirements of 6G, various cutting-edge technologies, such as intelligent reflecting surfaces (IRSs) [2], [3], fluid antenna systems [4], and movable antennas [5], have demonstrated their effectiveness in enhancing system capacity by proactively modifying channel environments. Indeed, these innovations enable channel characteristics to be dynamically tailored to cope with evolving communication requirements and to mitigate interference from other users or systems, thereby significantly improving system performance, increasing data rates, and enhancing reliability. Specifically, movable antenna and fluid antenna systems constitute pioneering solutions that offer spatial diversity by implementing subtle adjustments to their physical positions [5] or electromagnetic properties [4]. However, the range of motion of these systems is typically limited to only a few wavelengths, resulting in only a marginal impact on mitigating large-scale path losses. Indeed, when the line-of-sight (LoS) link is blocked, these minor antenna position adjustments are often inadequate to restore it, leading to a substantial degradation in communication performance. Moreover, IRSs can reflect signals to circumvent obstacles and establish a virtual LoS link by being deployed between transceivers. While typical IRS-assisted systems offer enhanced flexibility, they inherently suffer from “double path loss” signal attenuation [6], [7], weakening the overall signal strength. Thus, to further

enhance the system data rate, establishing a low-cost, highly adaptable LoS link is imperative.

Recently, pinching antennas (PAs) were first introduced by DOCOMO in 2022 [8], presenting a promising solution to establish strong LoS communications. The fundamental concept behind PAs is to leverage dielectric waveguides in conjunction with antennas that employ a distinct dielectric material to effectively pinch the waveguides [9]. In this configuration, radio waves propagating along the dielectric waveguide can be channeled into the surroundings of the PAs, which then radiate the signal to establish a designated communication zone. One of the distinctive features of PAs is their ability to slide along the dielectric waveguide, allowing them to radiate radio waves from any point on the waveguide. Moreover, once the PAs are removed, the corresponding radiation can be terminated [8]. Compared to conventional fixed-location antenna systems, e.g., [10], [11], PAs offer significant benefits, such as flexible deployment at chosen points along waveguides, enabling efficient on-demand LoS link establishment to desired users.

Several studies in the literature have demonstrated that PAs significantly enhance system performance across various communication systems. For instance, the authors of [12] maximized the minimum achievable data rate for uplink PA systems, confirming their superiority over fixed antenna approaches. Since the PAs activated on a given waveguide must transmit an identical signal, traditional spatial multiplexing techniques become inadequate when the number of users exceeds the number of available waveguides [9]. To address this, non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) is employed, allowing multiple users to share the same beam, thereby accommodating more users than the hardware typically permits while providing increased degrees of freedom (DoF). Furthermore, NOMA is implemented by ordering users based on their channel qualities, with more power allocated to those experiencing weaker channel conditions. Notably, in conventional antenna-based NOMA systems, the channel qualities are fixed and cannot be adjusted, inherently limiting both capacity and resource allocation fairness. In contrast, PA systems allow for the customization of effective channel qualities by strategically repositioning antennas. This flexibility facilitates better optimization of power allocation and user ordering, resulting in improved overall system capacity. Inspired by the numerous advantages, the authors of [13] investigated a NOMA-assisted downlink PA system, where multiple PAs along a dielectric waveguide serve multiple users via NOMA. However, both studies [12]

and [13] are limited to single-waveguide configurations without extending the setup to a more general multi-waveguide PA system. To further generalize the PAs system model, the authors of [14] explored the deployment of PA systems with multiple waveguides to maximize the achievable weighted sum-rate. Note that multiple dielectric waveguides not only provide higher DoF but also enable transmitting different information streams simultaneously. While these systems offer advancements, they also present new challenges. For instance, existing works [12], [14] have idealistically ignored the power attenuation along the waveguide, which can reduce signal strength, potentially degrading overall system performance [15]. In reality, power attenuation typically increases as carrier frequency rises [8], which is particularly significant in PA-assisted systems, as they are specifically designed to operate at high carrier frequencies, such as those in millimeter-wave bands [8]. Thus, developing an accurate model for power attenuation in waveguides is essential.

Motivated by these observations, this paper investigates a PA-assisted multiuser multiple-input single-output (MISO) NOMA wireless system utilizing multiple dielectric waveguides. Our contributions are as follows: i) We develop a model for power attenuation along dielectric waveguides in PA-assisted systems, representing a significant advancement toward a more realistic and practical system design for PA-assisted wireless networks; ii) We formulate a resource allocation problem to maximize the system sum-rate by jointly optimizing the precoder vector and the location of the PAs, which enhances system performance; iii) The formulated problem is non-convex, posing significant computational challenges. To address this, we propose a computationally efficient alternating optimization (AO)-based algorithm that yields an effective suboptimal solution; iv) Our results demonstrate substantial performance improvements with PAs over conventional antennas and the native PA system, which neglects power attenuation along dielectric waveguides. The results also highlight the critical importance of accounting for power attenuation, particularly at high carrier frequencies.

Notations: Scalars, vectors, and matrices are denoted by x , \mathbf{x} , and \mathbf{X} , respectively. $\mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{N \times M}$ represent real and complex $N \times M$ matrices. \mathbb{R}^+ denotes positive real numbers, and \mathbb{H}^N is the set of $N \times N$ Hermitian matrices. The modulus of a complex scalar is $|\cdot|$ and its conjugate is x^* . The transpose, conjugate transpose, expectation, rank, and trace of \mathbf{X} are \mathbf{X}^T , \mathbf{X}^H , $\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{X}\}$, $\text{Rank}(\mathbf{X})$, and $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{X})$, respectively. $\mathbf{X}[q, i]$ is the element at row q , column i . $\min\{a, b\}$ returns the smaller of a and b . $\mathbf{X} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ indicates that \mathbf{X} is positive semi-definite. j is the imaginary unit. A circularly symmetric complex Gaussian (CSCG) random variable with mean μ and variance σ^2 is denoted as $\mathcal{CN}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, with \sim meaning “distributed as.”

