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Abstract—The application of network non-orthogonal multiple access (N-NOMA) technique to coordinated multi-point (CoMP) systems has attracted significant attention due to its superior capability to improve connectivity and maintain reliable transmission for CoMP users simultaneously. Based on the concept of quasi-degraded channel for N-NOMA, this paper studies the precoding design for downlink N-NOMA scenarios with two base stations (BSs) equipped with multiple antennas. In specific, under quasi-degraded channels, simple linear precoding based N-NOMA can achieve the same minimal total transmission power as theoretically optimal but complicated dirty paper coding (DPC) scheme, when the users’ target rates and minimal transmission power of each BS are given. In this paper, the channel quasi-degradation (QD) condition is first rigorously derived for the scenario with single CoMP user and two NOMA users. The closed-form optimal precoders for N-NOMA under quasi-degraded channels are also provided. Then, based on QD condition, a novel hybrid N-NOMA (H-N-NOMA) scheme is proposed, which is a mixture of N-NOMA and conventional zero-forcing beamforming (ZFBF) scheme. Further, for the scenarios with more users, a low-complexity QD based user pairing (QDUP) algorithm is proposed, which is then combined with H-N-NOMA to make a novel scheme termed H-N-NOMA/QDUP into being. Numerical results are presented to reveal the impact factors on QD channels, and also demonstrate the superior performance of the proposed H-N-NOMA/QDUP scheme. It is shown that the proposed H-N-NOMA/QDUP scheme can effectively exploit the benefit of multi user diversity.

Index Terms—Network non-orthogonal multiple access (N-NOMA), coordinated multi-point (CoMP), quasi-degradation, precoding, minimal transmission power.

I. INTRODUCTION

COORDINATED multi-point (CoMP) techniques, which utilize the coordination among multiple spatially distributed base stations (BSs), play an important role in ensuring the transmission reliability of cell-edge users [1], [2]. However, conventional CoMP techniques are designed based on orthogonal multiple access (OMA), where different users are allocated with orthogonal channel resource blocks, resulting in low spectral efficiency. For example, when multiple BSs cooperatively serve a cell-edge user via CoMP, each BS needs to allocate a resource block for this user, and the resource block cannot be accessed by other users. Thus, the spectral resource becomes more stringent as the number of cell-edge users increases.

Recently, non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) has raised tremendous attention from both academia and industry, due to its superior spectral efficiency and support for massive connectivity [3]. The key idea of NOMA is to encourage multiple users share the same resource block. Network NOMA (N-NOMA) constitutes an important branch of NOMA, which can significantly ease the aforementioned dilemma caused by OMA based CoMP [4], [5], [6], [7]. In N-NOMA, multiple BSs cooperatively serve cell-edge users (termed CoMP users) via conventional CoMP techniques, meanwhile, each BS serves additional cell-center users (term NOMA users) by using the same resource blocks allocated to the CoMP users. Compared with OMA based CoMP schemes, N-NOMA can support larger connectivity and improve spectral efficiency, while the CoMP users’ performance can be guaranteed. Due to this appealing advantage, N-NOMA has been recognized as a valuable research topic for 5G and beyond [8].

A. Related Work

According to different antenna configurations, N-NOMA can be classified into two types: (a) single input single output (SISO) N-NOMA, where BSs and users are equipped with single antenna; (b) multiple input multiple output (MIMO) N-NOMA, where BSs and (or) users are equipped with multiple antennas. In the following, related works on SISO and MIMO N-NOMA are described respectively.
1) SISO N-NOMA: On the one hand, some papers focused on statistic performance analysis of N-NOMA. In [4], the ergodic rate achieved by Alamouti coding based N-NOMA scheme was studied. In [9], the outage performance of a opportunistic N-NOMA scheme with user cooperation was investigated. In [5], distributed analog beamforming was applied in a three-BS N-NOMA scenario. In [10], a generalized N-NOMA scheme was proposed, where the cell-center users can also be cooperatively served. The concept of mutual successive interference cancellation (SIC) was proposed for further performance improvement of N-NOMA. In [11], [12], [13], and [14], stochastic geometry was applied to model and analyze the performance of N-NOMA by considering the interference from the whole network. On the other hand, some papers focused on resource optimization for N-NOMA under different kinds of constraints. In [15], [16], and [17], power allocation algorithms were proposed for N-NOMA. In [18], a joint power allocation, user pairing and coordinated scheduling method was studied for a multi-connectivity based virtual N-NOMA system. In [19], the joint user clustering and power allocation issue was investigated. Besides, the combination of N-NOMA with advanced wireless techniques were also investigated [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25].

2) MIMO N-NOMA: When the cooperating BSs are equipped with multiple antennas, by applying proper precoding (or beamforming) design, the spatial degree of freedom can be adequately utilized and the inter-cell interference (ICI) can be effectively mitigated. In [26], two interference alignment based downlink N-NOMA precoding methods were proposed for the case with full channel state information (CSI) and partial CSI, respectively. Reference [27] proposed an optimal precoding algorithm to maximize the sum throughput of a downlink N-NOMA system with two cooperating BSs. In [28], the precoding design was considered for the scenario with multiple cooperating BSs. The users served by each BS are divided into two groups, and the proposed precoding algorithm aims to maximize the rates achieved by one group while guarantee the performance of the users belonging to the other group. For a similar scenario as in [28], in [29], an efficient algorithm was proposed to minimize the total transmission power.

B. Motivation and Contribution

The drawbacks of existing work on precoding design for MIMO N-NOMA are as follows.

- Most existing work such as [26], [27], [28], and [29] only provided statistical comparison between N-NOMA and traditional schemes. However, in reality, under some channel conditions, N-NOMA might not perform better than traditional schemes, such as zero-forcing beamforming (ZFBF). Thus, dynamically determining whether adopting N-NOMA as the transmission strategy according to channel conditions can further improve the spectral efficiency. Unfortunately, the characteristic of the channels which are favorable for the application of N-NOMA are still veiled, making it difficult to find a simple but effective rule for switching between N-NOMA and other schemes.
- Most existing precoding methods for N-NOMA relied on iterative algorithms [27], [28], [29], which heavily lack of efficiency for practical application, as well as insights for the better understanding of N-NOMA.
- Most of the papers focused on non-joint transmission (NJT), where the CoMP user’s signal is transmitted by only one BS and the purpose of coordination among BSs is just to mitigate ICI [26], [27], [28], [29]. However, NJT cannot cope well with the scenarios where cell-edge users face severely weak channels or their demands for quality of service (QoS) are pretty high. Thus, taking joint transmission (JT) into consideration for precoding design of N-NOMA is an urgent and necessary task.

To fulfill the above issues, this paper intends to study the relationship between N-NOMA and optimal dirty paper coding (DPC) scheme, by applying and extending the concept of quasi-degradation (QD) which is originated from the research for single-cell MISO NOMA [30], [31], [32]. To be specific, when the channels satisfy QD condition, simple linear precoding based N-NOMA can achieve the same minimal total transmission power as theoretically optimal but complicated DPC scheme, when the users’ target rates and minimal transmission power of each BS are given. Thus, studying quasi-degraded channels can help to reveal the properties of the channels which are favorable for the application of N-NOMA. In this paper, QD condition is explicitly given for downlink N-NOMA with two BSs, based on which efficient N-NOMA schemes are then proposed. The main contributions of this paper are listed as follows.

- The optimal precoding design problem for N-NOMA with two BSs is formulated, which aims to minimize the total transmission power under the constraints on users’ target rates and the maximum transmission power of each BS. Different from existing N-NOMA precoding methods which only focus on NJT, this paper deals with a more case by jointly considering JT and NJT.
- The comparison between the optimal design for N-NOMA and DPC is studied. Particularly, the definition of QD for N-NOMA is formally defined. Note that the concept of QD for N-NOMA is different from that of single cell NOMA [30]. Because in single cell NOMA as in [30], power constraint of a single BS is not considered, while in N-NOMA, power constraint of a single BS must be considered to avoid the consequence that the CoMP user is always served by one BS. Thus, it is more difficult to obtain the QD condition of N-NOMA than that of single cell NOMA. Fortunately, through rigorous derivation, closed-form expression for QD condition of N-NOMA is provided. Besides, closed-form optimal precoder of N-NOMA under quasi-degraded channel is also obtained.
- Based on the obtained QD condition, a novel hybrid N-NOMA (H-N-NOMA) scheme is proposed, which can dynamically choose N-NOMA and ZFBF as the transmission strategy according to real-time CSI. By taking the advantage of closed-form expressions, the proposed
H-N-NOMA scheme can significantly reduce the complexity compared to existing iterative algorithms, and the performance can be guaranteed.

