

# Beamforming Design for Continuous Aperture Array (CAPA)-Based MIMO Systems

Zhaolin Wang, *Member, IEEE*, Chongjun Ouyang, *Member, IEEE*,  
and Yuanwei Liu, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—An efficient beamforming design is proposed for continuous aperture array (CAPA)-based point-to-point multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems. In contrast to conventional spatially discrete array (SPDA)-MIMO systems, whose optimal beamforming can be obtained using singular-value decomposition, CAPA-MIMO systems require solving the eigendecomposition of a Hermitian kernel operator, which is computationally prohibitive. To address this challenge, an explicit closed-form expression for the achievable rate of CAPA-MIMO systems is first derived as a function of the continuous transmit beamformer. Subsequently, an iterative weighted minimum mean-squared error (WMMSE) algorithm is proposed, directly addressing the CAPA-MIMO beamforming optimization without discretization approximation. Closed-form updates for each iteration of the WMMSE algorithm are derived via the calculus of variations (CoV) method. For low-complexity implementation, an equivalent matrix-based iterative solution is introduced using Gauss-Legendre quadrature. Our numerical results demonstrate that 1) CAPA-MIMO achieves substantial performance gain over the SPDA-MIMO, 2) the proposed WMMSE algorithm enhances performance while significantly reducing computational complexity compared to state-of-the-art Fourier-based approaches, and 3) the proposed WMMSE algorithm enables practical realization of parallel, non-interfering transmissions.

**Index Terms**—Beamforming optimization, continuous aperture array (CAPA), MIMO

## I. INTRODUCTION

IN the evolving landscape of multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) communications, the continuous aperture array (CAPA) emerges as a transformative technology, redefining the paradigms of antenna design and performance [1]–[3]. Unlike traditional spatially discrete arrays (SPDAs), which consist of separate antenna elements, CAPAs utilize an electrically large aperture with a continuous current distribution, effectively forming a spatially continuous electromagnetic (EM) surface. This continuous structure enables precise beamforming capabilities, allowing for enhanced spatial resolution and the ability to approach the upper limits of spatial degrees of freedom within a given spatial resource. Furthermore, the principles underlying CAPA technology are deeply rooted in electromagnetic information theory (EIT), an interdisciplinary framework that integrates EM theory and information theory to analyze physical systems for wireless communication. By leveraging EIT, CAPAs can be optimized to harness the full

potential of EM fields, leading to more efficient and higher-capacity communication systems.

### A. Prior Works

Early studies on CAPA technology focused on characterizing the spatial degrees-of-freedom (DoFs) between two CAPAs (sometimes referred to as two volumes) based on EM theory. In particular, the authors of [4] established the relationship between the DoFs of scattered EM fields and Nyquist sampling principles. A rigorous method for DoF characterization was proposed by the authors of [5], who derived the proportionality of communication DoFs to the physical volumes of transmit and receive CAPAs through eigenfunction analysis. Subsequent studies refined these insights, analyzing DoFs in various scenarios and providing more analytical expressions [6]–[11]. Channel capacity is another important issue for CAPA systems and has attracted significant research attention. Due to the continuous nature of the signal model in CAPA systems, the conventional methods for characterizing the channel capacity in SPDA systems are no longer applicable. Consequently, numerous advanced methods have been developed to accurately quantify channel capacity for point-to-point CAPA-MIMO systems, including the eigenfunction method [12], Kolmogorov information theory [13], Fredholm determinant analysis [14], and physics-informed algorithms [15]. There have also been some initial efforts in characterizing the capacity for the CAPA-aided multiple-input single-output (MISO) broadcast channel and single-input multiple-output (SIMO) multiple access channel [16].

In recent years, initial research efforts have emerged to design practical beamforming methods to approach channel capacity. The beamforming design for CAPA-MISO and CAPA-SIMO systems has attracted particular attention due to their simpler channel structures. For example, the authors of [17] proposed a continuous-to-discrete approximation approach to maximize the sum achievable rate. Exploiting the Fourier-based approach, beamforming optimization for CAPA-SIMO multiple access systems was further investigated in [18]. As a further advance, the authors of [19] and [20] proposed to exploit the calculus of variations (CoV) method to address the continuous signal model in CAPA-MISO broadcast systems directly. This method not only clarified the optimal beamformer structures but also significantly reduced computational complexity compared to the Fourier-based method. Similarly, the optimal beamforming design for CAPA-SIMO multiple access systems was derived in [21]. The application of deep

Zhaolin Wang and Chongjun Ouyang are with the School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science, Queen Mary University of London, London E1 4NS, U.K. (e-mail: {zhaolin.wang, c.ouyang}@qmul.ac.uk).

Yuanwei Liu is with the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong (e-mail: yuanwei@hku.hk).

learning for designing CAPA-MISO beamforming was explored in [22], where a single-subspace method was exploited to achieve the continuous-to-discrete transformation. Additionally, for point-to-point CAPA-MIMO systems, the authors of [23] introduced a wavenumber-domain beamforming design based on the Fourier-based approach, effectively approaching channel capacity under line-of-sight conditions.

### B. Motivation and Contributions

Beamforming design has been shown to be important for maximizing communication performance and approaching channel capacity in CAPA systems. Due to the continuous nature of the CAPA signal model, discretization approaches are commonly employed to approximate the continuous optimization problem as a discrete one, enabling the use of classical optimization tools. The most representative discretization technique is the Fourier-based approach, which leverages the bandlimited property of spatial signals and half-wavelength sampling in the wavenumber domain to achieve highly accurate discretization [17], [23], [24]. However, the discretization method typically encounters two practical challenges. The first is the inevitable discretization loss compared to the original continuous model. The second is the high dimensionality of the discretized signal. For instance, the number of discretization points required by the Fourier-based approach grows dramatically with increasing CAPA aperture size and signal frequency, leading to substantial computational complexity.

Although several techniques, such as the CoV method [19]–[21], have been proposed to overcome the challenges associated with the Fourier-based method, these solutions are primarily tailored for CAPA-MISO or CAPA-SIMO systems and cannot be directly applied to the considerably more complex CAPA-MIMO channel. Nevertheless, the idea of the CoV method [19]–[21] is particularly appealing, as it directly addresses the continuous signal model without requiring discretization approximation. This method not only enhances communication performance but also significantly reduces computational complexity. These promising observations motivate us to directly tackle the continuous beamforming design for CAPA-MIMO systems without relying on discretization approximations—a problem for which, to the best of our knowledge, no existing method currently exists. The contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We study the beamforming design for a point-to-point uni-polarized CAPA-MIMO system. For the first time, we derive an explicit closed-form expression for the achievable rate as a function of transmit beamformers.
- We propose an iterative weighted minimum mean-squared error (WMMSE) algorithm to directly solve the continuous beamforming optimization problem for maximizing the achievable rate without relying on discretization approximations. Specifically, we characterize the rate-MMSE relationship for CAPA-MIMO and derive closed-form continuous receivers and beamformers at each iteration by employing the CoV. Furthermore, we introduce an equivalent, matrix-based implementation of the WMMSE algorithm using Gauss-Legendre quadrature, which facilitates practical usage.

- We present comprehensive numerical results demonstrating the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm. Key findings include: 1) CAPA-MIMO substantially enhances the achievable rate compared to SPAD-MIMO; 2) the proposed WMMSE algorithm improves the achievable rate while significantly reducing computational complexity compared to the conventional Fourier-based method; and 3) the proposed WMMSE algorithm can achieve nearly parallel, non-interference transmission of multiple data streams.

### C. Organization and Notations

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section II introduces the system model and formulates the beamforming design problem for CAPA-MIMO. Section III details the proposed WMMSE algorithm. Section IV provides a comparison between the proposed methods and the state-of-the-art Fourier-based approach. Numerical results evaluating the performance of different methods under various system configurations are presented in Section V. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

*Notations:* Scalars, vectors/matrices, and Euclidean subspaces are denoted by regular, boldface, and calligraphic letters, respectively. The sets of complex, real, and integer numbers are represented by  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $\mathbb{Z}$ , respectively. The inverse, transpose, conjugate transpose (Hermitian transpose), and trace operations are represented by  $(\cdot)^{-1}$ ,  $(\cdot)^T$ ,  $(\cdot)^H$ , and  $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$ , respectively. The absolute value and Euclidean norm are indicated by  $|\cdot|$  and  $\|\cdot\|$ , respectively. The ceiling function is denoted by  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ . The expectation operator is denoted by  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ . The real part of a complex number is denoted by  $\Re$ . An identity matrix of size  $N \times N$  is denoted by  $\mathbf{I}_N$ . Big-O notation is represented by  $O(\cdot)$ .

