

Multi-cell MIMO Downlink with Fairness Criteria: the Large-System Limit

Hoon Huh*, Giuseppe Caire*, Sung-Hyun Moon†, and Inkyu Lee†

*University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Email: hhuh, caire@usc.edu

†Korea University, Seoul, Korea, Email: shmoon, inkyu@korea.ac.kr

Abstract—We consider the downlink of a cellular network with multiple cells and multi-antenna base stations including arbitrary inter-cell cooperation, realistic distance-dependent pathloss and general “fairness” requirements. Beyond Monte Carlo simulation, no efficient computation method to evaluate the ergodic throughput of such systems has been provided so far. We propose a method based on the combination of some large random matrix results with Lagrangian optimization. The proposed method is computationally much more efficient than Monte Carlo simulation and provides a very accurate approximation (almost indistinguishable) for the actual finite-dimensional case, even for of a small number of user terminals and base station antennas. Numerical examples include a planar (two-dimensional) 7-cell layout, with no inter-cell cooperation, sector cooperation and full inter-cell cooperation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Multuser MIMO (MU-MIMO) technology is expected to play a key role in future wireless cellular networks. In particular, the MIMO Gaussian broadcast channel serves as an information theoretic model for the MU-MIMO downlink and its capacity was studied and characterized in [1]–[3]. In a multi-cell scenario, depending on the level of BS cooperation, we are in the presence of a MIMO broadcast and interference problem, which is not yet fully understood in the information theoretic sense. In this work we restrict to the case where clusters of cooperating BSs act as a single distributed MIMO transmitter, and where interference from other clusters of BSs is treated as noise. However, our framework encompasses arbitrary cooperation clusters. Multi-cell systems under full and partial cooperation have been widely studied under the so-called “Wyner model” [4]–[8] that assumes a very simplified and rather unrealistic model for the pathloss that essentially makes the system symmetric with respect to any given user. As a matter of fact, users in different locations of the cellular coverage are subject to distance-dependent pathloss that may have more than 30 dB dynamic range. It follows that in these realistic propagation conditions users are not symmetric at all. Therefore, studying the downlink sum-capacity (or achievable sum-throughput, under some suboptimal scheme) makes almost no sense from a system performance viewpoint: rate and power optimization would lead to the solution of letting only the users very close to a BS to transmit, while leaving the users at the cell edges to starve. In order to prevent this problem, *downlink scheduling* has been widely studied in order to achieve a good balance between network efficiency and “fairness” (see for example [9]–[11]) and refs. therein).

The goal of fairness scheduling is to make the system operate at a rate point of its ergodic achievable rate region such that a suitable concave and increasing *network utility function* is maximized [12]. Taking into account realistic pathloss models, multi-cell systems with arbitrary inter-cell cooperation clusters and fairness requirements makes system analysis extremely complicated. In fact, so far, the system performance has been evaluated only through extensive and computationally very intensive Monte Carlo simulation.

In this work we consider a particular “large-system” limit that can be studied using known results from large random matrix theory [13]–[15] and combine it with Lagrange optimization in order to obtain a numerical “almost” closed-form analysis tool that incorporates all the above system aspects. The proposed method is much more efficient than Monte Carlo simulation and, somehow surprisingly, provides results that match very closely the performance of finite-dimensional systems, even for very small dimension.

II. SYSTEM SETUP

Consider M BSs with $N\gamma$ antennas each, and KN single-antenna user terminals, distributed in some cellular coverage region. Users are divided into K co-located “user groups” of equal size N . Users in the same group are statistically equivalent: they see the same pathloss to all BSs, and their small-scale fading channel coefficients are iid.¹ The received signal vector $\mathbf{y}_k = [y_{k,1} \cdots y_{k,N}]^T \in \mathbb{C}^N$ for the k -th user group is given by

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \sum_{m=1}^M \alpha_{m,k} \mathbf{H}_{m,k}^H \mathbf{x}_m + \mathbf{n}_k \quad (1)$$

where $\alpha_{m,k}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{m,k}$ denote the the distance dependent pathloss and $N\gamma \times N$ small-scale channel fading matrix from the m -th BS to the k -th user group, respectively, $\mathbf{x}_m = [x_{m,1} \cdots x_{m,N\gamma}]^T \in \mathbb{C}^{N\gamma}$ is the transmitted signal vector, subject to the power constraint $\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x}_m)) \leq P_m$, and $\mathbf{n}_k = [n_{k,1} \cdots n_{k,N}]^T \in \mathbb{C}^N$ denotes the AWGN at the users’ receivers. The elements of \mathbf{n}_k and of $\mathbf{H}_{m,k}$ are iid $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$.