- An efficient QD-based user pairing (QDUP) algorithm for scenarios with multiple CoMP users is proposed. In QDUP, users whose channels satisfying QD condition are preferentially grouped. The complexity of the proposed QDUP is much lower than that of exhaustive search. Combining H-N-NOMA and QDUP, a novel transmission scheme called H-N-NOMA/SUPA is then proposed. Numerical results show that the proposed H-N-NOMA/SUPA scheme can significantly outperform existing schemes. It is also shown that the proposed H-N-NOMA/SUPA scheme can effectively exploit the benefit of multi-user diversity.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II gives the system model, which formulates the optimization problem for N-NOMA and DPC. In Section III, the optimal solution of DPC is provided, and the QD condition is obtained. In Section IV, by applying the obtained results in Section III, H-N-NOMA and QDUP algorithms are proposed. Section V illustrates the numerical results and Section VI concludes the paper.

Notations: Matrices and vectors are denoted by upper and lower case boldface letters, respectively. The superscript $(\cdot)$ denotes the Euclidean norm of a vector. $\mathbb{E}\{\cdot\}$ denotes the statistical expectation. $CN(a, R)$ represents the distribution of circularly-symmetric complex Gaussian (CSCG) random vectors with mean vector $a$ and covariance matrix $R$.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

Consider a two-cell downlink N-NOMA system. As shown in Fig. 1, there are two BSs, which are termed BS 1 and BS 2, respectively. A CoMP user, termed user 0, which is far from both considered BSs, is served cooperatively by the two BSs. In addition to the CoMP user, each BS individually serves a NOMA user which is close to the BS, by occupying the same resource block allocated to the CoMP user. Particularly, the NOMA user associated with BS $i$ ($i = 1, 2$) is denoted by user $i$. Each BS is equipped with $N$ antennas and each user is equipped with a single antenna. The channel between BS $i$ ($i = 1, 2$) and user $j$ ($j = 0, 1, 2$) is modeled by $h_{ij,j}$. Note that in this paper, it is assumed that the distance between the two cooperating BSs is far enough so that ICI at the NOMA users can be neglected, due to the effect of large scale path loss, i.e., $h_{1,2} = 0$ and $h_{2,1} = 0$. The transmitted signal by BS $i$ ($i = 1, 2$) is given by:

$$x_i = w_{i0}s_0 + w_{ii}s_i, \quad i = 1, 2$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $s_j$ ($j = 0, 1, 2$) is the signal intended for user $i$, whose power is normalized, i.e., $\mathbb{E}\{|s_j|^2\} = 1$, $w_{i0}$ ($i = 1, 2$) is the beamforming vector for the CoMP user, $w_{ii}$ ($i = 1, 2$) is the beamforming vector for user $i$. Note that, $w_{i0}$ might be a zero vector. And according to the values of $w_{i0}$ ($i = 1, 2$), the transmission scheme can be classified into the following two different types:

- JT, where both BSs transmit information to the CoMP user, i.e., $w_{i0} \neq 0$, $i = 1, 2$;
- NJT, where only one BS transmits information to the CoMP user, i.e., $\exists i, w_{i0} = 0$.

The CoMP user treats the signals of NOMA users as interferences, thus the signal to interference plus noise ratio (SINR) of the CoMP user to decode its own signal is:

$$\text{SINR}_{0 \rightarrow 0} = \frac{||h_{00}^H w_{00}||^2 + ||h_{20}^H w_{20}||^2}{||h_{10}^H w_{11}||^2 + ||h_{20}^H w_{22}||^2 + \sigma^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $\sigma^2$ is the noise power, $\text{SINR}_{j \rightarrow j'}$ denotes the SINR when user $j$ decodes the signal of user $j'$. It is noteworthy that non-coherent joint transmission (NC-JT) is applied for JT, where cooperative BSs transmit the same data to the CoMP user without prior phase mismatch correction and tight synchronization. By applying NC-JT, the received non-coherent sum of useful signals at the CoMP user yields a received power boost, which is known as cyclic delay diversity (CDD). For details on how the CDD can be obtained, interested readers can refer to Appendix A in [33]. By following the similar steps as in [33], the SINR expression shown in (2) can be obtained.

Different from the CoMP user, if $w_{i0} \neq 0$, $i = 1, 2$, the NOMA user (user 1 or 2) first decodes the signal of the CoMP user with the following SINR:

$$\text{SINR}_{j \rightarrow 0} = \frac{||h_{ij}^H w_{ij}||^2}{||h_{ij}^H w_{ij}||^2 + \sigma^2}, \quad j = 1, 2, i = j.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

If the CoMP user’s signal can be successfully decoded, user $j$ ($j = 1, 2$) carries out successive interference cancellation (SIC) to remove the signal of the CoMP user, and then decodes its own signal. If $w_{i0} = 0$, $i = 1, 2$, user $i$ will decode its own signal directly. In the above two cases, the SINR when the NOMA user decodes its own signal can be expressed as:

$$\text{SINR}_{j \rightarrow j} = \frac{||h_{ij}^H w_{ij}||^2}{\sigma^2}, \quad j = 1, 2, i = j.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Thus, the achievable rates of the users are given by:

$$R_0 = \min\left\{\log \left(1 + \text{SINR}_{0 \rightarrow 0}\right), \min_{j=1,2} \log \left(1 + \text{SINR}_{j \rightarrow 0}\right)\right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

$$R_j = \log \left(1 + \text{SINR}_{j \rightarrow j}\right), \quad j = 1, 2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

Note that user 0’s achievable rate depends on not only its own channel condition, but also the NOMA users’ channel conditions.
A. Formulation of N-NOMA

Given the target rate of each user and the largest transmit power of each BS, the total transmission power minimization problem of N-NOMA can be formulated as follows:

\[
\min_{\mathbf{w}_{10}, \mathbf{w}_{20}, \mathbf{w}_{11}, \mathbf{w}_{22}} \quad ||\mathbf{w}_{10}||^2 + ||\mathbf{w}_{20}||^2 + ||\mathbf{w}_{11}||^2 + ||\mathbf{w}_{22}||^2
\]

s.t. \( R_j \geq r_j, \quad j = 0, 1, 2 \) \hspace{1cm} (7a)

\( ||\mathbf{w}_{10}||^2 + ||\mathbf{w}_{20}||^2 \leq P_{\text{max}} \) \hspace{1cm} (7b)

\( ||\mathbf{w}_{11}||^2 \leq P_{\text{max}} \) \hspace{1cm} (7c)

\( ||\mathbf{w}_{22}||^2 \leq P_{\text{max}} \) \hspace{1cm} (7d)

where (7b) means that the achievable rate of user \( j \) (\( j = 0, 1, 2 \)) must be larger than a given target rate \( r_j \), (7c) and (7d) mean that the transmission power of each BS should not exceed a given maximum \( P_{\text{max}} \).

Problem (7) can be solved by simple problems with Gaussian randomization [34, 35], please refer to Appendix A for details. However, the closed-form expression for (7) is challenging, due to its non-convexity [36]. In the next, we will focus on studying a particular kind of channels, i.e., quasi-degraded channels, under which closed-form expression for (7) can be obtained to provide more insights for N-NOMA transmission design.

B. Formulation of Dirty Paper Coding (DPC)

By utilizing the obtained information of each user at transmitters, DPC can effectively avoid inter-user interferences, which generally achieves the optimal performance. Particularly, in the considered DPC in this paper, at BS 1, user 0’s information is encoded before user 1, which ensures that user 1 can avoid the interference from user 0. Similarly, user 2 can also avoid the interference from user 0. Thus, the power minimization problem of DPC can be given by:

\[
\min_{\mathbf{w}_{10}, \mathbf{w}_{20}, \mathbf{w}_{11}, \mathbf{w}_{22}} \quad ||\mathbf{w}_{10}||^2 + ||\mathbf{w}_{20}||^2 + ||\mathbf{w}_{11}||^2 + ||\mathbf{w}_{22}||^2
\]

s.t. \( \log(1 + \text{SINR}_{0-0}) \geq r_0, \) \hspace{1cm} (8a)

\( R_j \geq r_j, \quad j = 1, 2 \) \hspace{1cm} (8b)

\( ||\mathbf{w}_{10}||^2 + ||\mathbf{w}_{20}||^2 \leq P_{\text{max}} \) \hspace{1cm} (8c)

\( ||\mathbf{w}_{11}||^2 \leq P_{\text{max}} \) \hspace{1cm} (8d)

\( ||\mathbf{w}_{22}||^2 \leq P_{\text{max}} \) \hspace{1cm} (8e)

Compared with problem (7), there are two fewer constraints in problem (8). Thus, the minimal transmission power of DPC provides a lower bound of the minimal transmission power of N-NOMA. However, due to the high complexity, it is difficult to implement DPC in practical systems. Moreover, superposition coding used in N-NOMA is much easier to implement than DPC. Thus, an interesting question is whether N-NOMA can achieve the same minimal transmission power as DPC under some channel conditions. The channel makes this true is called quasi-degraded channel of N-NOMA.