## II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

### A. System Model

As shown in Fig. 1, we consider a single-carrier MIMO system with CAPAs equipped at both transceivers. The continuous surfaces of the Tx- and Rx-CAPAs are denoted by  $\mathcal{S}_T$  and  $\mathcal{S}_R$ , respectively. Without loss of generality, the square-shape Tx-CAPA is placed on the  $x$ - $y$  plane, centered at the origin. Its two sides are aligned parallel to the  $x$ - and  $y$ -axes, with lengths along these axes denoted by  $L_{T,x}$  and  $L_{T,y}$ , respectively. Under this circumstance, the coordinate of a point on the Tx-CAPA can be expressed as  $\mathbf{s} = [s_x, s_y, 0]^T$ . To model the coordinates of a point on the Rx-CAPA, we introduce an auxiliary coordinate system in which the Rx-CAPA is centered at the origin. Its two sides are aligned parallel to the new  $x$ - and  $y$ -axes, with lengths along these axes denoted by  $L_{R,x}$  and  $L_{R,y}$ , respectively. Let  $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = [\hat{r}_x, \hat{r}_y, 0]^T$  denote the coordinate of a point on the Rx-CAPA in the auxiliary coordinate system. The coordinates of this point in the original coordinate system can then be expressed as

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{R}_z(\alpha)\mathbf{R}_y(\beta)\mathbf{R}_x(\phi)\hat{\mathbf{r}} + \mathbf{r}_o, \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\phi$  are angles that the auxiliary coordinate system rotates along the  $z$ -,  $y$ -, and  $x$ -axes of the original




Fig. 1: Illustration of the point-to-point CAPA-MIMO system.

coordinate system, respectively, the matrices  $\mathbf{R}_z(\alpha)$ ,  $\mathbf{R}_y(\beta)$ , and  $\mathbf{R}_x(\phi)$  are corresponding rotation matrices, and  $\mathbf{r}_o$  is the coordinate of the origin of the auxiliary coordinate system in the original coordinate system.

The Tx-CAPA contains sinusoidal source currents to radiate information-bearing EM waves. Let  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{C}^{3 \times 1}, \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}_T$ , denote the Fourier transform of the source current density at the signal frequency  $f$ . The electric field density generated by the source current at the Rx-CAPA can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \overline{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{C}^{3 \times 1}, \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_R, \quad (2)$$

where  $\overline{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{C}^{3 \times 3}$  is the tensor Green's function. Under the line-of-sight condition, the Green's function can be derived from the inhomogeneous Helmholtz wave equation as [7]

$$\overline{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = \frac{-j\eta e^{-j\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{s}\|}}{2\lambda\|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{s}\|} \left( \mathbf{I}_3 - \frac{(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{s})(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{s})^T}{\|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{s}\|^2} \right), \quad (3)$$

where  $\eta$  denotes the free-space impedance,  $\lambda = c/f$  denotes the signal wavelength with  $c$  representing the speed of light. This study considers uni-polarized CAPAs, with the polarization direction of the Tx-CAPA aligned along the  $y$ -axis. Therefore, the source current density is expressed as

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{s}) = x(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{u}_T, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}_T = [0, 1, 0]^T$  represents the polarization direction vector and  $x(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{C}$  is the corresponding component of the source current. Assuming  $N$  independent data streams to transmit, the  $x(\mathbf{s})$  can be expressed as

$$x(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{n=1}^N w_n(\mathbf{s}) c_n = \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{c}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) = [w_1(\mathbf{s}), \dots, w_N(\mathbf{s})] \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N}$  and  $\mathbf{c} = [c_1, \dots, c_N]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$ , with  $w_n(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{C}$  denotes the continuous beamformer for the  $n$ -th data stream  $c_n \in \mathbb{C}$ . The data streams are assumed to be independent and have unit average power, satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{c}\mathbf{c}^H] = \mathbf{I}_N$ .

Similarly, the polarization direction of the Rx-CAPA aligns with the  $y$ -axis of its local auxiliary coordinate system, with polarization vector is  $\mathbf{u}_R = \mathbf{R}_z(\alpha) \mathbf{R}_y(\beta) \mathbf{R}_x(\phi) \hat{\mathbf{u}}_R$ , where  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_R = [0, 1, 0]^T$ . Therefore, the effective noisy electric field density observed by the Rx-CAPA is given by [17], [23]

$$\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{u}_R^T \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}) + z(\mathbf{r}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) x(\mathbf{s}) + z(\mathbf{r}), \quad (6)$$

where  $h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{u}_R^T \overline{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{u}_T \in \mathbb{C}$  denotes the channel

response and  $z(\mathbf{r}) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$  denotes independent white Gaussian noise.

## B. Problem Formulation

In this paper, we aim to optimize the transmit beamformer to maximize the achievable rate. Although the achievable rate of CAPA-MIMO has been extensively studied in the literature, most existing works rely on approximations and bounding techniques and, therefore, do not provide an explicit and accurate expression of the achievable rate as a function of the transmit beamformer. To bridge this gap, we formally characterize the achievable rate in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** (Achievable rate of CAPA-MIMO) The achievable rate that the data streams can reliably carry through channel  $h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})$  with the beamformer  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  is given by

$$R = \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q} \right), \quad (7)$$

where

$$\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s}, \quad (8)$$

$$\mathbf{Q} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{e}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (9)$$

*Proof:* Please refer to Appendix A ■

Based on **Theorem 1**, the achievable rate maximization problem can be formulated as

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})} \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q} \right) \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \|\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})\|^2 d\mathbf{s} \leq P_T, \quad (10b)$$

where (10b) is to constraint the transmit power within in a budget  $P_T$  [23]. Theoretically, the optimal beamformer that maximizes the achievable rate is “easy” to obtain. To elaborate, we rewrite the achievable rate as

$$R = \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{w}^H(\mathbf{s}) K(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} d\mathbf{s} \right), \quad (11)$$

where  $K(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{z})$  is a Hermitian kernel operator measuring the coupling between the two points  $\mathbf{s}$  and  $\mathbf{z}$ , given by

$$K(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{z}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} h^H(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (12)$$

Similar to the eigendecomposition of a matrix, the kernel  $K(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{z})$  can be decomposed into a complete set of basis function [5]:

$$K(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{z}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \xi_n \phi_n(\mathbf{s}) \phi_n^H(\mathbf{z}), \quad (13)$$

where  $\xi_n$  is the non-negative eigenvalue and the  $\phi_n(\mathbf{s})$  is the orthogonal eigenfunction. It follows that

$$\xi_n \phi_n(\mathbf{s}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} K(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{z}) \phi_n(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z}. \quad (14)$$

Therefore, assuming  $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2 \geq \dots \geq \xi_n \geq \dots$ , the optimal beamformer can be obtained as

$$w_n(\mathbf{s}) = \sqrt{P_n} \phi_n(\mathbf{s}), \quad n = 1, \dots, N, \quad (15)$$

where  $P_n$  is a power allocation coefficient that can be obtained using the water-filling strategy.

Nevertheless, although deriving the optimal beamformer is straightforward, its practical implementation remains prohibitive due to the extremely high computational complexity associated with numerically solving the eigendecomposition problem (13). A common state-of-the-art approach is to discretize the continuous kernel using Fourier basis functions [23]. However, this approach inevitably incurs discretization losses and leads to high-dimensional discretized kernels. To overcome these limitations, in the following section, we propose a WMMSE algorithm that directly solves the rate maximization problem in (10), thus effectively eliminating discretization losses and significantly reducing computational complexity.

### III. WMMSE ALGORITHM FOR CAPA-MIMO

This section describes the proposed WMMSE algorithm for solving problem (10). While the WMMSE algorithm is typically unnecessary for conventional point-to-point SPDA-MIMO, where the optimal beamformer can be directly obtained via singular-value decomposition (SVD), it becomes particularly useful for point-to-point CAPA-MIMO. Due to the complexity involved in solving the eigendecomposition problem for CAPAs, the WMMSE algorithm provides an effective alternative by circumventing the need for eigendecomposition. In the following, we elaborate on adapting the WMMSE algorithm specifically for CAPA-MIMO systems.

#### A. WMMSE Algorithm

To streamline the derivation of the WMMSE algorithm, we first transform problem (10) into an equivalent unconstrained problem using the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** (*Equivalent unconstrained problem*) Let  $\mathbf{w}^\dagger(\mathbf{s})$  denote the optimal solution to the following unconstrained optimization problem:

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})} \tilde{R} = \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{Q} \right), \quad (16)$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{P_T} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \|\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})\|^2 d\mathbf{s}. \quad (17)$$

The optimal solution to problem (10) is given by

$$\mathbf{w}^*(\mathbf{s}) = \sqrt{\frac{P_T}{\int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \|\mathbf{w}^\dagger(\mathbf{s})\|^2 d\mathbf{s}}} \mathbf{w}^\dagger(\mathbf{s}). \quad (18)$$

*Proof:* It can be readily verified that the optimal solution to problem (10) must satisfy the power constraint with equality, a condition clearly met by the solution provided in (18). Furthermore, by substituting (18) into (10), one can verify that the resulting objective value is always equal to the objective value of (16). This completes the proof. ■

Based on **Lemma 1**, we focus on solving the unconstrained problem (16) in the following. The corresponding signal model of problem (16) is given by

$$\tilde{y}(\mathbf{r}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) x(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} + \tilde{z}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (19)$$

where  $z(\mathbf{r}) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \tilde{\sigma}^2)$  is the equivalent noise.