We define the BS partition $\{\mathcal{M}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{M}_L\}$ of the set $\{1, \cdots, M\}$ and the corresponding user group partition

¹In practice, co-located users are separated by a sufficient number of wavelength such that they undergo iid small-scale fading. However, the wavelength is sufficiently small so that they all have essentially the same distance-dependent pathloss.

$\{\mathcal{K}_1, \dots, \mathcal{K}_L\}$ of the set $\{1, \dots, K\}$, where L is the number of cooperating clusters. The ℓ -th cooperating cluster is formed by the BSs in \mathcal{M}_ℓ , acting effectively as a distributed MIMO transmitter, and the users in \mathcal{K}_ℓ . We assume that each cluster has perfect channel state information for all terminals in the same cluster, and *statistical information* (i.e., known distributions but not the instantaneous values) relative to signals from other clusters. Under our assumptions, the interference plus noise variance at any user terminal in group $k \in \mathcal{K}_\ell$ is given by

$$\sigma_k^2 = 1 + \sum_{m \notin \mathcal{M}_\ell} \alpha_{m,k}^2 P_m. \quad (2)$$

Hence, from the viewpoint of cluster \mathcal{M}_ℓ , the system is equivalent to a single-cell MIMO downlink channel given by

$$\mathbf{y}_\ell = \mathbf{H}_\ell^H \mathbf{x}_\ell + \mathbf{v}_\ell \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{y}_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^{N|\mathcal{K}_\ell|}$ is the received signal vector formed by $\{\mathbf{y}_k : k \in \mathcal{K}_\ell\}$, $\mathbf{v}_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^{N|\mathcal{K}_\ell|}$ is a Gaussian interference-plus noise vector with independent components and block-diagonal covariance matrix $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}_\ell \mathbf{v}_\ell^H] = \text{diag}(\sigma_k^2 \mathbf{I}_N : k \in \mathcal{K}_\ell)$ and $\mathbf{H}_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^{N\gamma|\mathcal{M}_\ell| \times N|\mathcal{K}_\ell|}$ is the matrix

$$\mathbf{H}_\ell = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{m_1, k_1} \mathbf{H}_{m_1, k_1} & \cdots & \alpha_{m_1, k_{|\mathcal{K}_\ell|}} \mathbf{H}_{m_1, k_{|\mathcal{K}_\ell|}} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \alpha_{m_{|\mathcal{M}_\ell|}, 1} \mathbf{H}_{m_{|\mathcal{M}_\ell|}, 1} & \cdots & \alpha_{m_{|\mathcal{M}_\ell|}, k_{|\mathcal{K}_\ell|}} \mathbf{H}_{m_{|\mathcal{M}_\ell|}, k_{|\mathcal{K}_\ell|}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

For the sake of system optimization, we introduce the ‘‘dual uplink’’ channel model [2], [16], [17] corresponding to (3) given by

$$\mathbf{r} = \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{w} \quad (5)$$

where we define the transmit signal $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{C}^{NA}$ with diagonal covariance matrix \mathbf{Q} , subject to $\text{tr}(\mathbf{Q}) \leq Q$, the AWGN vector $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{NB})$ and the channel matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} \in \mathbb{C}^{NB \times NA}$ formed by the blocks $\beta_{m,k} \mathbf{H}_{m,k}$ in the same way as in (4) and where, for the sake of notation simplicity, we let $A = |\mathcal{K}_\ell|$, $B = \gamma|\mathcal{M}_\ell|$, $Q = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}_\ell} P_m$, and $\beta_{m,k} = \frac{\alpha_{m,k}}{\sigma_k}$.

We assume that the pathloss coefficients are fixed while the small-scale fading coefficients change in time according to some ergodic process with the assigned first-order $\mathcal{NC}(0, 1)$ iid distribution. This is representative of a typical situation where the distance between users and BSs changes significantly over a time-scale of the order of the tens of seconds, while the small-scale fading decorrelates completely within a few milliseconds [18]. In this regime, the goal of downlink scheduling is to maximize a suitable strictly increasing and concave network utility function $g(\cdot)$ of the users ergodic rates [12]. By symmetry, all users in the same group should achieve the same ergodic rate. However, users in different groups may operate at different rates, depending on the network utility function $g(\cdot)$. Letting $\mathbf{R} = [R_1, R_2, \dots, R_A]$ where R_k is the common ergodic rate of users in group k , the fairness scheduling problem is formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && g(\mathbf{R}) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{erg}}(Q) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\text{erg}}(Q)$ is the region of achievable ergodic group rates of system (5) (equivalently, of the ℓ -th cluster with channel model defined in (3)) for given sum power Q .

III. WEIGHTED ERGODIC SUM RATE MAXIMIZATION

In this section we recall the computation algorithm of [13] to solve, in the limit for $N \rightarrow \infty$, the weighted ergodic rate maximization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{k=1}^A W_k R_k \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{erg}}(Q) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This is a fundamental building block for the computation of (6). The exposition in this section is necessarily brief. More details can be found in [13] and references therein.