Definition 1 (Quasi-Degraded Channel for N-NOMA): Assume the decoding order of N-NOMA is that CoMP user is prior to NOMA user, and the encoding order of DPC is that CoMP user is prior to NOMA user, given the target rates \( r_j \) (\( j = 0, 1, 2 \)) and the maximum power of each BS \( P_{\text{max}} \), the channels \( \{\mathbf{h}_{10}, \mathbf{h}_{11}, \mathbf{h}_{20}, \mathbf{h}_{22}\} \) in N-NOMA are quasi-degraded if and only if the minimal transmission powers of N-NOMA and DPC are the same.

III. QUASI-DEGRADATION CONDITION

In this section, we would like the derive the expression for the condition that the quasi-degraded channel should meet, which is called QD condition [30]. To this end, it is necessary to first obtain the closed-form optimal solution of problem (8).

Without loss of generality, it is assumed that \( ||\mathbf{h}_{20}|| > ||\mathbf{h}_{10}|| \). It can be found that the optimal solution of problem (8) subjects to a specific format as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 1: The optimal solution of problem (8) can be expressed as follows:

\[
\mathbf{w}_{10}^* = \sqrt{P_{10}} \mathbf{h}_{10} / ||\mathbf{h}_{10}|| \hspace{1cm} (9)
\]

\[
\mathbf{w}_{20}^* = \sqrt{P_{20}} \mathbf{h}_{20} / ||\mathbf{h}_{20}|| \hspace{1cm} (10)
\]

\[
\mathbf{w}_{11}^* (x) = \sqrt{P_{11}(x)} \left( \frac{\mathbf{I} - x \mathbf{h}_{10} \mathbf{h}_{10}^H / ||\mathbf{h}_{10}||^2}{||\mathbf{I} - x \mathbf{h}_{10} \mathbf{h}_{10}^H / ||\mathbf{h}_{10}||^2||\mathbf{h}_{11}||} \right)^{1/2} \hspace{1cm} (11)
\]

\[
P_{11}(x) = \sigma_1^2 \mathbf{h}_{11}^H (||\mathbf{h}_{11}||^2 - 2x - x^2 ||\mathbf{h}_{10}||^2 / ||\mathbf{h}_{10}||^2)^2 , \hspace{1cm} (7a)
\]

\[
P_{22}(y) = \sigma_2^2 e_2 (||\mathbf{h}_{22}||^2 - 2y - y^2 ||\mathbf{h}_{20}||^2 / ||\mathbf{h}_{20}||^2)^2 \hspace{1cm} (14)
\]

where \( \epsilon_j = 2^{r_j} - 1, 0 \leq j \leq 2 \), and \( P_{10}, P_{20}, 0 < x \leq \epsilon_0 / (1 + \epsilon_0) \) and \( 0 < y \leq \epsilon_0 / (1 + \epsilon_0) \) are undetermined variables which will be given later.

Proof: Please refer to Appendix B.

In Lemma 1, there are four undetermined variables, i.e., \( P_{10}, P_{20}, x, \) and \( y \). Next, we need to find the optimal \( P_{10}, P_{20}, x, \) and \( y \), which are denoted by \( P_{10, \text{opt}}, P_{20, \text{opt}}, x_{\text{opt}} \) and \( y_{\text{opt}} \), respectively. An interesting observation is that the forms of the optimal precoding vectors of N-NOMA is similar to that of single cell NOMA as in [30]. However, the optimal choice of \( x \) and \( y \) are different from and more complicated than that in single cell NOMA.

According to the values of \( P_{10} \) and \( P_{20} \), the solution of (8) can be classified into three cases:

- Case I: \( P_{20} > 0 \) and \( P_{10} = 0 \);
- Case II: \( P_{20} > 0 \) and \( P_{10} > 0 \);
- Case III: \( P_{20} = 0 \) and \( P_{10} > 0 \).

In the following, the optimal solution for each case will be given first, and the optimal solutions of three cases will then be compared to determine the global optimal solution of problem (8).

For notational simplicity, define the following functions:

\[
F_{20}(x) = \frac{\sigma_2^2 e_0 + \epsilon_0 ||\mathbf{h}_{20}||^2 ||\mathbf{h}_{22}||^2 (1 - x)^2}{||\mathbf{h}_{20}||^2} + \frac{\sigma_2^2 e_0 \epsilon_1 ||\mathbf{h}_{12}||^2 ||\mathbf{h}_{11}||^2 (1 - x)^2}{||\mathbf{h}_{20}||^2 (A - Bx)^2} \hspace{1cm} (15)
\]
\[ F_{10}(y) = \frac{\sigma^2 \epsilon_0 + \epsilon_0 ||h_{10}^H w_{11}||^2}{||h_{10}||^2} + \frac{\sigma^2 \epsilon_0 \epsilon_1 ||h_{21}^H h_{22}||^2 (1 - y)^2}{||h_{10}||^2 (C - D y)^2} , \]

(16)

where \( A = ||h_{11}||^2, B = ||h_{11}^H h_{11}||^2/||h_{10}||^2, C = ||h_{22}||^2, \)
\( D = ||h_{22}^H h_{21}||^2/||h_{22}||^2, \)
\( \tilde{w}_{22} = w_{22} \epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0), \)
and \( \tilde{w}_{11} = w_{11} \epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0). \)

In the following, the optimal solution for \( P_{20} > 0 \) and \( P_{10} = 0 \) is firstly provided.

Theorem 1: Given \( ||h_{20}|| > ||h_{10}||, \)
problem (8) is feasible under the case where \( P_{20} > 0 \) and \( P_{10} = 0 \) if and only if:

\[ P_{11}(0) < P_{\text{max}} \quad \text{and} \quad F_{20}(\tilde{x}_B) \leq P_{\text{max}} - P_{22}(\epsilon_0/1 + \epsilon_0) \]

(17)

where,
\[
\tilde{x}_B = \begin{cases} \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0}, & \text{if } P_{11} \left( \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} \right) \leq P_{\text{max}} \\ A/2B, & \text{else if } B = \frac{P_{\text{max}}}{\sigma^2 \epsilon_1} \\ B - ABP_{\text{max}}/\sigma^2 \epsilon_1 + \sqrt{B(A - B)(AP_{\text{max}}/\sigma^2 \epsilon_1 - 1)}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

(18)

If the above condition holds, the optimal solution of problem (8) for the case with \( P_{20} > 0 \) and \( P_{10} = 0 \) can be given by:

\[ P_{10,\text{opt}} = 0, \quad P_{20,\text{opt}} = F_{20}(x_{\text{opt}}), \quad y_{\text{opt}} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} \]

(19)

\[ x_{\text{opt}} = \begin{cases} \tilde{x}_B, & \tilde{x}_B < \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} ||h_{20}||^2/||h_{10}||^2 \\ \tilde{x}_A, & \tilde{x}_A \geq \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} ||h_{20}||^2/||h_{10}||^2 \\ \epsilon_0 + ||h_{20}||^2/||h_{10}||^2, & \text{else} \end{cases} \]

(20)

where,
\[ \tilde{x}_A = \begin{cases} A \sqrt{P_{\text{A}}} - 1, & \text{if } A \sqrt{P_{\text{A}}} < 1 \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases} \]

(21)

\[ P_{\text{A}} = \left( P_{\text{max}} - P_{22}(\epsilon_0/1 + \epsilon_0) - \frac{\epsilon_0^2}{\sigma^2 \epsilon_0 + \epsilon_0} ||h_{20}^H w_{22}||^2 \right) \\ \frac{||h_{20}||^2}{\sigma^2 \epsilon_0 ||h_{11}^H h_{11}||^2} . \]

(22)

Proof: Please refer to Appendix C.