The key idea of the WMMSE algorithm is to transform the rate-maximization problem into an equivalent weighted-MSE minimization problem [25], [26]. Let  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N}$  denote the receiver to estimate the data stream  $\mathbf{c}$  from  $\tilde{y}(\mathbf{r})$ . The estimated signal is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{c}} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}^H(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{y}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{c} d\mathbf{r} + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \quad (20)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}^H(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{z}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \sim \mathcal{CN} \left( \mathbf{0}, \tilde{\sigma}^2 \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \right). \quad (21)$$

The above distribution of  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$  can be obtained following [21, Lemma 1]. The MSE matrix related to the receiver  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} &= \mathbb{E} [(\hat{\mathbf{c}} - \mathbf{c})(\hat{\mathbf{c}} - \mathbf{c})^H] \\ &= \left( \mathbf{I}_N - \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \right) \left( \mathbf{I}_N - \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \right)^H \\ &\quad + \tilde{\sigma}^2 \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The optimal MMSE receiver is given by<sup>1</sup> [21, Theorem 4]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{r}) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{E}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\mathbf{c}} - \mathbf{c}\|^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

To obtain the MSE matrix achieved by the MMSE receiver, we first derive the following intermediate expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I}_N - \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}_{\text{MMSE}}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \\ = \mathbf{I}_N - \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{Q} = \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}_{\text{MMSE}}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{v}_{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \\ = \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^4} \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{Q} \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

By substituting (24) and (25) into (22), the MSE matrix achieved by the MMSE receiver can be obtained as

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{MMSE}} = \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1}, \quad (26)$$

<sup>1</sup>The MMSE receiver in (23) is derived under the assumption that successive interference cancellation (SIC) is not employed, and thus is different from the MMSE receiver presented in Appendix A, which is derived under the condition that SIC is applied.

---

**Algorithm 1** WMMSE Algorithm for CAPA-MIMO Achievable Rate Maximization
 

---

- 1: initialize  $t = 0$  and  $\mathbf{w}_0(\mathbf{s})$
  - 2: **repeat**
  - 3:   update  $\mathbf{v}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r})$  as  $\mathbf{v}_{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{r})$  for given  $\mathbf{w}_t(\mathbf{s})$
  - 4:   update  $\mathbf{U}_{t+1}$  as  $\mathbf{E}_{\text{MMSE}}^{-1}$  for given  $\mathbf{w}_t(\mathbf{s})$
  - 5:   update  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1}(\mathbf{s})$  by (28) for given  $\mathbf{v}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{U}_{t+1}$
  - 6: **until** the fractional increase of the objective value of problem (10) falls below a predefined threshold
  - 7: scale the converged  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  according to (18)
- 

By comparing (16) and (26), it is easy to obtain a rate-MMSE relationship of  $\tilde{R} = \log \det(\mathbf{E}_{\text{MMSE}}^{-1})$ . Based on this relationship, the rate maximization problem can be equivalently reformulated as an MSE minimization problem, as stated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** (*Equivalent MSE minimization problem*) Define a weight matrix  $\mathbf{U} \succeq 0$ . The optimal solution to problem (16) is identical to the following problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}), \mathbf{U}} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{E}) - \log \det(\mathbf{U}). \quad (27)$$

*Proof:* Please refer to Appendix B. ■

Based on the equivalence established in **Theorem 2**, the solution of  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  to problem (16) can be obtained by solving problem (27) in an alternating manner. Specifically, according to the proof in Appendix B, for any given  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$ , the optimal solutions of  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{U}$  are given by  $\mathbf{v}_{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{E}_{\text{MMSE}}^{-1}$ , respectively. Furthermore, for any given  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{U}$ , the optimal solution of  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  is given in the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** For any given  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{U}$ , the optimal solution of  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  to the MSE minimization problem (27) is given by

$$\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s})\mathbf{U} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{I}_N + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{U} \right)^{-1}, \quad (28)$$

where

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} h^H(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}, \quad \mathbf{G} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s}, \quad (29)$$

$$\mathbf{V} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}, \quad \varepsilon = \frac{P_T}{\sigma^2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V})}. \quad (30)$$

*Proof:* Please refer to Appendix C. ■

Based on the above results, the WMMSE algorithm for solving problem (10) is summarized in **Algorithm 1**.

### B. Low-Complexity Implementation

In the WMMSE algorithm described in **Algorithm 1**, although each optimization variable update has a closed-form solution, its practical implementation remains challenging due to the need for computing integrals and handling continuous functions in each iteration. To overcome this challenge, we propose a practical matrix-based implementation of the WMMSE algorithm using Gauss-Legendre quadrature, which is a widely-used effective numerical integration method and takes the form [27]:

$$\int_a^b f(x) dx \approx \frac{b-a}{2} \sum_{m=1}^M \omega_m f\left(\frac{b-a}{2}\theta_m + \frac{a+b}{2}\right), \quad (31)$$

where  $M$  is the number of sample points,  $\{\omega_m\}_{m=1}^M$  are the quadrature weights, and  $\{\theta_m\}_{m=1}^M$  are the roots of the  $M$ -th Legendre polynomial. The Gauss-Legendre quadrature converges geometrically as  $M$  increases. Therefore, a small value of  $M$ , typically between 10 and 20, is usually sufficient to approximate (31) with extremely high accuracy. Therefore, in the following, we assume that the value of  $M$  is selected such that (31) holds almost with equality.

In the CAPA-MIMO system, there are two kinds of integrals that need to be calculated, i.e., the integrals over  $\mathcal{S}_T$  and  $\mathcal{S}_R$ , respectively. By using the Gauss-Legendre quadrature, the integral over  $\mathcal{S}_T$  can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} f(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} &= \int_{-\frac{L_{T,x}}{2}}^{\frac{L_{T,x}}{2}} \int_{-\frac{L_{T,y}}{2}}^{\frac{L_{T,y}}{2}} f(\mathbf{s}) ds_x ds_y \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\omega_n \omega_m A_T}{4} f(\mathbf{s}_{n,m}), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where

$$A_T = L_{T,x} L_{T,y}, \quad \mathbf{s}_{n,m} = \left[ \frac{\theta_i L_{T,x}}{2}, \frac{\theta_j L_{T,y}}{2}, 0 \right]^T. \quad (33)$$

The integral over  $\mathcal{S}_R$  can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} &= \int_{-\frac{L_{R,x}}{2}}^{\frac{L_{R,x}}{2}} \int_{-\frac{L_{R,y}}{2}}^{\frac{L_{R,y}}{2}} f(\mathbf{r}) d\hat{r}_x d\hat{r}_y \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\omega_n \omega_m A_R}{4} f(\mathbf{r}_{n,m}), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where

$$A_R = L_{R,x} L_{R,y}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{n,m} = \left[ \frac{\theta_i L_{R,x}}{2}, \frac{\theta_j L_{R,y}}{2}, 0 \right]^T \quad (35)$$

$$\mathbf{r}_{n,m} = \mathbf{R}(\alpha) \mathbf{R}(\beta) \mathbf{R}(\phi) \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{n,m} + \mathbf{r}_0. \quad (36)$$

It can be observed from (32) and (34) that the Gauss-Legendre quadrature effectively transform the continuous integral calculation into the discrete calculation. These transformations facilitate the matrix-based implementation of the WMMSE algorithm in **Algorithm 1**. In particular, the values of  $\mathbf{v}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r})$ ,  $\mathbf{U}_{t+1}$ , and  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1}(\mathbf{s})$  in the  $(t+1)$ -th iteration of the WMMSE algorithm need to be calculated by given the value of  $\mathbf{w}_t(\mathbf{s})$  obtained in the  $t$ -th iteration. Before proceeding to derive these quantities, we first define  $M_s = M^2$  and the following notations:

$$\mathbf{W}_t = [\mathbf{w}_t^T(\mathbf{s}_{1,1}), \dots, \mathbf{w}_t^T(\mathbf{s}_{M,M})]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{M_s \times N}, \quad (37a)$$

$$\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{r}) = [h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}_{1,1}), \dots, h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}_{M,M})] \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times M_s}, \quad (37b)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{s}) = [h^H(\mathbf{r}_{1,1}, \mathbf{s}), \dots, h^H(\mathbf{r}_{M,M}, \mathbf{s})] \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times M_s}, \quad (37c)$$

$$\mathbf{H} = [\mathbf{h}^T(\mathbf{r}_{1,1}), \dots, \mathbf{h}^T(\mathbf{r}_{M,M})]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{M_s \times M_s}, \quad (37d)$$

$$\Phi_T = \frac{1}{4} A_T \text{diag}(\omega_1 \omega_1, \dots, \omega_M \omega_M) \in \mathbb{C}^{M_s \times M_s}, \quad (37e)$$

$$\Phi_R = \frac{1}{4} A_R \text{diag}(\omega_1 \omega_1, \dots, \omega_M \omega_M) \in \mathbb{C}^{M_s \times M_s}. \quad (37f)$$

1) Calculate  $\mathbf{v}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{U}_{t+1}$ : To calculate these two variables,  $\mathbf{e}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r})$ ,  $\tilde{\sigma}_{t+1}^2$ , and  $\mathbf{Q}_{t+1}$  need to be calculated according to (23) and (26). In particular, based on the expression