II. SYSTEM MODEL

As illustrated in Fig. 1, we consider a downlink PA-assisted communication system adopting a NOMA scheme. Specifically, a base station (BS) feeds N dielectric waveguides and a single PA is activated on each waveguide. Each waveguide can be fed with different signals, which are sent to K single-antenna users




Fig. 1. A downlink PAs-assisted communication system.

simultaneously. We adopt a three-dimensional (3D) Cartesian coordinate system to represent key elements in our system model. All N dielectric waveguides are elevated by distance d above the x - y plane and extend along the y -axis [8], [9]. Signals are fed from the BS to the start of the waveguides. In the remainder of the paper, we refer to the starting points as feed points and their locations are denoted as $\psi_n^{\text{FP}} = (0, D_n^{\text{FP}}, d), \forall n \in \mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$. D_n^{FP} denotes the location of the n -th feeding point along the y -axis. The positions of these N PAs are represented as $\psi_n^{\text{Pin}} = (x_n^{\text{Pin}}, D_n^{\text{FP}}, d), \forall n$, where x_n^{Pin} denotes the location of the n -th PA along the x -axis¹. For the K users, we assume that they are randomly distributed across the x - y plane. The location of user² $u_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} = \{1, \dots, K\}$, is denoted as $\psi_k^{\text{User}} = (x_k, y_k, 0)$, where x_k and y_k denote user u_k 's coordinates along the x -axis and y -axis, respectively.

A. Signal Model

Since multiple users are simultaneously served exploiting a NOMA-based approach, the transmitted signal $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$ is a superposition of the independent signals transmitted to K users, which can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{s} = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{w}_k s_k, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$, $\mathbf{w}_k = [w_{k,1}, \dots, w_{k,n}, \dots, w_{k,N}]^T, \forall k$, is the precoding vector for user u_k . We denote the maximum transmit power of the n -th dielectric waveguide as P_n^{max} such that $\sum_{k=1}^K |w_{k,n}|^2 \leq P_n^{\text{max}}, \forall n$. Also, $s_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ with

¹A PA is designed to be movable along a pre-installed track parallel to the waveguide [9]. Its low cost allows for dense deployment, enabling each antenna to cover a small waveguide segment and quickly reposition as needed. For simplicity, this paper assumes that a PA can be perfectly positioned at any required location.

²For simplicity, we assume static users in this study. Both the PAs' positions and beamforming will be optimized based on the long-term user distribution in our future work.

$\mathbb{E}\{|s_k|^2\} = 1, \forall k, \mathbb{E}\{s_q^* s_k\} = 0, \forall q \neq k$, denotes the signal transmitted to user u_k .

B. Channel Model

As the PAs can be positioned in close proximity to users to establish near-field communications³ [8], [9], we adopt the spherical wave channel model [10]. The end-to-end channel between the n -th feed point via its PAs and user u_k is

$$\tilde{h}_{k,n} = \frac{\eta^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|\psi_k^{\text{User}} - \psi_n^{\text{Pin}}|} e^{-2\pi j \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} |\psi_k^{\text{User}} - \psi_n^{\text{Pin}}| + \frac{1}{\lambda_g} |\psi_n^{\text{FP}} - \psi_n^{\text{Pin}}| \right)}. \quad (2)$$

Here, $\eta = \frac{c}{4\pi f_c}$, where c and f_c denote the speed of light and the signal carrier frequency, respectively. As all N PAs are allocated along N waveguides at a distance from their feed points, this inevitably imposes phase shifts on their emitted signals [9]. To account for this phase-shifted behavior, we introduce a phase shift term, $e^{-2\pi j \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_g} |\psi_n^{\text{FP}} - \psi_n^{\text{Pin}}| \right)}$, to represent the phase shift between signal's propagation via the waveguide. The guided wavelength is defined as $\lambda_g = \frac{\lambda}{\eta_{\text{eff}}}$, where $\lambda = \frac{2\pi}{f_c}$, and $\eta_{\text{eff}} > 1$ signifies the effective refractive index of the waveguide. Besides, the phase shift $\exp\left(-2\pi j \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} |\psi_k^{\text{User}} - \psi_n^{\text{Pin}}| \right)\right)$ is due to the signal's wireless propagation from the n -th PA to user u_k .

Moreover, incorporating power attenuation along dielectric waveguides into the system model is essential for accurately evaluating and optimizing performance. Thus, the power attenuation for the n -th PA in lossy dielectric waveguide [16] is

$$P_{\text{Lossy},n} = P_{n,0} e^{-2\alpha_D |\psi_n^{\text{FP}} - \psi_n^{\text{Pin}}|}, \forall n, \alpha_D = \lambda_g \varepsilon_r \pi f_c^2 c^{-2} \tan \delta_e, \quad (3)$$

where $\alpha_D \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\varepsilon_r \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and $\tan \delta_e \in \mathbb{R}^+$ are the attenuation constant, dielectric constant, effective electric loss tangent of the dielectric waveguide, respectively. $P_{n,0}$ is the initial power at the n -th feed point. Combining the power attenuation (3) in the dielectric waveguide, $\tilde{h}_{k,n}$ is now updated as

$$h_{k,n} = \frac{\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{2\pi j}{\lambda} d_{k,n}^{\text{UPin}} - (\frac{2\pi j}{\lambda_g} + \alpha_D) x_n^{\text{Pin}}}}{d_{k,n}^{\text{UPin}}}, \quad (4)$$

where $d_{k,n}^{\text{UPin}} = \sqrt{(x_n^{\text{Pin}} - x_k)^2 + (D_n^{\text{FP}} - y_k)^2 + d^2}$. Hence, the equivalent channel from the PAs to user u_k , taking into account lossy dielectric waveguides, can be denoted as $\mathbf{h}_k = [h_{k,1} \ \cdots \ h_{k,n} \ \cdots \ h_{k,N}]^T$.