Remark 1: Note that, in Theorem 1, \( \tilde{x}_B \) is the largest \( x \) in interval \([0, \epsilon_0/1 + \epsilon_0]\) which satisfies constraint \( P_{11}(x) \leq P_{\text{max}} \). If \( P_{11}(0) < P_{\text{max}} \), then the optimal solution is restricted to be located in \([0, \tilde{x}_B]\). And, \( \tilde{x}_A \) is the minimal \( x \) in interval \([0, \tilde{x}_B]\) which satisfies constraint \( F_{20}(\tilde{x}_A) \leq P_{\text{max}} - P_{22}(\epsilon_0/1 + \epsilon_0) \). And it is noteworthy that the feasibility condition (17) is equivalent to the existence of \( \tilde{x}_A \) and \( \tilde{x}_B \). The following theorem provides the optimal solution for \( P_{10} > 0 \) and \( P_{20} > 0 \).

Theorem 2: Given \( ||h_{20}|| > ||h_{10}||, \)
problem (8) is feasible under the case where \( P_{10} > 0 \) and \( P_{20} > 0 \) if and only if:

\[
\begin{cases} 
 P_{\text{max}} - P_{11} \left( \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} \right) > 0, \\
 P_{\text{max}} - P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0)) > 0, \\
 ||h_{10}||^2 \left( P_{\text{max}} - P_{11} \left( \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} \right) \right) + ||h_{20}||^2 \left( P_{\text{max}} - P_{22} \left( \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} \right) \right) \\
 \geq F_{20} \left( \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} \right) ||h_{20}||^2 .
\end{cases}
\]

(23)

If the above conditions holds, then the optimal solution of problem (8) can be expressed as:

\[ P_{10,\text{opt}} = F_{20} \left( \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} \right) ||h_{20}||^2/||h_{10}||^2 \]

\[ - ||h_{20}||^2/||h_{10}||^2 \left( P_{\text{max}} - P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0)) \right), \]

(24)

\[ P_{20,\text{opt}} = P_{\text{max}} - P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0)), \]

(25)

\[ x_{\text{opt}} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0}, \quad y_{\text{opt}} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} . \]

(26)

Proof: Please refer to Appendix D.

From Theorem 1 and 2, a necessary condition for the feasibility under the first two cases can be easily obtained, as highlighted in the following.

Corollary 1: When \( P_{20} > 0 \), problem (8) is feasible only if:
\[ P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0)) < P_{\text{max}} . \]

The optimal solution for \( P_{10} > 0 \) and \( P_{20} = 0 \) is highlighted in the following theorem.

Theorem 3: Given \( ||h_{20}|| > ||h_{10}||, \)
problem (8) is feasible under the case where \( P_{10} > 0 \) and \( P_{20} = 0 \) if and only if:

\[ P_{22}(0) < P_{\text{max}} \quad \text{and} \quad F_{10}(\tilde{y}_B) \leq P_{\text{max}} - P_{11} \left( \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} \right) , \]

(27)

where (28), shown at the bottom of the next page.

If (27) is satisfied, the optimal solution of problem (8) for the case with \( P_{10} > 0 \) and \( P_{20} = 0 \) can be given by:

\[ P_{10,\text{opt}} = F_{10}(y_{\text{opt}}), \quad P_{20,\text{opt}} = 0, \quad x_{\text{opt}} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0}, \quad y_{\text{opt}} = \tilde{y}_B . \]

(29)

Proof: Please refer to Appendix E.

From Theorems 1-3, it can be straightforwardly shown the necessary and sufficient conditions for problem (8) to be feasible, as highlighted in the following corollary.

Corollary 2: Problem (8) is feasible if and only if (17) or (23) or (27) holds.

Until now, the optimal solution for each case is obtained. Obviously, directly comparing the optimal values of the three cases, the optimal solution for problem (8) can be obtained. However, this method provides little insight of the problem. Indeed, there is a more elegant way to determine the optimal solution of problem (8), which can provide more insight. Interestingly, the optimal solutions of the three cases have priorities as highlighted in the following.
Proposition 1: If problem (8) is feasible when \( P_{20} > 0 \), then the optimal solution of problem (8) should satisfy \( P_{20} > 0 \).

Proof: Please refer to Appendix F.

The above proposition means that if one of the first two cases is feasible, then the optimal solution must be one of the first two cases. In other words, the optimal solutions of the first two cases must be better than that of the third case.

The following corollary, which can be easily obtained from the proof for Proposition 1, is useful for deciding the optimal solution belongs to which case.

Corollary 3: When \( P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0)) < P_{\text{max}} \), for each feasible solution of case III, there must exist a better solution which belongs to Case I or II.

One important application of the above corollary is that: when \( P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0)) < P_{\text{max}} \) and there is no feasible solution of Case I nor II, it can be concluded that problem (8) is infeasible.

Further, the priority between the optimal solutions of the first two cases can also be determined, as described in the following proposition.

Proposition 2: If condition (17) holds, then there is no feasible solution of Case II which is better than the optimal solution of Case I.

Proof: Please refer to Appendix G.

An interesting observation from Propositions 1 and 2 and Theorem 1 is that when the transmit power is sufficiently large, NJT is optimal for the considered problem (8), as highlighted in the following corollary.

Corollary 4: Given \(|h_{20}| > |h_{10}|\), if problem (8) has no power constraint, i.e., \( P_{\text{max}} = \infty \), then (17) always holds and the optimal solution of problem (8) can be expressed as:

\[
P_{10, \text{opt}} = 0, \quad P_{20, \text{opt}} = F_{20}(x_{\text{opt}}),
\]

\[
y_{\text{opt}} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0}, \quad x_{\text{opt}} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon_0 + ||h_{20}||^2/||h_{10}||^2} \tag{30}
\]

By concluding the above results, i.e., Propositions 1-2 and Theorems 1-3, the optimal solution of Problem (8) can be efficiently obtained by Algorithm 1. And then, according to the relationship between problem (7) and problem (8), the quasi-degraded channel condition can be obtained, as shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 4: If problem (8) is feasible, the channels are quasi-degraded if and only if: there exists one pair of optimal solution of problem (8), denoted by \( \{w_{10}^D, w_{11}^D, w_{20}^D, w_{22}^D\} \), satisfying the following conditions:

if \( w_{10}^D \neq 0 \), \[-||h_{10}^H w_{10}^D||^2 + \epsilon_0 ||h_{11}^H w_{11}^D||^2 + \epsilon_0 \sigma^2 \leq 0, \tag{31}\]

if \( w_{20}^D \neq 0 \), \[-||h_{22}^H w_{20}^D||^2 + \epsilon_0 ||h_{22}^H w_{22}^D||^2 + \epsilon_0 \sigma^2 \leq 0. \tag{32}\]

Algorithm 1 Optimal Solution of Problem (8)

Input: \( h_{10}, h_{11}, h_{20}, h_{22}, r_j (j = 1, 2, 3), P_{\text{max}} \)
Output: \( w_{10}^D, w_{11}^D, w_{20}^D, w_{22}^D \)

\[
\text{if } P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0)) < P_{\text{max}} \text{ then}
\]

\[
\text{Calculate the optimal solution according to Theorem 1; }
\]

\[
\text{else if } (23) \text{ holds then Calculate the optimal solution according to Theorem 2; }
\]

\[
\text{else output Infeasible; }
\]

\[
\text{end}
\]

Algorithm 2 H-N-NOMA Scheme

Input: \( h_{10}, h_{11}, h_{20}, h_{22}, r_j (j = 1, 2, 3), P_{\text{max}} \)
Output: transmission strategy

\[
\text{if quasi degraded channel then choose N-NOMA transmission; }
\]

\[
\text{else choose ZFBF transmission; }
\]

\[
\text{end}
\]

Remark 2. Please note that when ICI is considered, the total transmission power minimization problem for N-NOMA can also be formulated, which is similar to (7), and can be solved by using the same method which is provided in Appendix A. However, for channel quasi-degradation condition, the obtained results in this section cannot be directly applied to the case with ICI. The reason is that the SINR expressions in (1) and (27) contain more terms when ICI is considered, which significantly increases the difficulty of deriving channel quasi-degradation conditions. Due to limited space, finding the channel quasi-degradation conditions for the case with ICI is left as a future work.