(8) and the transformation (32),  $\mathbf{e}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r})$  can be calculated by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{e}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r}) &= \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\omega_n \omega_m A_T}{4} h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}_{n,m}) \mathbf{w}_t(\mathbf{s}_{n,m}) \\ &= \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{r}) \Phi_T \mathbf{W}_t.\end{aligned}\quad (38)$$

Based on the expression (17) and the transformation (32),  $\tilde{\sigma}_{t+1}^2$  can be calculated by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\sigma}_{t+1}^2 &= \frac{\sigma^2}{P_T} \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\omega_n \omega_m A_T}{4} \|\mathbf{w}_t(\mathbf{s}_{n,m})\|^2 \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{P_T} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_t^H \Phi_T \mathbf{W}_t).\end{aligned}\quad (39)$$

Based on the expression (9) and the transformation (34),  $\mathbf{Q}_{t+1}$  can be calculated by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Q}_{t+1} &= \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\omega_n \omega_m A_R}{4} \mathbf{e}_{t+1}^H(\mathbf{r}_{n,m}) \mathbf{e}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r}_{n,m}) \\ &= \mathbf{W}_t^H \Phi_T \mathbf{H}^H \Phi_R \mathbf{H} \Phi_T \mathbf{W}_t.\end{aligned}\quad (40)$$

Therefore, based on (23),  $\mathbf{v}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r})$  can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r}) &= \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_{t+1}^2} \mathbf{e}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r}) \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_{t+1}^2} \mathbf{Q}_{t+1} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{r}) \Phi_T \mathbf{W}_t \Theta_{t+1}^{-1},\end{aligned}\quad (41)$$

where  $\Theta_{t+1} = \tilde{\sigma}_{t+1}^2 \mathbf{I}_N + \mathbf{Q}_{t+1}$ . Furthermore, based on (26),  $\mathbf{U}_{t+1}$  can be calculated as

$$\mathbf{U}_{t+1} = \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_{t+1}^2} \mathbf{Q}_{t+1}.\quad (42)$$

2) *Calculate  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1}(\mathbf{s})$ :* According to (28),  $\mathbf{g}_{t+1}(\mathbf{s})$ ,  $\mathbf{G}_{t+1}$ , and  $\mathbf{V}_{t+1}$  need to be calculated first. In particular, based on the expression in (29) and the transformation (34),  $\mathbf{g}_{t+1}(\mathbf{s})$  can be calculated by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{g}_{t+1}(\mathbf{s}) &= \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\omega_n \omega_m A_R}{4} h^H(\mathbf{r}_{n,m}, \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{v}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r}_{n,m}) \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{s}) \Phi_R \mathbf{H} \Phi_T \mathbf{W}_t \Theta_{t+1}^{-1}.\end{aligned}\quad (43)$$

Based on the expression in (29) and the transformation (32),  $\mathbf{G}_{t+1}$  can be calculated by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{G}_{t+1} &= \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\omega_n \omega_m A_T}{4} \mathbf{g}_{t+1}^H(\mathbf{s}_{n,m}) \mathbf{g}_{t+1}(\mathbf{s}_{n,m}) \\ &= \Theta_{t+1}^{-1} \mathbf{W}_t^H \Phi_T \mathbf{H}^H \Phi_R \mathbf{H} \Phi_T \mathbf{H}^H \Phi_R \mathbf{H} \Phi_T \mathbf{W}_t \Theta_{t+1}^{-1},\end{aligned}\quad (44)$$

Based on the expression in (30) and the transformation (32),  $\mathbf{V}_{t+1}$  can be calculated by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{V}_{t+1} &= \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\omega_n \omega_m A_R}{4} \mathbf{v}_{t+1}^H(\mathbf{r}_{n,m}) \mathbf{v}_{t+1}(\mathbf{r}_{n,m}) \\ &= \Theta_{t+1}^{-1} \mathbf{W}_t^H \Phi_T \mathbf{H}^H \Phi_R \mathbf{H} \Phi_T \mathbf{W}_t \Theta_{t+1}^{-1}.\end{aligned}\quad (45)$$

Therefore, based on (28),  $\mathbf{w}_{t+1}(\mathbf{s})$  can be calculated by

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{g}_{t+1}(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{U}_{t+1} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{t+1}} \mathbf{I}_N + \mathbf{G}_{t+1} \mathbf{U}_{t+1} \right)^{-1}$$

---

### Algorithm 2 Matrix-based WMMSE Algorithm for CAPA-MIMO Achievable Rate Maximization

---

- 1: initialize  $t = 0$  and  $\mathbf{W}_0$
  - 2: **repeat**
  - 3:   update  $\mathbf{W}_{t+1}$  as (47) for given  $\mathbf{W}_t$
  - 4: **until** the fractional increase of the  $R_t$  falls below a predefined threshold
  - 5: calculate  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  according (46) using the converged  $\mathbf{W}$
  - 6: scale  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  according to (18)
- 

$$= \tilde{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{s}) \Phi_R \mathbf{H} \Phi_T \mathbf{W}_t \Theta_{t+1}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{t+1} \Omega_{t+1}^{-1},\quad (46)$$

where  $\Omega_{t+1} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{t+1}} \mathbf{I}_N + \mathbf{G}_{t+1} \mathbf{U}_{t+1}$ . Furthermore, the expression of  $\mathbf{W}_{t+1}$  can be obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{W}_{t+1} &= [\mathbf{w}_{t+1}^T(\mathbf{s}_{1,1}), \dots, \mathbf{w}_{t+1}^T(\mathbf{s}_{M,M})]^T \\ &= \mathbf{H}^H \Phi_R \mathbf{H} \Phi_T \mathbf{W}_t \Theta_{t+1}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{t+1} \Omega_{t+1}^{-1}.\end{aligned}\quad (47)$$

3) *Overall Implementation:* From the above results, it is evident that **Algorithm 1** can be implemented by iteratively updating  $\mathbf{W}_t$  according to (47). In each iteration, the objective value can be computed as

$$R_t = \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_t^2} \mathbf{Q}_t \right),\quad (48)$$

where  $\mathbf{Q}_t$  is calculated as given in (40). Thus, the overall matrix-based implementation of **Algorithm 1** is summarized in **Algorithm 2**. This algorithm can be extended to solve beamforming problems with more general correlated power constraints, as discussed in Appendix D. The computational complexity of the algorithm arises primarily from matrix inversion and multiplication operations. Therefore, given the dimensions of the involved matrices, the overall complexity is  $O(N^3 + M_s^3 + NM_s^2 + M_s N^2)$ .

## IV. COMPARISON WITH FOURIER-BASED APPROACH

In this section, we compare the proposed WMMSE algorithm with the existing Fourier-based approach for CAPA-MIMO beamforming. The Fourier-based method leverages the band-limited property of signals in the wavenumber domain (i.e., the Fourier transform of the spatial domain), enabling continuous signals to be represented by a finite set of Fourier basis functions. For the considered two-dimensional Tx- and Rx-CAPAs, the continuous beamformer and receiver can be expressed via Fourier series expansions as

$$\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{(n,m) \in \mathcal{D}_\infty} \mathbf{w}_{n,m} \psi_{T,n,m}(\mathbf{s}),\quad (49)$$

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{(n,m) \in \mathcal{D}_\infty} \mathbf{v}_{n,m} \psi_{R,n,m}(\mathbf{r}),\quad (50)$$

where  $\mathbf{w}_{n,m} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{n,m} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N}$  denote the beamformer and receiver coefficients in the wavenumber domain, respectively, and  $\mathcal{D}_\infty = \{(n,m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ . The Fourier basis functions  $\psi_{T,n,m}(\mathbf{s})$  and  $\psi_{R,n,m}(\mathbf{r})$  are defined as [23], [24]

$$\psi_{T,n,m}(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A_T}} e^{j \left( \frac{2\pi}{L_{T,x}} n s_x + \frac{2\pi}{L_{T,y}} m s_y \right)},\quad (51)$$

$$\psi_{R,n,m}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A_R}} e^{j \left( \frac{2\pi}{L_{R,x}} n \hat{r}_x + \frac{2\pi}{L_{R,y}} m \hat{r}_y \right)}.\quad (52)$$

The wavenumber-domain representations of the beamformer and receiver are obtained by

$$\mathbf{w}_{n,m} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) \psi_{T,n,m}^H(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s}, \quad (53)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{n,m} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{R,n,m}^H(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (54)$$

It is proved that spatial-domain signals are band-limited in the wavenumber domain, leading to the following approximations [23], [24]

$$\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) \approx \sum_{(n,m) \in \mathcal{D}_T} \mathbf{w}_{n,m} \psi_{T,n,m}(\mathbf{s}), \quad (55)$$

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) \approx \sum_{(n,m) \in \mathcal{D}_R} \mathbf{v}_{n,m} \psi_{R,n,m}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (56)$$

where the index sets are defined as

$$\mathcal{D}_T = \left\{ (n, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : |n| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{L_{T,x}}{\lambda} \right\rfloor, |m| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{L_{T,y}}{\lambda} \right\rfloor \right\}, \quad (57)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_R = \left\{ (n, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : |n| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{L_{R,x}}{\lambda} \right\rfloor, |m| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{L_{R,y}}{\lambda} \right\rfloor \right\}. \quad (58)$$

Define  $M_{T,x} = \left\lfloor \frac{L_{T,x}}{\lambda} \right\rfloor$ ,  $M_{T,y} = \left\lfloor \frac{L_{T,y}}{\lambda} \right\rfloor$ ,  $M_{R,x} = \left\lfloor \frac{L_{R,x}}{\lambda} \right\rfloor$ , and  $M_{R,y} = \left\lfloor \frac{L_{R,y}}{\lambda} \right\rfloor$ . Thus, the total number of terms in the approximated Fourier series for the beamformer and receiver are  $\widetilde{M}_T = (2M_{T,x} + 1)(2M_{T,y} + 1)$  and  $\widetilde{M}_R = (2M_{R,x} + 1)(2M_{R,y} + 1)$ , respectively.