Remark 1. *Pinching antenna placement introduces a trade-off between waveguide attenuation and wireless path loss, both of which significantly impact the end-to-end channel gain. Specifically, increasing the distance between the feed point and the PAs results in higher waveguide attenuation, thereby reducing the extracted signal power. Conversely, positioning the PAs closer to the feed point may increase their distance to the users, leading to longer wireless transmission and greater large-scale path loss.*

³Transmission is classified as far-field when the distance between the transmitter and receiver exceeds the Fraunhofer distance [10], i.e., $d_F = \frac{2D^2}{\lambda}$, where D represents the antenna diameter and λ is the wavelength. In contrast, the receiver is considered to be in the near-field region if the distance is shorter than d_F but greater than the Fresnel distance, typically expressed as $d_N = \sqrt[3]{\frac{D^4}{8}\lambda}$.

To maximize overall channel gain, it is crucial to identify an optimal pinching location that balances these two losses.

C. Received Signal at Users

Combining equations (1) and (4), the received signal at user $u_k, \forall k$, is given by

$$y_k = \mathbf{h}_k^H \sum_{m=1}^K \mathbf{w}_m s_m + n_k, \forall k, \quad (5)$$

where $n_k \in \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_k^2), \forall k$, is the thermal noise at user u_k and σ_k^2 is the variance of n_k .

To implement NOMA in the considered PA-assisted system, we assume that users' channels are ordered in ascending strength based on their user index, without loss of generality [11]. Specifically, the strongest user is denoted as u_K and the weakest user as u_1 with all remaining users arranged in increasing order with respect to their indices. Consequently, as illustrated in Fig. 1, user u_k decodes the signals of all users $u_m, \forall m < k$, and performs successive interference cancellation (SIC), while treating the signals of users $u_m, \forall m > k$, as interference. User u_K can mitigate interference from all other users by performing SIC, while the weakest user u_1 cannot decode any interference signals [11]. According to NOMA principles, when user u_k successfully eliminate the interference from users u_m with indices $m < k, \forall m \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ by applying the SIC operation, the achievable rate for u_k to decode its intended information is given by [11]

$$R_k^k = \log_2(1 + \text{SINR}_k^k), \quad \forall k. \quad (6)$$

Here, SINR_m^k denotes the signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) at user u_m for decoding the message of user u_k :

$$\text{SINR}_m^k = \frac{|\mathbf{h}_m^H \mathbf{w}_k|^2}{\sum_{b=k+1}^K |\mathbf{h}_m^H \mathbf{w}_b|^2 + \sigma_m^2}, \forall k, m. \quad (7)$$

It is worth mentioning that to ensure the data rate in (6) achieves a target data rate R_{th} for user u_k (i.e., $R_k^k \geq R_{\text{th}}$), the data rate of all users $u_m, \forall m > k$, decoding the message of user u_k , denoted as R_m^k , must be at least R_{th} for u_k , i.e.,

$$R_m^k = \log_2(1 + \text{SINR}_m^k) \geq R_{\text{th}}, m \in \{k+1, \dots, K\}, \forall k. \quad (8)$$

To further elaborate, (8) ensures that the SINR for user u_m when decoding the message intended for user u_k (i.e., SINR_m^k corresponding to R_m^k , where $m > k$) exceeds the SINR for user u_k decoding its own message (i.e., SINR_k^k corresponding to R_k^k). Once this condition is satisfied, users with stronger channels (i.e., those with higher indices in the predefined ordering) can successfully perform SIC. Based on this observation, we propose maximizing the minimum SINR among SINR_k^k and $\{\text{SINR}_m^k, \forall m > k\}$. Then, the users' sum-rate is

$$R_{\text{sum}} = \sum_{k=1}^K R_k, \quad (9)$$

$$R_k = \begin{cases} \log_2(1 + \min\{\text{SINR}_k^k, \text{SINR}_{k+1}^k, \dots, \text{SINR}_K^k\}), 1 \leq k < K, \\ \log_2(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{w}_k|^2}{\sigma_K^2}), k = K. \end{cases}$$

It can be observed from (9) that the effective channel strength for the users can be influenced by adjusting the positions of the N PAs, x_n^{pin} , and by altering the precoding vector to the PAs, \mathbf{w}_k . Consequently, the following condition must be satisfied [11]:

$$|\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{w}_1|^2 \geq \dots \geq |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{w}_m|^2 \geq \dots \geq |\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{w}_K|^2, \forall k. \quad (10)$$

Specifically, (10) ensures that users with stronger channels receive a lower combined channel gain and reduced beamforming power, thereby optimizing the SINRs necessary for decoding the messages of other users. Thus, (10) plays a critical role in achieving efficient resource allocation and enhancing overall system performance.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section, we formulate a problem to maximize sum-rate of the proposed PA-assisted NOMA system. Our problem formulation takes into account the power attenuation over lossy dielectric waveguides, which is expressed as (11) by optimizing the locations for N PAs, x_n^{pin} , and the precoding vectors, \mathbf{w}_k :