IV. APPLICATION OF QUASI-DEGRADATION CHANNELS

A. H-N-NOMA

Note that, according to the previous discussion, N-NOMA can achieve the same performance as the DPC scheme only when the channels are degraded. Thus, when the channels are not degraded, there is performance loss by applying N-NOMA compared to DPC. Besides, when the channels are degraded,
closed-form expressions for the optimal precoding vectors of N-NOMA can be obtained by using Algorithm 1, which are actually the same as those of DPC. However, closed-form expressions are not available when the channels are not degraded and the acquisition of precoding vectors relies on iterative algorithms as shown in Appendix A, which is not efficient. Thus, in this paper, to reduce the precoding complexity, a novel H-N-NOMA scheme as shown in Algorithm 2 is proposed. In the proposed H-N-NOMA scheme, N-NOMA is adopted if the channels are degraded, otherwise, ZFBF is adopted. The superiority of H-N-NOMA will be shown in Section V. The advantage of H-N-NOMA can be further exploited by combining with QDUP, as described in the next subsection.

B. Quasi-Degradation Based User Pairing (QDUP) for Multiple N-NOMA Groups

Consider a scenario with multiple CoMP users as shown in Fig. 2. There are $3K$ users, including: (a) $K$ CoMP users, denoted by $U_{0,k}, 1 \leq k \leq K$; (b) $K$ NOMA users which are near to BS 1, denoted by $U_{1,i}, 1 \leq i \leq K$; (c) $K$ NOMA users which are near to BS 2, denoted by $U_{2,j}, 1 \leq j \leq K$. The channel between $U_{1,i}$ and BS 1 is denoted by $h_{1i}^1$, the channel between $U_{2,j}$ and BS 2 is denoted by $h_{2j}^2$, and the channels between $U_{0,k}$ and BS 1 and 2 are denoted by $h_{10}^1$ and $h_{20}^2$, respectively.

The $3K$ users are divided into $K$ groups. Each group consists of a CoMP user, a NOMA user of BS 1 and a NOMA user of BS 2. The index of the NOMA user of BS 1 which is paired with CoMP user $U_{0,k}$ is denoted by $\pi_1(k)$, and the index of the NOMA user of BS 2 which is paired with CoMP user $U_{0,k}$ is denoted by $\pi_2(k)$. In this paper, TDMA is applied to serve different groups, i.e., each group is allocated with an independent time slot with equal length, yielding no interference between different groups. Besides, for fairness consideration, equal power allocation is considered for each group, i.e., the maximum power allocated to a group by a BS is $P_{\text{max}}/K$. Thus, the power minimization problem can be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{align*}
\min_{\pi_1, \pi_2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} & \left( \|w_{10k}^k\|^2 + \|w_{20k}^k\|^2 + \|w_{11k}^{\pi_1(k)}\|^2 + \|w_{22k}^{\pi_2(k)}\|^2 \right) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad R_f^k \geq r_j, \quad 0 \leq j \leq 2, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K, \\
& \quad \|w_{10k}^k\|^2 + \|w_{11k}^{\pi_1(k)}\|^2 \leq P_{\text{max}}/K, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K, \\
& \quad \|w_{20k}^k\|^2 + \|w_{22k}^{\pi_2(k)}\|^2 \leq P_{\text{max}}/K, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K,
\end{align*}$$

(33)

where $R_f^k$ is the achievable rate of the user in the $k$-th group, which depends on the specific transmission scheme applied for this group, and $w_{10k}^k, w_{20k}^k, w_{11k}^{\pi_1(k)}$ and $w_{22k}^{\pi_2(k)}$ are the beamforming vectors for the grouped users $U_{0,k}$ and $U_{1,\pi_1(k)}$ and $U_{2,\pi_2(k)}$, respectively. For simplicity, the target rates of the CoMP users, and NOMA users are set as the same, respectively. Obviously, the task is how to group users and design beamforming vectors for each group. Problem (33) is a mixed integer programming problem, finding its optimal solution is very challenging. In this paper, a novel transmission scheme termed H-N-NOMA/QDUP is proposed. First, based

![Fig. 2. Illustration of the system model for multiple N-NOMA groups.](image-url)
on QD condition obtained in Section III, a greedy user pairing algorithm termed QDUP with low complexity is proposed to provide a sub-optimal solution. The proposed QDUP preferentially pairs users whose channels satisfy QD condition or orthogonality, for making the best of N-NOMA and ZFBF. Then, H-N-NOMA can be applied to serve users for each group.

Remark 3: The complexity of the proposed QDUP algorithm is \( O(K^3) \), while that of the exhaustive search is \( O((K^2)^2) \).

Remark 4: Note that the proposed scheme can also be generalized when there are \( K_0 \) CoMP users, \( K_1 \) NOMA users which are near to BS 1 and \( K_2 \) NOMA users which are near to BS 2, where \( K_0, K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) are not necessarily to be same. One way for the generalization is provided as follows. Firstly, let \( K = \max\{K_0, K_2, K_3\} \). Then, add \( \hat{K} - K_0 \), \( \hat{K} - K_1 \) and \( \hat{K} - K_2 \) virtual users to the CoMP users, the NOMA users of BS 1 and the NOMA users of BS 2, respectively, and set these users’ target rates as zero. Finally, the proposed H-N-NOMA/QDUP scheme can be applied to serve these \( 3\hat{K} \) users.

V. Numerical Results

In this section, numerical results are presented to demonstrate the channels’ quasi-degradation characteristic of the considered N-NOMA system. The performance of the proposed H-N-NOMA scheme and H-N-NOMA/QDUP scheme are also presented by providing comparisons with traditional transmission schemes in terms of outage probability and required minimal total transmission power. Rayleigh fading is considered for channel modeling, and the distribution of the channels are as set follows: \( h_{11}, h_{22} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2_{11}) \), and \( h_{10}, h_{20} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2_{10}) \), where \( \mathcal{CN} \) denotes the circularly symmetric complex gaussian (CSCG) distribution.

Fig. 3 shows the probabilities which are relevant to QD versus \( N \) and \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \). Note that \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \) represents the disparity between the channel conditions of the CoMP and NOMA users. The larger \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \) is, the weaker the channels of the CoMP user are, and the larger the disparity is. Specifically, Fig. 3(a) shows the occurrence probability of channels which make problem (8) feasible and satisfy QD condition, while Fig. 3(b) shows the conditional QD probability given that problem (8) is feasible, and Fig. 3(c) shows the probability of that problem (8) is feasible. As shown in Fig. 3(c), problem (8) is more likely to be feasible with a larger \( N \) and smaller \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \), which is consistent with common intuition. From Fig. 3(b), it can be observed that, with large \( N \) and small \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \), the conditional QD probability given problem (8) is feasible decreases with \( N \) and increases with \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \), which is the same as single cell NOMA [30]. However, the variation becomes a bit complicated when \( N \) is small and \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \) is large, which behaves quiet different from single cell NOMA [30]. From one point of view, when \( N \) is small, the conditional QD probability first increases with \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \) and then decreases slightly. From another point of view, when \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \) is large, the conditional QD probability first decreases, then increases, and finally decreases with \( N \). It is noteworthy that these different behaviors between N-NOMA and single cell NOMA are mainly caused by the maximum power constraint of each BS added in N-NOMA. Due to this considered constraint in N-NOMA, the optimal solutions switch among three cases for different channel realizations.

Fig. 4 shows more detailed statistics obtained from \( 10^7 \) independent channel realizations, which is helpful to understand the results shown in Fig. 3. Fig. 4(a), (b) and (c) show the frequencies of occurrence of the channels that make the optimal solutions of problem (8) belong to case I, case II and case III, respectively. Channels that are quasi-degraded and not quasi-degraded are also separated in the three sub-figures, respectively. A direct observation from Fig. 4 is that the proportion of Case I solutions are dominant compared to Case II and III in most of the situations. And the proportion of Case II solutions is larger than Case III. Moreover, from Fig. 4(a), the proportion of channels that result in Case I solutions decreases with \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \) for fixed \( N \). Besides, it can be observed that from Fig. 4(b), the proportion of the channels that result in Case II solutions first increases then decreases with \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \), when \( N = 2 \), while it increases with with \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \) when \( N = 4, 6, 8 \). From the three sub-figures, it can be find that when \( N \) is fixed, the QD proportion (or conditional QD probability) generally increases with \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \), which indicates that larger channel disparities is more beneficial for the application of N-NOMA.