Based on the approximation discussed above, the estimated signal at the RX-CAPA after applying the receiver  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})$  can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{y}} &= \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \\ &\approx \sum_{(n,m) \in \mathcal{D}_R} \sum_{(n',m') \in \mathcal{D}_T} \mathbf{v}_{n,m}^H H_{n,m,n',m'}^w \mathbf{w}_{n',m'} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{z}, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where  $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \sum_{(n,m) \in \mathcal{D}_R} \mathbf{v}_{n,m}^H \mathbf{v}_{n,m})$  and the wavenumber-domain channel  $H_{n,m,n',m'}^w$  is given by

$$H_{n,m,n',m'}^w = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \psi_{R,n,m}^H(\mathbf{r}) h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \psi_{T,n',m'}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} d\mathbf{r}. \quad (60)$$

To simplify notation, we define the following matrices:

$$\mathbf{H}_w = \begin{bmatrix} H_{1,1,1,1}^w & \cdots & H_{1,1,M_{T,x},M_{T,y}}^w \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ H_{M_{R,x},M_{R,y},1,1}^w & \cdots & H_{M_{R,x},M_{R,y},M_{T,x},M_{T,y}}^w \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\widetilde{M}_R \times \widetilde{M}_T} \quad (61)$$

$$\mathbf{W} = \left[ \mathbf{w}_{1,1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{M_{T,x},M_{T,y}}^T \right]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{\widetilde{M}_T \times N}, \quad (62)$$

$$\mathbf{V} = \left[ \mathbf{v}_{1,1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{M_{R,x},M_{R,y}}^T \right]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{\widetilde{M}_R \times N}. \quad (63)$$

Consequently, the estimated signal simplifies to

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{H}_w \mathbf{W} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{z}, \quad (64)$$

which resembles the conventional discrete MIMO system model. Thus, the achievable rate can be approximated as

$$R \approx \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{W}^H \mathbf{H}_w^H \mathbf{H}_w \mathbf{W} \right). \quad (65)$$

Similarly, the transmit power can be approximated by

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \|\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})\|^2 d\mathbf{s} \approx \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{W}^H), \quad (66)$$

resulting in the following achievable rate maximization problem in the wavenumber domain:

$$\max_{\mathbf{W}} \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{W}^H \mathbf{H}_w^H \mathbf{H}_w \mathbf{W} \right) \quad (67a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{W}^H) \leq P_T. \quad (67b)$$

This formulation aligns exactly with the standard discrete MIMO beamforming problem. The optimal solution for  $\mathbf{W}$  can be found through the SVD of the matrix  $\mathbf{H}_w$  and the water-filling power allocation [28].

The computational complexity of the Fourier-based approach primarily arises from three components. The first component is the calculation of the wavenumber-domain channel matrix  $\mathbf{H}_w$  with entries defined in (60). Each entry can be calculated using the Gauss-Legendre quadrature and the transformation in (32) and (34), given by

$$H_{n,m,n',m'}^w = \psi_{R,n,m}^H \Phi_R \mathbf{H} \Phi_T \psi_{T,n',m'}, \quad (68)$$

where

$$\psi_{T,n,m} = [\psi_{T,n,m}(\mathbf{s}_{1,1}), \dots, \psi_{T,n,m}(\mathbf{s}_{M,M})]^T, \quad (69)$$

$$\psi_{R,n,m} = [\psi_{R,n,m}(\mathbf{r}_{1,1}), \dots, \psi_{R,n,m}(\mathbf{r}_{M,M})]^T. \quad (70)$$

Thus, the complexity for computing matrix  $\mathbf{H}_w$  is  $O(\widetilde{M}_R \widetilde{M}_T M_s^2)$ . The second component is the SVD of  $\mathbf{H}_w$  with complexity  $O(\widetilde{M}_R \widetilde{M}_T \max\{\widetilde{M}_R, \widetilde{M}_T\})$ . The third component is the power allocation using water-filling, which has a complexity of  $O(N)$  [29]. In contrast to the proposed WMMSE algorithm, the computational complexity of the Fourier-based approach is primarily determined by  $\widetilde{M}_T$  and  $\widetilde{M}_R$ , which can be extremely large. For example, for a Tx-CAPA with  $L_{T,x} = L_{T,y} = 0.5$  m, the value of  $\widetilde{M}_T$  reaches 81 at 2.4 GHz, 729 at 7.8 GHz, and 2601 at 15 GHz. Consequently, although the Fourier-based approach effectively converts the CAPA-MIMO problem into a discrete MIMO problem, it may result in unaffordable computational complexity.

## V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

This section presents numerical results demonstrating the effectiveness of the proposed WMMSE algorithm. Unless otherwise specified, all simulations are conducted using the following setup. The areas of the Tx- and Rx-CAPAs are both set as  $A_T = A_R = 0.25$  m<sup>2</sup>, with edge lengths  $L_{T,x} = L_{T,y} = \sqrt{A_T}$  and  $L_{R,x} = L_{R,y} = \sqrt{A_R}$ . The position and orientation of the Rx-CAPA relative to the Tx-CAPA are defined by




Fig. 2: Convergence behavior of the proposed WMMSE algorithm.

setting  $\mathbf{r}_o = [0, 0, 10\text{m}]^T$  and  $\alpha = \beta = \phi = 0$ , which implies that the Tx- and Rx-CAPAs are parallel to each other and their polarization directions are matched for maximum wave reception. The signal frequency is set to  $f = 2.4\text{GHz}$ , and the free-space impedance is  $\eta = 120\pi\ \Omega$ . The transmit power and noise power are specified as  $P_T = 100\text{mW}$  and  $\sigma^2 = 5.6 \times 10^{-3}\text{V}^2/\text{m}^2$ , respectively. Finally, the number of Gauss-Legendre quadrature samples is set to  $M = 10$ .

#### A. Benchmarks

The following benchmarks are considered in the simulation.

1) *Fourier-SVD*: This benchmark refers to the Fourier-based approach presented in Section IV, where the continuous beamformer and receiver are approximated using finite Fourier series and the final problem is solved using SVD of the wavenumber-domain channel. For both the proposed WMMSE algorithm and the Fourier-SVD benchmark, the number of data streams is set to  $N = \min\{\bar{M}_R, \bar{M}_T\}$ , unless stated otherwise, to ensure the maximization of the multiplexing gain.

2) *SPDA*: In this benchmark, both the transmitter and receiver are assumed to utilize SPDAs of identical size to their CAPA counterparts. The corresponding signal model is derived following the methods presented in [23] and [17]. Specifically, the Tx-SPDA and Rx-SPDA are each composed of discrete antennas with an effective aperture of  $A_d = \frac{\lambda^2}{4\pi}$  and spacing of  $d = \frac{\lambda}{2}$ . Consequently, the number of antennas is  $\bar{M}_T = \bar{M}_{T,x} \times \bar{M}_{T,y}$  for the Tx-SPDA and  $\bar{M}_R = \bar{M}_{R,x} \times \bar{M}_{R,y}$  for the Rx-SPDA, where  $\bar{M}_{T,x} = \lceil \frac{L_{T,x}}{d} \rceil$ ,  $\bar{M}_{T,y} = \lceil \frac{L_{T,y}}{d} \rceil$ ,  $\bar{M}_{R,x} = \lceil \frac{L_{R,x}}{d} \rceil$  and  $\bar{M}_{R,y} = \lceil \frac{L_{R,y}}{d} \rceil$ . The position of the  $(n, m)$ -th antenna at the Tx-SPDA is given by

$$\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n,m} = \left[ (n-1)d - \frac{L_{T,x}}{2}, (m-1)d - \frac{L_{T,y}}{2}, 0 \right]^T. \quad (71)$$

Similarly, the location of the  $(n, m)$ -th antenna at the Rx-SPDA is given by

$$\bar{\mathbf{r}}_{n,m} = \mathbf{R}_z(\alpha)\mathbf{R}_y(\beta)\mathbf{R}_x(\phi)\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{n,m} + \mathbf{r}_o, \quad (72)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{n,m} = \left[ (n-1)d - \frac{L_{R,x}}{2}, (m-1)d - \frac{L_{R,y}}{2}, 0 \right]^T. \quad (73)$$




Fig. 3: Convergence behavior of the achievable rate with the number of Gauss-Legendre samples under different signal frequencies and aperture sizes.