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{x_n^{\text{pin}}, \mathbf{w}_k}{\text{maximize}} R_{\text{sum}} & (11) \\ & \text{s.t. C1: (10),} \\ & \text{C2: } \sum_{k=1}^K |w_{k,n}|^2 \leq P_n^{\text{max}}, \forall n, \\ & \text{C3: } R_k \geq R_{\text{min}}, \forall k, \\ & \text{C4: } 0 \leq x_n^{\text{pin}} \leq x^{\text{max}}, \forall n. \end{aligned}$$

Specifically, to facilitate the decoding process, constraint C1 ensures that the channels are the ordered by strength. Constraint C2 guarantees that the transmit power consumption of the n -th dielectric waveguide dose not exceed its power budget, P_n^{max} . Constraint C3 restricts that the achievable rate of user u_k is not less than the minimum rate requirement R_{min} . The formulated problem is non-convex due to the coupling between optimization variables \mathbf{w}_k and x_n^{pin} in the objective function, constraints C1 and C3. Constraint C4 restricts the movement of the PAs along the x -axis to the range $[0, x^{\text{max}}]$. In general, obtaining the globally optimal solution to (11) necessitates the use of a brute-force search, which becomes computationally infeasible even for systems of a moderate size. As a practical alternative, we propose a computationally efficient suboptimal iterative algorithm based on AO in the following section.

IV. SOLUTION OF THE OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM

A. Problem Transformation

Firstly, we introduce constraints C5, C6, and slack optimization variables, $r_k, \forall k$, to replace $1 + \min\{\text{SINR}_k^k, \dots, \text{SINR}_K^k\}$, $k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{K\}$, and $1 + |\mathbf{h}_K^H \mathbf{w}_K|^2 / \sigma_K^2$ in R_{sum} and R_k . As such, constraints C5 and C6 are equivalently given by

$$\text{C5: } r_k - 1 \leq \min\{\text{SINR}_k^k, \dots, \text{SINR}_K^k\}, k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{K\}, \quad (12)$$

Algorithm 1 SCA-based Iterative Precoder Optimization

- 1: Set the maximum iterations number t_{max} , initial the index of the previous iteration $t_1 = 0$, and optimization variables in $\xi_{m,k}^{(t_1)}, \forall k, m$, and $r_k^{(t_1)}, \forall k$, for a given constant $\mathbf{h}_k^{\text{Con.}}$.
- 2: **repeat** {Main Loop: SCA}
- 3: Solve (19) with given optimization variables in $\xi_{m,k}^{(t_1)}$ and $r_k^{(t_1)}$ and constants $\mathbf{h}_k^{\text{Con.}}$ to obtain the variables for $\xi_{m,k}^{(t_1+1)}$ and $r_k^{(t_1+1)}$;
- 4: Set $t_1 = t_1 + 1$ and update $\xi_{m,k}^{(t_1)}$ and $r_k^{(t_1)}$;
- 5: **until** convergence or $t_1 = t_{\text{max}}$.

$$\Leftrightarrow r_k - 1 \leq \text{SINR}_m^k, m \in \{k, \dots, K-1\}, k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{K\},$$

$$\text{C6: } r_K - 1 \leq \sigma_K^{-2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}_K^H \mathbf{w}_K \mathbf{w}_K^H \mathbf{h}_K),$$

respectively. To handle the non-convexity, we introduce slack variables $\xi_{m,k}$ to decouple the fractional form in SINRs in (12). Then, C5 can be equivalently transformed as

$$\text{C5a: } \xi_{m,k} r_k - \xi_{m,k} \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}_m^H \mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k^H \mathbf{h}_m), \quad (13)$$

$$m \in \{k, \dots, K-1\}, k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{K\},$$

$$\text{C5b: } \sum_{b=k+1}^K \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}_m^H \mathbf{w}_b \mathbf{w}_b^H \mathbf{h}_m) + \sigma_m^2 \leq \xi_{m,k},$$

$$m \in \{k, \dots, K-1\}, k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{K\}.$$

On the other hand, constraint C1, $\forall k, m = \{2, \dots, K\}$, can be equivalently transformed as following:

$$\text{C1} \Leftrightarrow \overline{\text{C1}} : \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{w}_m \mathbf{w}_m^H \mathbf{h}_k) \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{w}_{m-1} \mathbf{w}_{m-1}^H \mathbf{h}_k). \quad (14)$$

By defining $\mathbf{W}_k \triangleq \mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k^H$, the optimization problem (11) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{x_n^{\text{pin}}, \mathbf{W}_k \in \mathbb{H}^N, \xi_{m,k}, r_k}{\text{maximize}} \sum_{k=1}^K \log_2(r_k) & (15) \\ & \text{s.t. } \overline{\text{C1}}, \overline{\text{C2}}: \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{W}_k[n, n] \leq P_n^{\text{max}}, \forall n, \overline{\text{C3}}: r_k \geq 2^{R_{\text{min}}}, \forall k, \\ & \text{C4, C5a, C5b,} \\ & \overline{\text{C6}}: r_K - 1 \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}_K \mathbf{h}_K^H \mathbf{W}_K) / \sigma_K^2, \\ & \text{C7: Rank}(\mathbf{W}_k) \leq 1, \forall k, \text{C8: } \mathbf{W}_k \succeq \mathbf{0}, \forall k. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the optimization problem in (15), constraints $\overline{\text{C1}}$, $\overline{\text{C5a}}$, $\overline{\text{C5b}}$, and $\overline{\text{C6}}$ are nonconvex due to variable couplings, while constraint C7 is a discrete rank constraint. Hence, in the following section, an iterative AO algorithm is introduced to obtain a suboptimal solution to (15). Specifically, the proposed algorithm addresses the coupled variables \mathbf{W}_k and x_n^{pin} by decomposing (15) into two subproblems. Then, the proposed algorithm alternately updates \mathbf{W}_k or x_n^{pin} while fixing the remaining variables in each sub-problem.