Figs. 5 and 6 show the comparison between the proposed H-N-NOMA and traditional schemes, where one CoMP user and two NOMA users are served. Please note that simulation results for N-NOMA are obtained by solving problem (7) via the methods provided in Appendix A. Fig. 5 shows the outage probabilities achieved by different schemes versus \( N \). Note that the outage event is defined as that the corresponding total power minimization problem is infeasible. And the optimal OMA is based on TDMA with optimal time splitting. Fig. 5 shows that DPC scheme achieves the best outage performance while optimal TDMA scheme performs worst. It can be shown that H-N-NOMA outperforms optimal OMA, ZFBF and NOMA with NJT schemes. And the gap between H-N-NOMA and ZFBF becomes larger with a larger \( \sigma_0/\sigma_1 \), NOMA NJT only performs better than TDMA, which indicates the importance for taking JT into consideration. Another observation is that H-N-NOMA achieves higher outage probability compared pure N-NOMA scheme. However, H-N-NOMA has two advantages compared to pure N-NOMA as follows:

- Closed-form expressions for the optimal precoding of H-N-NOMA are available. However, it is difficult to obtain the closed-form expressions for N-NOMA, due to the non-convexity of problem (7). Thus, the design of the precoder for N-NOMA has to rely on iterative algorithms, which is much more complicated and inefficient for practical implementation than closed-form results driven H-N-NOMA.
- As shown later, H-N-NOMA combined with QDUP can outperform N-NOMA with random user pairing. Because
efficient user pairing algorithm for N-NOMA is difficult to obtain, while that for H-N-NOMA can be concisely given through the obtained QD condition. Fig. 6 shows the minimal total transmission power required by different schemes, when $P_{\text{max}} = \infty$. In this figure, an important observation needs to be highlighted that the minimal total transmission power required by NOMA NJT is same as that required by N-NOMA. Which means that N-NOMA degrades to NOMA NJT when the power of one BS is sufficiently large.
TABLE I

| Minimal total transmission powers of N-NOMA with and without ICI. | \( \sigma^2 = 0.0001 \), \( r_0 = 1.5 \) BPCU, \( r_1 = 2 \) BPCU, \( r_2 = 2 \) BPCU, \( N = 5 \) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Minimal power (W) \( D \) (m) | 10 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | 120 | 140 |
| Two cases | | | | | | | | |
| With ICI | 0.0306 | 0.0385 | 0.0735 | 0.1371 | 0.2339 | 0.3502 | 0.4943 | 0.6709 |
| Without ICI | 0.0368 | 0.0419 | 0.0748 | 0.1380 | 0.2347 | 0.3510 | 0.4950 | 0.6716 |

Figs. 7 and 8 show the comparison among the proposed H-N-NOMA/QDUP scheme with other benchmark schemes in terms of outage performance, in the scenario with multiple CoMP and NOMA users. These benchmark schemes are briefly described as follows:

- ZFBF/Ran: users are randomly paired and ZFBF is applied in each group;
- ZFBF/minCorr: CoMP users are sequentially paired with the NOMA users with largest channel angels, and ZFBF is applied in each group;
- H-N-NOMA/Ran: users are randomly grouped, and H-N-NOMA is applied in each group;
- H-N-NOMA/maxCorr: CoMP users are sequentially paired with the NOMA users with smallest channel angels, and H-N-NOMA is applied in each group;
- N-NOMA/Ran: users are randomly grouped, and N-NOMA is applied in each group;

The outage probabilities in Figs. 7 and 8 are obtained as follows. In each trial, users are divided into \( K \) groups. For each group, if the target rates of the users cannot be supported by the allocated power, then it is counted as one time of outage event. Finally, the outage probability can be calculated as:

\[
\frac{\text{number of outage groups}}{K \times \text{number of trials}}. \tag{34}
\]

Fig. 7 shows that, when \( K \geq 2 \), H-N-NOMA/QDUP outperforms H-N-NOMA/Ran, H-N-NOMA/maxCorr, ZFBF/Ran and ZFBF/minCorr schemes. When \( K \) is small,
H-N-NOMA/QDUP achieves higher outage probability than N-NOMA/Ran. However, H-N-NOMA/QDUP can effectively exploit the benefit of multi user diversity, and the achieved outage probability decreases with $K$, while that of N-NOMA/Ran don’t vary with $K$. And hence, H-N-NOMA/QDUP gradually outperforms N-NOMA/Ran as $K$ increases as shown in Fig. 7. In Fig. 8, $K$ is set to be 32, it can be observed that H-N-NOMA/QDUP outperforms all other schemes.

Table. I shows the minimal total transmission powers required by N-NOMA under the cases with and without ICI. BSs 1 and 2 are located at $(-D,0)$ and $(D,0)$, respectively, users 0, 1 and 2 are located at $(0,0),(-D+10,0)$ and $(D-10,0)$, respectively. The large scale path loss exponent parameter is set as 2. The results for both cases are obtained by using the same method as provided in Appendix A. From the table, it can be shown that as $D$ increases, i.e., the two cooperating BS getting farther from each other, the gap between the minimal total transmission powers of the two cases diminishes. This observation verifies the rationality of neglecting ICI when the two cooperating BSs are far enough.

VI. Conclusion

In this paper, quasi-degraded channel has been studied for downlink N-NOMA system with two BSs. Under quasi-degraded channels, given the users’ target rates and the maximum transmit power of each BS, N-NOMA can achieve the same minimal total transmission power as DPC. Mathematical condition for channels to satisfy QD has been rigorously derived. And closed-form expression for the optimal precoding vector of N-NOMA under quasi-degraded channel has also been provided. Based on the obtained closed-form results, a novel H-N-NOMA scheme has been proposed. Further, for the scenarios with more users, a low-complexity QD based user pairing (QDUP) algorithm has been proposed. Finally, QDUP and H-N-NOMA have been combined, and it has been shown that the proposed H-N-NOMA/QDUP scheme can effectively exploit the benefit of multi user diversity and outperform existing schemes.

APPENDIX A

SOLUTION FOR PROBLEM (7)

Note that, problem (7) can be divided into three cases:

a) $w_{10} \neq 0$ and $w_{20} \neq 0$; b) $w_{10} = 0$ and $w_{20} \neq 0$; c)
\( w_{10} \neq 0 \) and \( w_{20} = 0 \). By finding the solutions for the three cases and then comparing them, the optimal solution can be obtained. The three cases can be solved in a similar way, thus, in the following, only how the first case can be solved is provided.

By letting \( W_{10} = w_{10} W_{10}^H, W_{20} = w_{20} W_{20}^H, W_{11} = w_{11} W_{11}^H, \) and \( W_{22} = w_{22} W_{22}^H \), problem (7) can be transformed as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{W_{10}, W_{20}, W_{11}, W_{22}} & \quad \text{Tr} (W_{10} + W_{20} + W_{11} + W_{22}) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad -h_{10}^H W_{10} h_{10} - h_{20}^H W_{20} h_{20} + \epsilon_0 h_{10}^H W_{11} h_{10} + \epsilon_0 h_{20}^H W_{22} h_{20} + \epsilon_0 \sigma^2 \leq 0, \\
& \quad -h_{11}^H W_{11} h_{11} + \epsilon_0 h_{11}^H W_{11} h_{11} + \epsilon_0 \sigma^2 \leq 0, \\
& \quad -h_{22}^H W_{22} h_{22} + \epsilon_0 h_{22}^H W_{22} h_{22} + \epsilon_0 \sigma^2 \leq 0, \\
& \quad \text{Tr} (W_{10} + W_{11}) \leq P_{\text{max}}, \\
& \quad \text{Tr} (W_{20} + W_{22}) \leq P_{\text{max}}, \\
& \quad W_{10} \succeq 0, W_{11} \succeq 0, W_{20} \succeq 0, W_{22} \succeq 0, \\
& \quad \text{Rank} (W_{10}) = 1, \quad \text{Rank} (W_{11}) = 1, \\
& \quad \text{Rank} (W_{20}) = 1, \quad \text{Rank} (W_{22}) = 1.
\end{align*}
\]

Note that problem (35) is a non-convex semi-definite problem (SDP) with rank one constraints. It is usually challenging to obtain closed-form solutions for such problems. However, by applying semi-definite relaxation (SDR) technique with gaussian randomization [34], [35], an approximated optimal solution for problem (35) can be obtained. Note that after SDR, the remaining rank constraints in problem (35), i.e., removing the rank constraints in problem (35), becomes a convex problem and it can be efficiently solved by applying existing solvers such as CVX in Matlab.