Let  $\mathcal{S}_{T,n,m}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{R,n,m}$  denote the surface of the  $(n, m)$ -th antennas at the Tx-SPDA and Rx-SPDA, respectively. The beamformer and receiver can be expressed as

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A_d}} \sum_{(n,m) \in \mathcal{E}_T} \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{n,m} \text{rect}(\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}_{T,n,m}), \quad (74)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{v}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A_d}} \sum_{(n,m) \in \mathcal{E}_R} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{n,m} \text{rect}(\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_{R,n,m}), \quad (75)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{n,m} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{n,m} \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N}$  are the discrete beamformer and receiver, respectively. The index sets are given by  $\mathcal{E}_T = \{(n, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : 1 \leq n \leq \bar{M}_{T,x}, 1 \leq m \leq \bar{M}_{T,y}\}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_R = \{(n, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : 1 \leq n \leq \bar{M}_{R,x}, 1 \leq m \leq \bar{M}_{R,y}\}$ . The SPDA signal model can thus be obtained following the procedure described in Section IV. Specifically, referring to (60), the channel between the  $(n', m')$ -th transmit antenna and the  $(n, m)$ -th receive antenna is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{H}_{n,m,n',m'} &= \int_{\mathcal{S}_{R,n,m}} \int_{\mathcal{S}_{T,n',m'}} \frac{1}{A_d} h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{s} \\ &\approx A_d h(\bar{\mathbf{r}}_{n,m}, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{n',m'}). \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Consequently, the achievable rate is given by

$$\bar{R} = \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^H \bar{\mathbf{H}}^H \bar{\mathbf{H}} \bar{\mathbf{W}} \right), \quad (77)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{W}} = [\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{1,1}^T, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{w}}_{\bar{M}_{T,x}, \bar{M}_{T,y}}^T]^T$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$  is defined similar to (61). The optimal solution to the corresponding rate maximization problem can be obtained through SVD and water-filling power allocation. For the SPDA benchmark, the number of data streams is set to  $N = \min\{\bar{M}_R, \bar{M}_T\}$ .

#### B. Convergence and Complexity of the Proposed Algorithm

Fig. 2 demonstrates the rapid convergence of the proposed WMMSE algorithm with respect to the number of iterations under varying aperture sizes, thereby confirming its effectiveness. Furthermore, as illustrated in Fig. 3, another convergence trend is observed as the number of Gauss-Legendre samples increases, owing to the enhanced accuracy in integral computations. Notably, the proposed WMMSE algorithm requires



TABLE I: Comparison of Average CPU Time for Different Approaches with  $N = 10$  and  $M = 10$ .

Frequency	$A_T = 0.2 \text{ m}^2$		$A_T = 0.3 \text{ m}^2$		$A_T = 0.4 \text{ m}^2$	
	WMMSE	Fourier-SVD	WMMSE	Fourier-SVD	WMMSE	Fourier-SVD
2.4 GHz	0.246 s	0.615 s	0.244 s	1.277 s	0.257 s	2.387 s
5 GHz	0.245 s	7.029 s	0.255 s	16.076 s	0.237 s	22.828 s
7.8 GHz	0.239 s	31.985 s	0.247 s	75.893 s	0.243 s	123.490 s




Fig. 4: Capacity versus transmit power.




Fig. 6: Capacity versus distance between Tx- and Rx-CAPAs.




Fig. 5: Capacity versus aperture size.




Fig. 7: Capacity versus frequency.

only a few samples (fewer than 5) to achieve high accuracy, whereas the Fourier-SVD method demands significantly more, especially for high frequencies and large apertures. This disparity arises because the Fourier-SVD approach relies on Gauss-Legendre quadrature to compute a large number of distinct integrals in the wavenumber-domain channel matrix  $\mathbf{H}_w$ , resulting in substantial error accumulation. These observations indicate that the high computational complexity of the Fourier-SVD method stems not only from the large number of wavenumber-domain samples but also from the extensive Gauss-Legendre samples required.

To further investigate computational complexity, Table I presents the CPU time consumed by different approaches, with parameters fixed at  $N = 10$  and  $M = 10$ . All experiments are conducted using MATLAB R2024a on an Apple M3 silicon chip, and the number of iterations for the proposed WMMSE algorithm is fixed at 100. It is observed that the CPU time for the Fourier-SVD method increases dramatically from 0.615 s to 123.490 s as frequency and array aperture grow, whereas

the proposed WMMSE algorithm maintains a consistently low CPU time of approximately 0.250 s. The practical CPU time of the WMMSE algorithm can be even lower than 0.250 seconds, as the number of iterations required for convergence is typically much less than 100, as demonstrated in Fig. 2.

### C. Achievable Rate Versus Different Parameters

Fig. 4 illustrates the increase in achievable rate with higher transmit power. As shown in the figure, the proposed WMMSE algorithm consistently achieves a higher achievable rate than the Fourier-SVD approach while also exhibiting lower computational complexity. This advantage stems from the ability of the proposed algorithm to effectively avoid discretization loss. The figure also highlights the significant performance gain of CAPA over SPDA, attributed to the enhanced spatial DoFs offered by CAPA. Additionally, a performance loss occurs when the rotation angle  $\phi$ , which defines the orientation of the Rx-CAPA with respect to the  $x$ -axis, changes from 0 to  $\pi/4$ . This performance loss results from the reduced




Fig. 8: Normalized correlation between different data streams.

effective apertures and polarization mismatch between non-parallel CAPAs [30]. Similar phenomena are observed in Fig. 5, which demonstrates the impact of array aperture. In this figure, we keep  $A_T = A_R$ . It is interesting to see that the achievable rate of SPDAs does not increase smoothly with aperture size. This is because a larger aperture does not always result in a higher number of antennas for SPDAs.

Fig. 6 demonstrates the decreasing trend in achievable rate as the distance between the Tx- and Rx-CAPAs increases. This behavior can be attributed to two main factors: the increased free-space path loss and the reduction in spatial DoFs in line-of-sight MIMO channels [30]. Additionally, there is a substantial performance gain achieved by multiple data streams than single data streams (i.e.,  $N = 1$ ) when the Tx- and Rx-CAPAs are close due to the enhanced spatial DoFs, which highlights the importance of fully exploiting spatial DoFs in line-of-sight CAPA-MIMO systems. Furthermore, Fig. 7 shows that the achievable rate increases with signal frequency. This improvement is attributed to the higher spatial DoFs available at higher frequency bands [31].

#### D. Correlation Between Different Data Streams

An important feature of point-to-point MIMO channels is that they can be converted into parallel, non-interfering single-input single-output (SISO) channels, allowing each data stream to be independently decoded without SIC while still achieving the channel capacity. Such an ideal decomposition is precisely realized when employing eigendecomposition (13) for the beamforming design [5]. Results shown in Fig. 8 indicate that the proposed WMMSE algorithm closely achieves this decomposition. Specifically, the correlation between the  $n$ -th and  $m$ -th data streams is defined as

$$\xi_{n,m} = \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} v_n^H(\mathbf{r}) h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) w_m(\mathbf{s}) ds d\mathbf{r} \right|^2, \quad (78)$$

which can be interpreted as the desired signal power for  $m = n$  or the interference caused by the  $m$ -th data stream when decoding the  $n$ -th data stream for  $m \neq n$ . More particularly, the beamformer  $w_m(\mathbf{s})$  is obtained using the proposed WMMSE algorithm, and the receiver  $v_n(\mathbf{r})$  is designed as the optimal MMSE receiver in (23) without SIC. Fig. 8 illustrates that near-perfect orthogonality between data streams is achievable for  $N = 6$  data streams. While for  $N = 8$  and  $N = 10$ ,

the orthogonality is slightly reduced, but the inter-stream interference is still maintained at a low level. Furthermore, when  $N = 10$ , it can be observed that the strength of the signal is high for only the first several data streams. This is because of the limited spatial DoFs of the line-of-sight channel. Finally, considering the marginal achievable rate improvement from 42.08 bit/s/Hz to 42.26 bit/s/Hz when increasing from 6 to 10 data streams, it would be more efficient in practice to avoid transmitting a large number of data streams, which helps to reduce receiver complexity while maintaining high performance.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has proposed an efficient WMMSE algorithm to address beamforming optimization in point-to-point CAPA-MIMO systems, effectively overcoming the discretization loss and high computational complexity associated with conventional Fourier-based approaches. The proposed algorithm also shows promise for extension to multi-user CAPA-MIMO beamforming optimization, which is a compelling direction for future research.