B. Sub-problem 1: Optimization of the Precoding Vector

In this section, we focus on optimizing the precoding matrix \mathbf{W}_k and slack variables $\xi_{m,k}$ and r_k , assuming a fixed and feasible location for the PAs. With this assumption, the channel

\mathbf{h}_k remains constant and sub-problem 1 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{W}_k \in \mathbb{H}^N, \xi_{m,k}, r_k}{\text{maximize}} \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \log_2(r_k) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \overline{\text{C1}}, \overline{\text{C2}}, \overline{\text{C3}}, \text{C5a}, \text{C5b}, \overline{\text{C6}}, \text{C7}, \text{C8}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Consequently, only constraints C5a and C7 remain non-convex in this sub-problem. Firstly, we apply an iterative method based on successive convex approximation (SCA) to handle the difference of convex (d.c.) functions in C5a. For any feasible point $\xi_{m,k}^{(t_1)}$ and $r_k^{(t_1)}$, where (t_1) denotes the iteration index of SCA, as summarized in **Algorithm 1**, we establish an upper bound function for $-\xi_{m,k}^2$, $m \in \{k, \dots, K-1\}$, and $-r_k^2$, $k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{K\}$, by adopting their first-order Taylor series expansions:

$$\begin{aligned} -0.5\xi_{m,k}^2 &\leq -0.5(\xi_{m,k}^{(t_1)})^2 - \xi_{m,k}^{(t_1)}(\xi_{m,k} - \xi_{m,k}^{(t_1)}), \\ -0.5r_k^2 &\leq -0.5(r_k^{(t_1)})^2 - r_k^{(t_1)}(r_k - r_k^{(t_1)}). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

As such, a convex subset of C5a can be derived as

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{C5a}}: & -\text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}_m \mathbf{h}_m^H \mathbf{W}_k) + 0.5(\xi_{m,k} + r_k)^2 \\ & - \xi_{m,k}^{(t_1)}(\xi_{m,k} - \xi_{m,k}^{(t_1)}) - 0.5(r_k^{(t_1)})^2 - r_k^{(t_1)}(r_k - r_k^{(t_1)}) \\ & - \xi_{m,k} - 0.5(\xi_{m,k}^{(t_1)})^2 \leq 0, m \in \{k, \dots, K-1\}, \forall k, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

such that $\overline{\text{C5a}}$ implies C5a. Currently, rank constraint C7 is the only non-convex aspect of sub-problem 1. To tackle this, we apply the semidefinite relaxation (SDR) technique [2], removing the rank constraint. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{W}_k \in \mathbb{H}^N, \xi_{m,k}, r_k}{\text{maximize}} \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \log_2(r_k) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \overline{\text{C1}}, \text{C2}, \overline{\text{C3}}, \overline{\text{C5a}}, \text{C5b}, \overline{\text{C6}}, \text{C8}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

At this stage, the problem in (19) has been transformed into a convex semidefinite program, which can be efficiently solved using standard convex optimization numerical solvers, e.g., CVX [17]. The tightness of the applied SDR is analyzed in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. For $P_n^{\max} > 0, \forall n$, and if (19) is feasible, a rank-one solution of (19) can always be constructed.

Proof: Due to space limitation, we provide only a brief sketch of the proof. By examining the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions of (19), it can be demonstrated that a rank-one solution \mathbf{W}_k must exist to ensure a bounded solution to the dual problem of (19). Furthermore, a rank-one solution to (19) can be explicitly constructed by leveraging the dual variables of its corresponding dual problem. \square

By applying the SCA technique, solving (19) yields a sub-optimal solution to (16). We further refine this by iteratively updating the feasible solution by solving (19) at each t_1 -th iteration. The proposed SCA-based **Algorithm 1** converges to a suboptimal solution, with proof in [18].

C. Sub-problem 2: Pinching Antennas' Location Optimization

Algorithm 2 SCA-based Iterative PAS' Location Optimization

- 1: Set the maximum iterations number t_{\max} , initial the index of the previous iteration $t_2 = 0$, and optimization variables in $x_n^{\text{Pin}(t_2)}, \gamma_{k,i,q}^{(t_2)}, r_k^{(t_2)}$, and $\xi_{m,k}^{(t_2)}$ for a given $\mathbf{W}_k^{\text{Con.}}$.
- 2: **repeat** {Main Loop: SCA}
- 3: Solve (22) with given optimization variables in $x_n^{\text{Pin}(t_2)}, \gamma_{k,i,q}^{(t_2)}, r_k^{(t_2)}$, and $\xi_{m,k}^{(t_2)}$ and constants $\mathbf{W}_k^{\text{Con.}}$ to obtain the variables for $x_n^{\text{Pin}(t_2+1)}, \gamma_{k,i,q}^{(t_2+1)}, r_k^{(t_2+1)}$, and $\xi_{m,k}^{(t_2+1)}$;
- 4: Set $t_2 = t_2 + 1$ and update $x_n^{\text{Pin}(t_2)}, \gamma_{k,i,q}^{(t_2)}, r_k^{(t_2)}$, and $\xi_{m,k}^{(t_2)}$.
- 5: **until** convergence or $t_2 = t_{\max}$.