**APPENDIX B**

**PROOF FOR LEMMA 1**

Problem (8) can be rewritten as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{w_{10}, w_{20}, w_{11}, w_{22}} & \quad ||w_{10}||^2 + ||w_{20}||^2 + ||w_{11}||^2 + ||w_{22}||^2 \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad -||h_{10}^H w_{10}||^2 - ||h_{20}^H w_{20}||^2 + \epsilon_0 (||h_{10}^H w_{11}||^2 + ||h_{20}^H w_{22}||^2 + \sigma^2) \leq 0, \\
& \quad -||h_{11}^H w_{11}||^2 + \sigma^2 \epsilon_1 \leq 0, \\
& \quad -||h_{22}^H w_{22}||^2 + \sigma^2 \epsilon_2 \leq 0, \\
& \quad ||w_{10}||^2 + ||w_{11}||^2 \leq P_{\text{max}}, \\
& \quad ||w_{20}||^2 + ||w_{22}||^2 \leq P_{\text{max}}.
\end{align*}
\]

This problem is a non-convex problem. However, as shown later, it can be transformed to a convex problem. An interesting observation is that: the directions of the optimal \( w_{10} \) and \( w_{20} \) should satisfy: \( w_{10} = \frac{\text{h}_{10}}{||\text{h}_{10}||}, w_{20} = \frac{\text{h}_{20}}{||\text{h}_{20}||} \). Thus, \( w_{10} \) and \( w_{20} \) can be expressed as: \( w_{10} = \sqrt{P_{10}} w_{10}, w_{20} = \sqrt{P_{20}} w_{20} \). Then, problem (36) can be rewritten as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{P_{10}, P_{20}, w_{11}, w_{22}} & \quad P_{10} + P_{20} + ||w_{11}||^2 + ||w_{22}||^2 \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad -||h_{10}||^2 P_{10} - ||h_{20}||^2 P_{20} + \epsilon_0 (||h_{10}^H w_{11}||^2 + ||h_{20}^H w_{22}||^2 + \sigma^2) \leq 0, \\
& \quad -||h_{11}^H w_{11}||^2 + \sigma^2 \epsilon_1 \leq 0, \\
& \quad -||h_{22}^H w_{22}||^2 + \sigma^2 \epsilon_2 \leq 0, \\
& \quad P_{10} + ||w_{11}||^2 \leq P_{\text{max}}, \\
& \quad P_{20} + ||w_{22}||^2 \leq P_{\text{max}}, \\
& \quad P_{10} \leq 0, \\
& \quad P_{20} \leq 0.
\end{align*}
\]

It can be found that, the constraints (37b), (37e)-(37h) are convex. Intuitively, (37c) is a non-convex constraint, however, in essence, it is a convex constraint, the reasons are as follows: first, multiply \( w_{10} \) with a complex number with modulus 1, denoted by \( e^{j\phi} \), such that \( h_{10}^H w_{10} \) is a positive real number, this operation will not change the optimality of the problem, then (37c) can be transformed into a linear constraint, and hence is convex. Similarly, constraint (37d) is also convex. Thus, problem (37) is a convex problem. The Lagrangian of problem (37) is:

\[
L = P_{10} + P_{20} + ||w_{11}||^2 + ||w_{22}||^2 + \lambda_1 ( -||h_{10}||^2 P_{10} - ||h_{20}||^2 P_{20} + \epsilon_0 (||h_{10}^H w_{11}||^2 + ||h_{20}^H w_{22}||^2 + \sigma^2) ) + \lambda_2 ( -||h_{11}^H w_{11}||^2 + \sigma^2 \epsilon_1 ) + \lambda_3 ( -||h_{22}^H w_{22}||^2 + \sigma^2 \epsilon_2 ) + \lambda_4 ( P_{10} + ||w_{11}||^2 - P_{\text{max}} ) + \lambda_5 ( P_{20} + ||w_{22}||^2 - P_{\text{max}} ) - \lambda_6 P_{10} - \lambda_7 P_{20}.
\]

where \( \lambda_i \geq 0, i = 1, 2, \ldots, 7 \) are the Lagrangian multipliers.

It is not difficult to find that the optimal \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \) must be larger than zero, and equality holds for the corresponding constraints. Then, according to the stationarity of the KKT condition, the following relationships can be established:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial L}{\partial P_{10}} & = 1 + \lambda_4 - \lambda_6 - \lambda_1 ||h_{10}||^2 = 0, \\
\frac{\partial L}{\partial P_{20}} & = 1 + \lambda_5 - \lambda_7 - \lambda_1 ||h_{10}||^2 = 0, \\
\frac{\partial L}{\partial w_{11}} & = 2(1 + \lambda_4) w_{11} + 2\lambda_1 \epsilon_0 h_{10}^H h_{10} w_{11} - 2\lambda_2 h_{11}^H h_{11} w_{11} = 0, \\
\frac{\partial L}{\partial w_{22}} & = 2(1 + \lambda_5) w_{22} + 2\lambda_1 \epsilon_0 h_{20}^H h_{20} w_{22} - 2\lambda_3 h_{22}^H h_{22} w_{22} = 0.
\end{align*}
\]

From the first two equations above, it is easy to get the following relationships:

\[
\frac{\lambda_1}{1 + \lambda_4 - \lambda_6} = \frac{1}{||h_{10}||^2}.
\]
While from the later two equations, the followings can be obtained:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{w}_{11} &= \left( I + \frac{\lambda_2}{1 + \lambda_4} \mathbf{h}_{10}^H \right)^{-1} \lambda_2 \mathbf{h}_{11}^H \mathbf{w}_{11} \\
\mathbf{w}_{22} &= \left( I + \frac{\lambda_2}{1 + \lambda_4} \mathbf{h}_{20}^H \right)^{-1} \lambda_3 \mathbf{h}_{22}^H \mathbf{w}_{22}
\end{align*}
\]

Let \( y = \frac{\lambda_2}{1 + \lambda_4} \mathbf{h}_{10}^H \), and value range of \( y \) can be obtained as similar to (44) and Sherman Morrison equation, \( \mathbf{w}_{22} \) can be rewritten as:

\[
\mathbf{w}_{22} = \left( I - \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} \mathbf{h}_{20}^H ||\mathbf{h}_{20}||^2 \right) ||\mathbf{h}_{11}|| \mathbf{w}_{22}.
\]

Further, let \( x = \frac{t_2 \mathbf{h}_{10}^H}{1 + t_2 ||\mathbf{h}_{10}||^2} \), and let equality holds in constraint (37c), the expression of \( P_{11} \) can be obtained. Moreover, according to (43), it is obtained that \( 0 < x \leq \epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0) \).

Similarly, \( \mathbf{w}_{22} \) can be expressed as \( \mathbf{w}_{22} = \sqrt{P_{22}} \mathbf{w}_{22} \), and let equality holds in constraint (37d), the expression of \( P_{22}(x) \) can be obtained. According to (43), it is obtained that \( 0 < x \leq \epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0) \).

Thus, the left task is to find the optimal \( x \).

Let \( G(x) = F_{20}(x) + P_{11}(x) \), and take the derivative of \( G(x) \) with respect to \( x \), we have

\[
G'(x) = F'_{20}(x) + F'_{11}(x).
\]

Thus, in interval \( 0 < x \leq \epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0) \), it is easy to have the following observations:

a) \( F_{20} \) decreases with \( x \);

b) \( P_{11} \) increases with \( x \);

c) \( G(x) \) first decreases with \( x \) and then increases.

Let \( G'(x) = 0 \), the extreme point can be obtained:

\[
\sigma = \frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon_0 + ||\mathbf{h}_{20}||^2/||\mathbf{h}_{10}||^2}.
\]

Let \( \tilde{x} \) be the largest \( x \) in interval \( [0, \epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0)] \) which satisfies constraint (52b), obviously, \( \tilde{x} \) exists if and only if \( P_{11}(0) < P_{max} \).

If \( P_{11}(0) < P_{max} \), then the optimal solution is restricted to be located in \( (0, \tilde{x}) \). Further, take constraint (52c) into consideration, let \( \tilde{x} \) be the minimal \( x \) in interval \( (0, \tilde{x}) \) which satisfies constraint (52c), and \( \tilde{x} \) exists if and only if:

\[
P_{20}(\tilde{x}) \leq P_{max} - P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0))
\]

Under the condition that \( \tilde{x} \) and \( \tilde{x} \) exist, it is not to derive their expressions as shown in the theorem. Hence, the optimal solution of \( x \) is restricted to be located in \( [\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}] \). Finally, by using the relationship between \( x_{\text{ext}} \) and \( \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \), the expression of the optimal solution can be obtained, and the proof is complete.