### APPENDIX A PROOF OF THEOREM 1

In this appendix, we derive the achievable rate based on the MMSE-SIC receiver, which is shown to be optimal for MIMO systems [32]. Without loss of generality, we assume that the SIC is sequentially carried out from the first to the  $N$ -th data stream. Under this assumption, the signal for decoding the  $n$ -th data stream after the SIC is given by

$$y_n(\mathbf{r}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) w_n(\mathbf{s}) c_n d\mathbf{s} + \sum_{j>n} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) w_j(\mathbf{s}) c_j d\mathbf{s} + z(\mathbf{r}). \quad (79)$$

Applying a receiver  $v_n(\mathbf{r})$  to  $y_n(\mathbf{r})$  yields

$$\tilde{y}_n = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} v_n^H(\mathbf{r}) e_n(\mathbf{r}) c_n d\mathbf{r} + \sum_{j>n} \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} v_n^H(\mathbf{r}) e_j(\mathbf{r}) c_j d\mathbf{r} + z_n, \quad (80)$$

where

$$e_n(\mathbf{r}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} h(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) w_n(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s}, \quad z_n = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} v_n^H(\mathbf{r}) z(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (81)$$

More particularly,  $z_n$  is the effective noise after the receiver. According to [21, Lemma 1], it follows a distribution of

$$z_n \sim \mathcal{CN}\left(0, \sigma^2 \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} |v_n(\mathbf{r})|^2 d\mathbf{r}\right). \quad (82)$$

Consequently, the SINR for decoding  $c_n$  is given by

$$\gamma_n = \frac{\left| \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} v_n^H(\mathbf{r}) e_n(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \right|^2}{\sum_{j>n} \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} v_n^H(\mathbf{r}) e_j(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \right|^2 + \sigma^2 \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} |v_n(\mathbf{r})|^2 d\mathbf{r}}. \quad (83)$$

Following [21, Theorem 3], the optimal  $v_n(\mathbf{r})$  for maximizing  $\gamma_n$  is the MMSE receiver, which is given by

$$v_n^{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{r}) = e_n(\mathbf{r}) - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{e}_n(\mathbf{r}) \left( \mathbf{I}_{N-n} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q}_n \right)^{-1} \mathbf{q}_n, \quad (84)$$

where

$$\mathbf{Q}_n = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{e}_n^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{e}_n(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{C}^{(N-n) \times (N-n)}, \quad (85)$$

$$\mathbf{q}_n = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{e}_n^H(\mathbf{r}) e_n(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{C}^{(N-n) \times 1}, \quad (86)$$

and  $\mathbf{e}_n(\mathbf{r}) = [e_{n+1}(\mathbf{r}), \dots, e_N(\mathbf{r})] \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times (N-n)}$ . By substituting (84) into (83), we obtain the following optimal SINR (see Section V-C of [21] for detailed derivations):

$$\gamma_n^{\text{MMSE}} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} |e_n(\mathbf{r})|^2 d\mathbf{r} - \frac{1}{\sigma^4} \mathbf{q}_n^H \left( \mathbf{I}_{N-n} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q}_n \right)^{-1} \mathbf{q}_n. \quad (87)$$

Therefore, the achievable rate realized by the MMSE-SIC receiver is given by

$$R = \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left( 1 + \gamma_n^{\text{MMSE}} \right). \quad (88)$$

However, the above expression is non-tractable due to the complicated form of  $\gamma_n^{\text{MMSE}}$ . To simplify it, we reformulate the achievable rate of each data stream, i.e.,  $R_n = \log(1 + \gamma_n^{\text{MMSE}})$ , as given in (89). In particular, step (a) in (89) follows the determinant of block matrices, which states that [33]

$$\det \left( \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \det(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{C}) \det(\mathbf{D}). \quad (90)$$

Based on the results in (89), the achievable rate  $R$  can be reformulated as

$$R = \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \left( \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_{N-n+1} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q}_{n-1} \right) - \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_{N-n} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q}_n \right) \right) = \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q}_0 \right). \quad (91)$$

By defining  $\mathbf{Q} \triangleq \mathbf{Q}_0$ , the expression of the achievable rate in (7) can be obtained. The proof is thus completed.

## APPENDIX B PROOF OF THEOREM 2

This theorem can be proven by following the approach used in the proof for conventional discrete arrays [26]. First, it can be shown that when other optimization variables are fixed, the optimal  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})$  corresponds to the MMSE receiver given in (23), while the optimal  $\mathbf{U}$  is given by  $\mathbf{E}^{-1}$ . Substituting these optimal solutions into problem (27) transforms it into

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})} N - \log \det(\mathbf{E}_{\text{MMSE}}^{-1}), \quad (92)$$

which, according to (26), is equivalent to problem (16). The proof is thus completed.

## APPENDIX C PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

To simplify the derivation of the optimal  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$ , we first define the following notations:

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} h^H(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}, \quad \mathbf{V} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} \mathbf{v}^H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (93)$$

The, the MSE matrix in (22) can be reformulated as

$$\mathbf{E} = \left( \mathbf{I}_N - \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} \right) \left( \mathbf{I}_N - \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} \right)^H + \frac{\sigma^2}{P_T} \mathbf{V} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \|\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})\|^2 d\mathbf{s}. \quad (94)$$

When all optimization parameters are fixed except for  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$ , problem (27) reduces to

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})} G(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{E}). \quad (95)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_n &= \log \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} |e_n(\mathbf{r})|^2 d\mathbf{r} - \frac{1}{\sigma^4} \mathbf{q}_n^H \left( \mathbf{I}_{N-n} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q}_n \right)^{-1} \mathbf{q}_n \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \log \det \left( \begin{bmatrix} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \int_{\mathcal{S}_R} |e_n(\mathbf{r})|^2 d\mathbf{r} \right) & \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{q}_n^H \\ \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{q}_n & \left( \mathbf{I}_{N-n} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q}_n \right) \end{bmatrix} \right) - \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_{N-n} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q}_n \right) \\ &= \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_{N-n+1} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q}_{n-1} \right) - \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_{N-n} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{Q}_n \right). \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

This problem is a functional optimization problem, which can be solved using the CoV method. Specifically, the optimal  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  is determined by satisfying the following condition:

$$\left. \frac{dG(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) + \epsilon \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{s}))}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} = 0, \quad (96)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times N}$  is any arbitrary smooth function with each entry defined on  $\mathcal{S}_T$ . To leverage the above condition, we first give the explicit expression for  $\Phi(\epsilon) \triangleq G(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) + \epsilon \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{s}))$ , given by:

$$\Phi(\epsilon) = 2\epsilon \Re \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) \boldsymbol{\eta}^H(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} \right\} + \Psi(\epsilon^2) + C, \quad (97)$$

where  $\Psi(\epsilon^2)$  collect terms related to  $\epsilon^2$ ,  $C$  is a constant, and

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{U} \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{I}_N \right) + \frac{\sigma^2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V})}{P_T} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}). \quad (98)$$

Substituting (97) into (96) yields

$$\Re \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) \boldsymbol{\eta}^H(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} \right\} = 0. \quad (99)$$

Following the fundamental lemma of CoV given in [20, Lemma 1], it must hold that  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{0}$  to satisfy the above conditions for any arbitrary  $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{s})$ , leading to the following result:

$$\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) = \epsilon \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{U} \left( \mathbf{I}_N - \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} \right), \quad (100)$$

where  $\epsilon = \frac{P_T}{\sigma^2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V})}$ . However, obtaining an explicit expression for  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  from (100) remains challenging, as  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  appears on both sides of the equation. To solve it, we multiply both sides of (100) by  $\mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{s})$  and integrate over  $d\mathbf{s}$ , resulting in

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \epsilon \mathbf{G} \mathbf{U} (\mathbf{I}_N - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}), \quad (101)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s}, \quad \mathbf{G} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s}. \quad (102)$$

Following (101), matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  can be calculated as

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} \mathbf{I}_N + \mathbf{G} \mathbf{U} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{U}. \quad (103)$$

By substituting (103) into (100), the optimal  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) &= \epsilon \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{U} \left( \mathbf{I}_N - \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} \mathbf{I}_N + \mathbf{G} \mathbf{U} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{U} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{U} \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} \mathbf{I}_N + \mathbf{G} \mathbf{U} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

#### APPENDIX D EXTENSION OF WMMSE FOR CORRELATED POWER CONSTRAINTS

In this appendix, we discuss the extension of the WMMSE algorithm for solving the more general correlated power con-

straint given below:

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) c_T(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}^H(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} d\mathbf{s} \leq P_T, \quad (105)$$

where  $c_T(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{z})$  characterize the correlation between points  $\mathbf{s}$  and  $\mathbf{z}$  at the Tx-CAPA. One of the primary reasons for correlation is mutual coupling, which refers to the electromagnetic interaction between individual radiating elements when placed in close proximity [34]. When  $c_T(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{z}) = \delta(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{z})$ , i.e., there is no correlation, the power constraint (105) reduces to (10b). Similar to **Lemma 1**, maximizing the achievable rate subject to the new power constraint (105) can be formulated as an unconstrained problem as

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})} \tilde{R} = \log \det \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\bar{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{Q} \right), \quad (106)$$

where

$$\bar{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{P_T} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) c_T(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}^H(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} d\mathbf{s}. \quad (107)$$

Following **Theorem 2**, problem (106) can be transformed into the following equivalent MSE minimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}), \mathbf{U}} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}) - \log \det(\mathbf{U}), \quad (108)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} &= \left( \mathbf{I}_N - \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} \right) \left( \mathbf{I}_N - \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} \right)^H \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma^2}{P_T} \mathbf{V} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) c_T(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}^H(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} d\mathbf{s}. \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

Following the procedure in Section III-A, the optimal solutions of  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{U}$  to problem (108) can be derived as