Now, we fix the precoding matrix $\mathbf{W}_k, \forall k$, and optimize the location of the PASs, i.e., $x_n^{\text{Pin}}, \forall n$, slack variables $\xi_{m,k}, \forall m, k$, and $r_k, \forall k$, to improve the channel condition $\mathbf{h}_k, \forall k$. Therefore, sub-problem 2 is written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{x_n^{\text{Pin}}, \xi_{m,k}, r_k}{\text{maximize}} \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \log_2(r_k) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \overline{\text{C1}}, \overline{\text{C3}}, \text{C4}, \text{C5a}, \text{C5b}, \text{C6}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

To address the non-convexity of (20), $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{W}_m)$ is equivalently reformulated as $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{h}_k^H \mathbf{W}_m) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{q=1}^N h_{k,i} h_{k,q}^* \mathbf{W}_m[q, i]$. Here, $h_{k,i} h_{k,q}^* = \frac{\eta e^{-\frac{2\pi j}{\lambda}(d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}} - d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}}) - (\frac{2\pi j}{\lambda} \alpha_D) x_i^{\text{Pin}} - (\frac{2\pi j}{\lambda} \alpha_D) x_q^{\text{Pin}}}}{d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}} d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}}}$.

Now, we introduce slack optimization variables $\tau_{k,i,q}$ and $\gamma_{k,i,q}, \forall k, i, q$, and constraints C9 and C10, which are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{C9: } & 2\pi j \left(\frac{d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}} - d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}}}{\lambda} + \frac{x_q^{\text{Pin}} - x_i^{\text{Pin}}}{\lambda_g} \right) - \alpha_D x_i^{\text{Pin}} - \ln \left(d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}} \right) \\ & - \alpha_D \lambda_g x_q^{\text{Pin}} - \ln \left(d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}} \right) + \ln(\eta) \leq \ln(\tau_{k,i,q}), \forall k, i, q, \\ \text{C10: } & 2\pi j \left(\frac{d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}} - d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}}}{\lambda} + \frac{x_i^{\text{Pin}} - x_q^{\text{Pin}}}{\lambda_g} \right) + \alpha_D x_i^{\text{Pin}} + \ln \left(d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}} \right) \\ & + \alpha_D x_q^{\text{Pin}} + \ln \left(d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}} \right) + \ln(\gamma_{k,i,q}) - \ln(\eta) \leq 0, \forall k, i, q, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

respectively. By following the same approach as for handling sub-problem 1 in Section IV-B, we apply the SCA to address the non-convexity in constraints $\overline{\text{C1}}, \text{C5a}, \text{C5b}, \text{C6}, \text{C9}$, and C10. Thus, the optimization problem in (20) can be transformed as the optimization problem in (22) to obtain a suboptimal solution:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{x_n^{\text{Pin}}, \tau_{k,i,q}, \gamma_{k,i,q}, \xi_{m,k}, r_k}{\text{maximize}} \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \log_2(r_k) \\ \text{s.t. } & \widetilde{\text{C1}}: \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{q=1}^N \tau_{k,i,q} \mathbf{W}_m[q, i] - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{q=1}^N \gamma_{k,i,q} \mathbf{W}_{m-1}[q, i] \\ & \leq 0, m \in \{2, \dots, K\}, \forall k, \overline{\text{C3}}, \text{C4}, \\ & \widetilde{\text{C5a}}: 0.5(\xi_{m,k} + r_k)^2 - 0.5(\xi_{m,k}^{(t_2)})^2 - \xi_{m,k}^{(t_2)}(\xi_{m,k} - \xi_{m,k}^{(t_2)}) \\ & - 0.5(r_k^{(t_2)})^2 - r_k^{(t_2)}(r_k - r_k^{(t_2)}) - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{q=1}^N \gamma_{m,i,q} \mathbf{W}_k[q, i] \\ & - \xi_{m,k} \leq 0, m \in \{k, \dots, K-1\}, k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{K\}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Algorithm 3 Overall AO Algorithm

- 1: Set the maximum iterations number τ_{\max} , initial the index of the previous iteration $\tau = 0$, and the optimization variables in $\mathbf{W}_k^{(\tau)}$ and $x_n^{\text{Pin}(\tau)}$.
- 2: **repeat** {Main Loop: AO}
- 3: Obtain $\mathbf{W}_k^{(\tau+1)}$ by **Algorithm 1** with given optimization variables in constants $\mathbf{h}_k^{\text{Con.}} = \mathbf{h}_k|_{x_n^{\text{Pin}}=x_n^{\text{Pin}(\tau)}}$.
- 4: Obtain the variables $x_n^{\text{Pin}(\tau+1)}$ by **Algorithm 2** with given $\mathbf{W}_k^{(\tau+1)}$;
- 5: Update $x_n^{\text{Pin}(\tau)}$.
- 6: Set $\tau = \tau + 1$ and update the optimization variables;
- 7: **until** convergence or $\tau = \tau_{\max}$.