**APPENDIX D**

**PROOF FOR THEOREM 2**

Given \( P_{10} > 0 \) and \( P_{20} > 0 \), according to the complementary slackness of the KKT condition of problem (37), we have \( \lambda_6 = 0 \) and \( \lambda_7 = 0 \), and based on (43) and (51), we have \( x_{\text{opt}} = \epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0) \) and \( y_{\text{opt}} = \epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0) \). Then by applying Lemma 1, the optimal \( P_{11}, P_{22}, \mathbf{w}_{11}, \) and \( \mathbf{w}_{22} \) can be determined. Then, the optimization problem (8) can be simplified to:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{min} & \quad P_{10} + P_{20} \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad ||\mathbf{h}_{10}||^2 P_{10} + ||\mathbf{h}_{20}||^2 P_{20} = P_{11}(x_{\text{opt}}) \\
& \quad 0 \leq P_{10} \leq P_{max} - P_{11}(x_{\text{opt}}) \\
& \quad 0 \leq P_{20} \leq P_{max} - P_{22}(y_{\text{opt}})
\end{align*}
\]
Problem (57) is a linear programming problem with variables $P_{10}$ and $P_{20}$ and it can be easily solved. Constraints (57c) and (57d) provides the feasibility condition for the problem. Note that $||h_{20}||$ is larger than $||h_{10}||$, which means it is better to use as much $P_{20}$ as possible. Based on the observation, the optimal solution can be obtained and the proof is complete.

**APPENDIX E**

**PROOF FOR THEOREM 3**

In problem (37), according to the complementary slackness of the KKT condition, we have: $\lambda_6 P_{10} = 0$, $\lambda_7 P_{20} = 0$. Since $P_{20} = 0$ and $P_{20} > 0$ are assumed, it can be concluded that $\lambda_6 = 0$. By taking $\lambda_6 = 0$ into (43), it is obtained that: $\lambda_1 / 1 + \lambda_4 = 1 / ||h_{10}||^2$. Thus $t_x = 1 / ||h_{10}||^2$ and the value of optimal $x$ denoted by $x_{opt}$ can be obtained: $x_{opt} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0}$.

Further, by noting that constraint (37b) should take mark of $y = F_{\max}$, thus $y_{\max}$, we have $y_{\max} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0}$.

Let $Q(y) = F_{10}(y) + P_{22}(y)$, and take the derivative of $Q(y)$ with respect to $y$, we have $Q'(y) = F_{10}'(y) + P_{22}'(y)$, where

$$F_{10}'(y) = \frac{2\sigma^2 \epsilon_0 ||h_{20}||^2 (C - D)(y - 1)}{||h_{10}||^2 (C - Dy)^3}$$

$$P_{22}'(y) = \frac{2\sigma^2 \epsilon_0 (C - D) D y}{(C - Dy)^3}$$

When $0 < y < 1$, it is not hard to have the following observations: (a) $F_{10}$ decreases with $y$ and $F_{10}'$ increases with $y$; (b) $P_{22}$ increases with $y$ and $P_{22}'$ increases with $y$. Thus $Q'(y)$ increases with $y$ when $0 < y < 1$. Let $Q'(y) = 0$, the extreme point can be obtained:

$$y_{ext} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0}$$

Since $||h_{10}|| < ||h_{20}||$, it can be concluded that $y_{ext} > \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0}$. Thus, in interval $0 < y \leq \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0}$, $Q'(y)$ decreases with $y$.

Let $y_B$ be the largest $y$ in interval $(0, \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0})$ which satisfies constraint (52b). Then (58) is feasible if and only if $y_B$ exist and $F_{10}(y_B) \leq P_{max} - P_{11}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0))$ (58c).

Obviously, $y_B$ exists if and only if $F_{22}(0) < P_{max}$. If problem (58) is feasible, then $y_B$ is the optimal $y$, i.e., $y_{opt} = y_B$.

**APPENDIX F**

**PROOF FOR PROPOSITION 1**

We use proof by contradiction to prove Proposition 1. Assume that the optimal solution belongs to the third case. Since problem (8) is feasible when $P_{20} > 0$, from Corollary 2, it can be obtained that $P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0)) < P_{max}$. Thus, from Theorem 3, it can be obtained that:

$$P_{10, opt} = F_{10}(y_{opt}) \quad P_{20, opt} = 0 \quad x_{opt} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0}$$

Let

$$P_1'_{opt} = \max \left\{ 0, F_{20} \left( \frac{\epsilon_0}{1 + \epsilon_0} \right) \frac{||h_{20}||^2}{||h_{10}||^2} \left( P_{max} - P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0)) \right) \right\}$$

$$P_2'_{opt} = P_{max} - P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0))$$

$$x'_{opt} = x_{opt} \quad y'_{opt} = y_{opt}$$

It can be easily proved that the tuple $(P_1'_{opt}, P_2'_{opt}, x'_{opt}, y'_{opt})$ is a feasible solution of problem (8), which belongs to Case I or II, and is better than $(P_{10, opt}, P_{20, opt}, x_{opt}, y_{opt})$. This contradicts with that $(P_{10, opt}, P_{20, opt}, x_{opt}, y_{opt})$ is the optimal solution and the proof is complete.

**APPENDIX G**

**PROOF FOR PROPOSITION 2**

The proof for Theorem (2) can be divided into three cases:

1) When $x_{opt} = x_A$: For this case, we have $x_A < x_A$, and the value $x_{opt}$ is the optimal solution of problem (8), thus, there must exist a optimal solution $x_{opt}$ and $x_{opt}$ $x_{opt}$ such that:

$$P_{10} + P_{20} + P_{11}(x') < P_{20, opt} + P_{11}(x_{opt})$$

$$P_{10} > 0, P_{20} > 0$$

Note that, $x'$ must be smaller than $x_A$, i.e., $x_{opt}$. Besides, $P_{10}$ and $P_{20}$ should satisfy:

$$||h_{10}||^2 P_{10} + ||h_{20}||^2 P_{20} = ||h_{20}||^2 F_{20}(x')$$

According to $||h_{20}|| > ||h_{10}||$, we have $P_{10} + P_{20} > F_{20}(x')$, we have:

$$P_{10} + P_{20} + P_{11}(x') - (P_{20, opt} + P_{11}(x_{opt})) > 0$$

which is contradict with (64).

2) $x_{opt} = x_A$: Assume that $P_{10, opt}$, $P_{20, opt}$ and $x_{opt}$ is not the optimal solution of problem (8). Thus, there must exist an optimal solution $x_{opt}$, and $x_{opt}$ such that:

$$P_{10} + P_{20} + P_{11}(x') < P_{20, opt} + P_{11}(x_{opt})$$

Note that, similar to the proof for the case when $x_{opt} = x_A$, it can be proved that $x'$ must satisfy $x' < x_A$. In that case, (65) also needs to be satisfied. According to the fact that $F_{20}(x)$ is monotonically decreasing with $x$, and $F_{20}(x_A) = P_{max} - P_{22}(\epsilon_0/(1 + \epsilon_0))$, the optimal $P_{20}$
should be \( p'_{20} = p_{\text{max}} - p_{22}(\varepsilon_0/(1 + \varepsilon_0)) \), thus the following relationship can be obtained:

\[
(p'_{20} + p'_{10} + p_{11}(x')) - (p_{20, \text{opt}} + p_{11}(x_{\text{opt}})) = (p_{\text{max}} - p_{22}(\varepsilon_0/(1 + \varepsilon_0)) + p'_{10} + p_{11}(x')) - (p_{\text{max}} - p_{22}(\varepsilon_0/(1 + \varepsilon_0)) + p_{11}(x_{\text{opt}})) \]

\[
= \left(\frac{\|h_{20}\|^2}{\|h_{10}\|^2} + 1\right) p_{11}(x') - \left(\frac{\|h_{20}\|^2}{\|h_{10}\|^2} + 1\right) p_{11}(x_{\text{opt}}) + p_{20}(x_{\text{opt}}) \cdot
\]

(68)

Define a new function: \( \tilde{G}(x) = \frac{\|h_{20}\|^2}{\|h_{10}\|^2} F_{20}(x) + p_{11}(x) \), by taking the derivatives of \( \tilde{G}(x) \), it can be concluded that \( \tilde{G}(x) \) is monotonically decreasing with \( x \) when \( 0 < x \leq \varepsilon_0/(1 + \varepsilon_0) \), thus \( (p'_{20} + p'_{10} + p_{11}(x')) - (p_{20, \text{opt}} + p_{11}(x_{\text{opt}})) > 0 \), which leads to the contradiction.

3) \( x_{\text{opt}} = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2\|h_{20}\|^2/\|h_{10}\|^2} \). For this case, the optimal solution is the same as the case where there is no power constraint, as shown in Corollary 1. Thus, there is no feasible solutions which are more optimal.
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