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{\text{MMSE}} = \frac{1}{\bar{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) \left( \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\bar{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{Q} \right)^{-1}, \quad (110)$$

$$\mathbf{U} = \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\text{MMSE}}^{-1} = \mathbf{I}_N + \frac{1}{\bar{\sigma}^2} \mathbf{Q}. \quad (111)$$

The optimal solution of  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})$  can be obtained by minimizing  $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s})) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\tilde{\mathbf{E}})$  using the CoV method as in Appendix C. In particular, define  $\tilde{\Phi}(\epsilon) = \tilde{G}(\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{s}) + \epsilon \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{s}))$ , whose explicit expression is given by

$$\tilde{\Phi}(\epsilon) = 2\epsilon \Re \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \tilde{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{s}) \boldsymbol{\eta}^H(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} \right\} + \tilde{\Psi}(\epsilon^2) + \tilde{C}, \quad (112)$$

where  $\tilde{\Psi}(\epsilon^2)$  collect terms related to  $\epsilon^2$ ,  $\tilde{C}$  is a constant, and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{s}) &= \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{U} \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{I}_N \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} c_T(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z}. \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

Following the fundamental lemma of CoV, it must hold that  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{0}$ , which yields

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}_T} c_T(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} = \epsilon \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{U} \left( \mathbf{I}_N - \int_{\mathcal{S}_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} \right). \quad (114)$$

Define  $c_T^{\text{inv}}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s})$  such that

$$\int_{S_T} c_T^{\text{inv}}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s}) c_T(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{s} = \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{z}). \quad (115)$$

Multiplying both sides of (114) by  $c_T^{\text{inv}}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s})$  and integrating over  $d\mathbf{s}$  yields

$$\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{r}) = \varepsilon \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{U} \left( \mathbf{I}_N - \int_{S_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{z}) \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} \right), \quad (116)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{r}) = \int_{S_T} c_T^{\text{inv}}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s}. \quad (117)$$

Then, following the same procedure as in (101)-(104), the optimal  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{r})$  can be obtained as

$$\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{r}) = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{U} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{I}_N + \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{U} \right)^{-1}, \quad (118)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{G}} &= \int_{S_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \\ &= \int_{S_T} \int_{S_T} \mathbf{g}^H(\mathbf{r}) c_T^{\text{inv}}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} d\mathbf{r}. \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

Based on the results in (110), (111), and (116), the WMMSE algorithm for correlated power constraints can be established. However, obtaining a closed-form expression for  $c_T^{\text{inv}}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s})$  remains generally challenging unless the term assumes a special form, as demonstrated in [20, Lemma 2]. In general cases, no systematic method exists to explicitly compute  $c_T^{\text{inv}}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s})$ , necessitating a scenario-specific analysis. This limitation highlights an open problem and will be addressed in future work.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. W. Prather, "Toward holographic RF systems for wireless communications and networks," *IEEE ComSoc Tech. News*, Jun. 2016.
- [2] E. Björnson, L. Sanguinetti, H. Wymeersch, J. Hoydis, and T. L. Marzetta, "Massive MIMO is a reality—what is next?: Five promising research directions for antenna arrays," *Digit. Signal Process.*, vol. 94, pp. 3–20, Nov. 2019.
- [3] Y. Liu, C. Ouyang, Z. Wang, J. Xu, X. Mu, and Z. Ding, "CAPA: Continuous-aperture arrays for revolutionizing 6G wireless communications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.00894*, 2024.
- [4] O. M. Bucci and G. Franceschetti, "On the degrees of freedom of scattered fields," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, vol. 37, no. 7, pp. 918–926, Jul. 1989.
- [5] D. A. Miller, "Communicating with waves between volumes: evaluating orthogonal spatial channels and limits on coupling strengths," *Appl. Opt.*, vol. 39, no. 11, pp. 1681–1699, 2000.
- [6] A. Poon, R. Brodersen, and D. Tse, "Degrees of freedom in multiple-antenna channels: A signal space approach," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 523–536, Feb. 2005.
- [7] D. Dardari, "Communicating with large intelligent surfaces: Fundamental limits and models," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 2526–2537, Nov. 2020.
- [8] N. Decarli and D. Dardari, "Communication modes with large intelligent surfaces in the near field," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 165 648–165 666, Dec. 2021.
- [9] A. Pizzo, A. d. J. Torres, L. Sanguinetti, and T. L. Marzetta, "Nyquist sampling and degrees of freedom of electromagnetic fields," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 70, pp. 3935–3947, Jun. 2022.
- [10] L. Ding, E. G. Ström, and J. Zhang, "Degrees of freedom in 3D linear large-scale antenna array communications—a spatial bandwidth approach," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 40, no. 10, pp. 2805–2822, Oct. 2022.
- [11] Z. Xie, Y. Liu, J. Xu, X. Wu, and A. Nallanathan, "Performance analysis for near-field MIMO: Discrete and continuous aperture antennas," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 12, no. 12, pp. 2258–2262, Dec. 2023.
- [12] M. A. Jensen and J. W. Wallace, "Capacity of the continuous-space electromagnetic channel," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 524–531, Feb. 2008.
- [13] M. D. Migliore, "Horse (electromagnetics) is more important than horse-man (information) for wireless transmission," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 2046–2055, Apr. 2019.
- [14] Z. Wan, J. Zhu, Z. Zhang, L. Dai, and C.-B. Chae, "Mutual information for electromagnetic information theory based on random fields," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 71, no. 4, pp. 1982–1996, Apr. 2023.
- [15] S. Mikki, "The Shannon information capacity of an arbitrary radiating surface: An electromagnetic approach," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 2556–2570, Mar. 2023.
- [16] B. Zhao, C. Ouyang, X. Zhang, and Y. Liu, "Continuous aperture array (CAPA)-based wireless communications: Capacity characterization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15056*, 2024.
- [17] Z. Zhang and L. Dai, "Pattern-division multiplexing for multi-user continuous-aperture MIMO," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 41, no. 8, pp. 2350–2366, Aug. 2023.
- [18] M. Qian, L. You, X.-G. Xia, and X. Gao, "On the spectral efficiency of multi-user holographic MIMO uplink transmission," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 15 421–15 434, Oct. 2024.
- [19] Z. Wang, C. Ouyang, and Y. Liu, "Beamforming optimization for continuous aperture array (CAPA)-based communications," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. early access, 2025. DOI: 10.1109/TWC.2025.3545770.
- [20] —, "Optimal beamforming for multi-user continuous aperture array (CAPA) systems," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, early access, Mar. 2025. doi: 10.1109/TCOMM.2025.3554644.
- [21] C. Ouyang, Z. Wang, X. Zhang, and Y. Liu, "Performance of linear receive beamforming for continuous aperture arrays (CAPAs)," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.06620*, 2024.
- [22] J. Guo, Y. Liu, H. Shin, and A. Nallanathan, "Deep learning for beamforming in multi-user continuous aperture array (CAPA) systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.09104*, 2024.
- [23] L. Sanguinetti, A. A. D'Amico, and M. Debbah, "Wavenumber-division multiplexing in line-of-sight holographic MIMO communications," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 2186–2201, Apr. 2023.
- [24] A. Pizzo, L. Sanguinetti, and T. L. Marzetta, "Fourier plane-wave series expansion for holographic MIMO communications," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 6890–6905, Sep. 2022.
- [25] S. S. Christensen, R. Agarwal, E. De Carvalho, and J. M. Cioffi, "Weighted sum-rate maximization using weighted MMSE for MIMO-BC beamforming design," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 12, pp. 4792–4799, Dec. 2008.
- [26] Q. Shi, M. Razaviyayn, Z.-Q. Luo, and C. He, "An iteratively weighted MMSE approach to distributed sum-utility maximization for a MIMO interfering broadcast channel," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 4331–4340, Sep. 2011.
- [27] F. W. Olver, D. W. Lozier, R. F. Boisvert, and C. W. Clark, *NIST Handbook of Mathematical Functions*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010.
- [28] A. Goldsmith, S. Jafar, N. Jindal, and S. Vishwanath, "Capacity limits of MIMO channels," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 684–702, Jun. 2003.
- [29] D. Palomar and J. Fonollosa, "Practical algorithms for a family of waterfilling solutions," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 686–695, Feb. 2005.
- [30] Y. Liu, Z. Wang, J. Xu, C. Ouyang, X. Mu, and R. Schober, "Near-field communications: A tutorial review," *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 4, pp. 1999–2049, Aug. 2023.
- [31] E. Björnson, F. Kara, N. Kolomvakis, A. Kosasih, P. Ramezani, and M. B. Salman, "Enabling 6G performance in the upper mid-band by transitioning from massive to gigantic MIMO," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05630*, 2024.
- [32] D. Tse and P. Viswanath, *Fundamentals of wireless communication*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005.
- [33] J. R. Silvester, "Determinants of block matrices," *Math. Gaz.*, vol. 84, no. 501, pp. 460–467, Nov. 2000.
- [34] A. Pizzo and A. Lozano, "Mutual coupling in holographic MIMO: Physical modeling and information-theoretic analysis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.10209*, 2025.