Let π denote the permutation such that $W_{\pi_1} \leq \dots \leq W_{\pi_A}$, and define $\Theta_{k:A} = \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k:A} \mathbf{Q}_{k:A} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k:A}^H$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{k:A}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{k:A}$ denote the channel and the input covariance sub-matrices restricted to the user groups π_k, \dots, π_A . By symmetry, we have that all users in group k are allocated the same (uplink) power Q_k . After dividing the channel coefficients by \sqrt{N} , the power constraint for any N remains as before: $\sum_{k=1}^A Q_k \leq Q$. For the dual uplink channel (5), the weighted sum-rate is maximized by a block successive interference cancellation decoding strategy that decodes jointly the users in groups π_1, \dots, π_A , and after decoding each group subtracts it from the received signal. It follows that the problem (7) reduces to the maximization with respect to \mathbf{Q} of the objective function

$$F_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{Q}) = \sum_{k=1}^A \Delta_k \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\log |\mathbf{I} + \Theta_{k:A}|] \quad (8)$$

where $\Delta_k = W_{\pi_k} - W_{\pi_{k-1}}$ with $W_{\pi_0} \triangleq 0$. Using the differentiation rule $\partial \log |\mathbf{X}| = \text{tr}(\mathbf{X}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{X})$ and the *Karush-Kuhn-Tucker* (KKT) conditions applied to the Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Q}, \lambda) = F_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{Q}) - \lambda(\text{tr}(\mathbf{Q}) - Q)$, we can eliminate the Lagrange multiplier λ by imposing that the power constraint holds with equality and we easily obtain

$$Q_{\pi_k} = Q \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \Delta_i \left(1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\text{mmse}_{i:A}^{(k)} \right] \right)}{\sum_{j=1}^A \sum_{i=1}^j \Delta_i \left(1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\text{mmse}_{i:A}^{(j)} \right] \right)}. \quad (9)$$

where $\text{mmse}_{i:A}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{I} - Q_{\pi_k} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\pi_k}^H \Theta_{i:A}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\pi_k} \right]$ is the average MMSE estimation error for the input symbols of group π_k , with $k \geq i$, from the observation \mathbf{r} in (5) after removal of groups π_1, \dots, π_{i-1} , and where $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\pi_k}$ denotes the $NB \times NA$ submatrix of $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ corresponding to the group π_k .

For finite N , the amount of calculation in order to evaluate the solution of (9) via the iterative algorithm analogous to [19, Algorithm 1] is tremendous because the average MMSE terms must be computed by Monte Carlo simulation. In the following, we consider the large system regime where we let $N \rightarrow \infty$ and, by using the asymptotic random matrix results of [15], we arrive at a computationally efficient algorithm. Letting $\Upsilon_{i:A}^{(k)} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{mmse}_{i:A}^{(k)}$, and defining $\Gamma_{i:A}^{(k)} = 1/\Upsilon_{i:A}^{(k)} - 1$, a

direct application of [15, Lemma 1] yields $\Gamma_{i:A}^{(k)}$ as the solution of the fixed-point equation:

$$\Gamma_{i:A}^{(k)} = \gamma Q_{\pi_k} \sum_{m=1}^{B/\gamma} \frac{\beta_{m,\pi_k}^2}{1 + \sum_{j=i}^A \frac{\beta_{m,\pi_j}^2 Q_{\pi_j}}{1 + \Gamma_{i:A}^{(k)}}}. \quad (10)$$

By combining (10) with the iterative algorithm [19, Algorithm 1], that converges to the KKT conditions (9), we obtain Algorithm 1 below (for notation simplicity, the algorithm is written assuming $\pi_k = k$ for all $k = 1, \dots, A$).

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for weighted sum rate maximization

- 1) Initialize $\mathbf{Q}(0) = \frac{Q}{A} \mathbf{I}_A$.
- 2) For $\ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, iterate until the following solution settles:

$$Q_k(\ell + 1) = Q \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \Delta_i (1 - \Upsilon_{i:A}^{(k)}(\ell))}{\sum_{j=1}^A \sum_{i=1}^j \Delta_i (1 - \Upsilon_{i:A}^{(j)}(\ell))}, \quad (11)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, A$, where $\Upsilon_{i:A}^{(k)}(\ell) = 1/(1 + \Gamma_{i:A}^{(k)}(\ell))$, and $\Gamma_{i:A}^{(k)}(\ell)$ is obtained as the solution (also obtained by iteration) of (10) for powers $Q_i = Q_i(\ell)$.