$$\widetilde{\text{C5b}}: \sum_{b=k+1}^K \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{q=1}^N \tau_{m,i,q} \mathbf{W}_b[q, i] + \sigma_m^2 \leq \xi_{m,k},$$

$$m \in \{k, \dots, K-1\}, k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{K\},$$

$$\overline{\text{C6}}: \sigma_K^2 r_K - \sigma_K^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{q=1}^N \gamma_{K,i,q} \mathbf{W}_K[q, i],$$

$$\text{C9a}: -\alpha_D x_i^{\text{Pin}} + f_{\text{sca}}(-\ln(d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}})) - \alpha_D \lambda_g x_q^{\text{Pin}} + f_{\text{sca}}(-\ln(d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}})) + \ln(\eta) \leq \ln(\tau_{k,i,q}), \forall k, i, q,$$

$$\text{C9b}: \frac{f_{\text{sca}}(-d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}}) + f_{\text{sca}}(d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}})}{\lambda} + \frac{x_q^{\text{Pin}} - x_i^{\text{Pin}}}{\lambda_g} = 0, \forall k, i, q,$$

$$\text{C10a}: \alpha_D x_i^{\text{Pin}} + \ln(d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}}) + \alpha_D x_q^{\text{Pin}} + \ln(d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}}) + f_{\text{sca}}(\ln(\gamma_{k,i,q})) - \ln(\eta) \leq 0, \forall k, i, q,$$

$$\text{C10b}: \frac{f_{\text{sca}}(d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}}) + f_{\text{sca}}(-d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}})}{\lambda} + \frac{x_i^{\text{Pin}} - x_q^{\text{Pin}}}{\lambda_g} = 0, \forall k, i, q,$$

where

$$f_{\text{sca}}(-d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}}) = -d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}}|_{x_n^{\text{Pin}}(t_2)} - \frac{x_i^{\text{Pin}(t_2)} - x_k}{d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}}|_{x_n^{\text{Pin}}(t_2)}} (x_i^{\text{Pin}} - x_i^{\text{Pin}(t_2)}),$$

$$f_{\text{sca}}(\ln(\gamma_{k,i,q})) = \ln(\gamma_{k,i,q}^{(t_2)}) + \frac{1}{\gamma_{k,i,q}^{(t_2)}} (\gamma_{k,i,q} - \gamma_{k,i,q}^{(t_2)}) \quad (23)$$

$$f_{\text{sca}}(-\ln(d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}})) = -\ln(d_{k,q}^{\text{UPin}}|_{x_n^{\text{Pin}}(t_2)}) - \frac{x_q^{\text{Pin}(t_2)} - x_k}{(d_{k,i}^{\text{UPin}}|_{x_n^{\text{Pin}}(t_2)})^2} (x_q^{\text{Pin}} - x_q^{\text{Pin}(t_2)}).$$

Now, the optimization problem in (22) can be efficiently solved using a standard convex programming solver, yielding a suboptimal solution to the original problem in (20). The proposed algorithm for solving (22) is presented in **Algorithm 2**. Furthermore, the overall process, which iteratively solves the two sub-problems in (19) and (22), is summarized in **Algorithm 3**. The proposed **Algorithm 3** is guaranteed to converge to a sub-optimal solution of (11) within a polynomial-time computational complexity [19].

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

This section evaluates the system performance of the proposed PA-assisted NOMA system with multiple dielectric waveguides via simulation base on the setup in Fig. 1. Specifically, each dielectric waveguide is spaced 10 meters apart, i.e., $|D_{n+1}^{\text{FP}} - D_n^{\text{FP}}| = 10$ meters, $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, and




Fig. 2. System sum-rate versus the total transmit power budget of pinching or conventional antennas at the BS, P_{\max} , with $K = 6$ and $N = 2$.

$d = 3$ meters [9]. x^{\max} is set to 100 meters. The minimum rate requirement R_{\min} for users is 0.5 bps/s/Hz. The K users are randomly distributed within a square area of side length 100 m. Without loss of generality, the maximum power budget of each dielectric waveguide, P_n^{\max} , is assumed to be identical and the total transmitted power is given by $P_{\max} = \sum_{n=1}^N P_n^{\max}$. The dielectric waveguides are composed of Polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) [8], with key parameters specified as follows: $\eta_{\text{eff}} = 1.42$, $\epsilon_r = 2.1$, and $\tan \delta_e = 2 \times 10^{-4}$. The values of P_{\max} , K , N , and the carrier frequency f_c are specified in each figure. For comparison, in addition the proposed scheme, denoted as ‘‘Pin.’’ in Figs. 2 and 3, we also evaluate the system performance of three other schemes: 1) Ideal Pin. scheme: This scheme is identical to the proposed scheme but assumes the waveguides are deployed with perfect dielectric material, thereby ensuring no power attenuation through the waveguides. Thus, it serves as a performance upper bound; 2) Nai. Pin. scheme: This is a naive baseline scheme, which assumes that there is no power attenuation through the waveguides during the resource allocation process. To ensure a fair comparison, the system sum-rate was recalculated based on the channel considering power attenuation in (4). Moreover, to increase its feasibility, the results of this scheme are not required to satisfy the channel ordering constraint C1; 3) Con. scheme: This is a baseline scheme adopted a conventional antenna system, where N BS antennas are fixed at the center of the feed points. The free-space channel model is adopted between the BS and each user under far-field conditions.

Fig. 2 illustrates the system sum-rate versus the total transmit power budget for both pinching and conventional antennas at the BS across different schemes. As expected, the sum-rate for all schemes increases monotonically with P_{\max} . Moreover, the proposed scheme outperforms the conventional antenna scheme. This performance gain stems from the ability of PAs to establish a more favorable radio propagation environment by optimizing




Fig. 3. System sum-rate versus the number of pinching or conventional antennas at the BS, N , with $P_{\max} = 15$ dBm and $f_c = 28$ GHz.

their pinching positions. Consequently, the large-scale path loss between the BS and users can be effectively reduced compared with a system adopting conventional antennas. On the other hand, the proposed scheme exhibits a performance gap compared to the ideal PA scheme. This discrepancy arises because the ideal PA scheme assumes perfect dielectric waveguides with no power loss during signal transmission. However, power attenuation is unavoidable in reality. Indeed, the naive PA scheme neglects power attenuation, causing a mismatch between the optimized beamformer and PA positions with the actual channel state information, which leads to performance degradation compared to the proposed scheme. Notably, at high carrier frequencies f_c , the performance degradation becomes more significant, particularly at mmWave frequencies such as 28 GHz. Indeed, the f_c^2 -dependent term in the attenuation constant α_D in (3) leads to exponential signal decay as frequency increases, resulting in more severe power attenuation over the dielectric waveguide. This exacerbates the discrepancy between the actual channel h and the one assumed in the naive scheme, causing the PAs' positions to deviate from the optimized placement and further degrading system performance.

Fig. 3 illustrates the system sum-rate versus the number of pinching or conventional antennas at the BS, across different schemes. As N increases, the system sum-rate improves. This is because a larger N provides more DoF for optimizing the channel between the PAs (or conventional antennas) and the users, thereby enhancing the beamforming gain. However, the performance improvement saturates gradually for a sufficiently large N as the performance is ultimately constrained by the power budget. We also observe that increasing the number of users, K , enables better spectrum utilization in the NOMA system, thereby enhancing the system sum-rate.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper investigated a PA-assisted multiuser MISO NOMA wireless system employing multiple dielectric waveguides, taking into account the crucial factor of power attenuation over dielectric waveguides. By jointly optimizing the precoder vector and the placement of the PAs, we formulated a non-convex optimization problem for maximizing the system's sum-rate. An AO-based algorithm was proposed, yielding an effective suboptimal solution. Our results reveal significant performance gains achieved by the proposed PA-assisted system compared to both conventional antennas and a naive PA-assisted system that ignores power attenuation in lossy dielectric waveguides.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Zhang, Y. Xiao, Z. Ma, M. Xiao, Z. Ding, X. Lei, G. K. Karagiannidis, and P. Fan, "6G wireless networks: Vision, requirements, architecture, and key technologies," *IEEE Veh. Technol. Mag.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 28–41, Sep. 2019.
- [2] S. Hu, Z. Wei, Y. Cai, C. Liu, D. W. K. Ng, and J. Yuan, "Robust and secure sum-rate maximization for multiuser MISO downlink systems with self-sustainable IRS," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 69, no. 10, pp. 7032–7049, Jul. 2021.
- [3] S. Hu, C. Liu, Z. Wei, Y. Cai, D. W. Kwan Ng, and J. Yuan, "Beamforming design for intelligent reflecting surface-enhanced symbiotic radio systems," in *ICC 2022*, 2022, pp. 2651–2657.
- [4] K.-K. Wong, A. Shojaefard, K.-F. Tong, and Y. Zhang, "Fluid antenna systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 1950–1962, Nov. 2020.
- [5] L. Zhu, W. Ma, and R. Zhang, "Movable antennas for wireless communication: Opportunities and challenges," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, Oct. 2023.
- [6] Z. Zhang, L. Dai, X. Chen, C. Liu, F. Yang, R. Schober, and H. V. Poor, "Active RIS vs. passive RIS: Which will prevail in 6G?" *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 1707–1725, Mar. 2023.
- [7] S. Hu, C. Liu, D. W. K. Ng, and J. Yuan, "Secure communication in multifunctional active intelligent reflection surface-assisted systems," in *WSA & SCC 2023*. VDE, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [8] H. O. Y. Suzuki and K. Kawai, "Pinching antenna-using a dielectric waveguide as an antenna," *NTT DOCOMO Tech. J.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 5–12, Jan. 2022.
- [9] Z. Ding, R. Schober, and H. V. Poor, "Flexible-antenna systems: A pinching-antenna perspective," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.02376*, 2024.
- [10] H. Zhang, N. Shlezinger, F. Guidi, D. Dardari, M. F. Imani, and Y. C. Eldar, "Beam focusing for near-field multiuser MIMO communications," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 7476–7490, Sep. 2022.
- [11] M. F. Hanif, Z. Ding, T. Ratnarajah, and G. K. Karagiannidis, "A minorization-maximization method for optimizing sum rate in the downlink of non-orthogonal multiple access systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 76–88, Jan. 2016.
- [12] S. A. Tegos, P. D. Diamantoulakis, Z. Ding, and G. K. Karagiannidis, "Minimum data rate maximization for uplink pinching-antenna systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.13892*, 2024.
- [13] K. Wang, Z. Ding, and R. Schober, "Antenna activation for NOMA assisted pinching-antenna systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.13969*, 2024.
- [14] A. Bereyhi, S. Asaad, C. Ouyang, Z. Ding, and H. V. Poor, "Downlink beamforming with pinching-antenna assisted MIMO systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.01590*, 2025.
- [15] N. S. R. Sadiku, Matthew N. O., *Elements of Electromagnetics (7th Edition)*. Oxford University Press, 2021.
- [16] C. A. Balanis, *Advanced engineering electromagnetics*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [17] M. Grant and S. Boyd, "CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.1," 2014.
- [18] Z. Opial, "Weak convergence of the sequence of successive approximations for nonexpansive mappings," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 73, no. 4, pp. 591–597, 1967.
- [19] I. Pólik and T. Terlaky, "Interior point methods for nonlinear optimization," in *Nonlinear optimization*. Springer, Jul. 2010, pp. 215–276.