- 3) Denote by $\Gamma_{i:A}^{(k)}(\infty)$, $\Upsilon_{i:A}^{(k)}(\infty)$ and by $Q_i(\infty)$ the fixed points reached by the iteration at point 2). If the condition

$$Q \sum_{i=1}^k \Delta_i \Gamma_{i:A}^{(k)}(\infty) \leq \sum_{j=1}^A \sum_{i=1}^j \Delta_i (1 - \Upsilon_{i:A}^{(j)}(\infty))$$

is satisfied for all k such that $Q_k(\infty) = 0$, then stop. Otherwise, set $Q_k = 0$ for k corresponding to the lowest value of $\sum_{i=1}^k \Delta_i \Gamma_{i:A}^{(k)}(\infty)$ and repeat steps 2) and 3).

After the powers $Q_k^* = Q_k(\infty)$ have been obtained from Algorithm 1, it remains to compute the user ergodic rates. We have

$$R_{\pi_k} = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\log |\mathbf{I} + \Theta_{k:A}|] - \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\log |\mathbf{I} + \Theta_{k+1:A}|] \quad (12)$$

In the limit for $N \rightarrow \infty$, we can use the asymptotic analytical expression for the mutual information given in [14]. Adapting [14, Result 1] to our case, we obtain $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\log |\mathbf{I} + \Theta_{k:A}|]$ in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=k}^A \log \left(1 + \gamma \sum_{m=1}^{B/\gamma} Q_{\pi_j}^* \beta_{m,\pi_j}^2 u_m \right) \\ & + \gamma \sum_{m=1}^{B/\gamma} \log \left(1 + \sum_{j=k}^A Q_{\pi_j}^* \beta_{m,\pi_j}^2 v_j \right) \\ & - \gamma \sum_{j=k}^A \sum_{m=1}^{B/\gamma} Q_{\pi_j}^* \beta_{m,\pi_j}^2 u_m v_j \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\{u_m\}$ and $\{v_j\}$ are the unique solutions to the system

of fixed point equations

$$\begin{aligned} u_m &= \left(1 + \sum_{j=k}^A Q_{\pi_j}^* \beta_{m,\pi_j}^2 v_j \right)^{-1}, \quad m = 1, \dots, B/\gamma \\ v_j &= \left(1 + \gamma \sum_{m=1}^{B/\gamma} Q_{\pi_j}^* \beta_{m,\pi_j}^2 u_m \right)^{-1}, \quad j = k, \dots, A. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

IV. INTRODUCING FAIRNESS

In a finite dimensional system, a dynamic scheduling policy allocate powers and rates in order to let the system ergodic rate point (i.e., the time-average user rates) be as closed as possible to the solution of (6). This can be systematically obtained using the stochastic optimization approach of [10], [11], based on the idea of ‘‘virtual queues’’. For a deterministic network, this approach coincides with Lagrangian duality with outer subgradient iteration, where the Lagrangian dual variables play the same role of the virtual queues backlogs in the dynamic scheduling policy. Under the large system limit, the channel uncertainty disappears and the multi-cell MU-MIMO system becomes indeed deterministic. Hence, the problem (6) for large N can be addressed directly, using Lagrangian duality.

We rewrite (6) using auxiliary variables $\mathbf{r} = [r_1, \dots, r_A]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{Q}, \pi} g(\mathbf{r}) \\ & \text{s.t. } r_{\pi_k} \leq \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\log \frac{|\mathbf{I} + \Theta_{k:A}|}{|\mathbf{I} + \Theta_{k+1:A}|} \right], \quad \forall k, \\ & \text{tr}(\mathbf{Q}) \leq Q \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The Lagrange function of problem (15) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{Q}, \pi, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \\ & = \underbrace{g(\mathbf{r})}_{f\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{r})} - \sum_{k=1}^A r_{\pi_k} \mu_{\pi_k} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^A \mu_{\pi_k} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\log \frac{|\mathbf{I} + \Theta_{k:A}|}{|\mathbf{I} + \Theta_{k+1:A}|} \right]}_{h_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^N(\mathbf{Q}, \pi)} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ denotes the dual variables for the rate constraints. The Lagrange dual function for (16) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \max_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{Q}, \pi} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{Q}, \pi, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \\ &= \underbrace{\max_{\mathbf{r}} f\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{r})}_{(a)} + \underbrace{\max_{\mathbf{Q}, \pi} h_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^N(\mathbf{Q}, \pi)}_{(b)} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

and it is obtained by the decoupled maximization in (a) (with respect to \mathbf{r}) and in (b) (with respect to \mathbf{Q}, π) in (17). Finally, we can solve the dual problem defined as

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \geq 0} \mathcal{G}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad (18)$$

Since the maximization of (b) is a weighted ergodic sum-rate maximization for weights $\mathbf{W} = \boldsymbol{\mu}$, it follows that the optimal

π^* is the permutation that sorts μ in non-decreasing order (see Section III). For $\pi = \pi^*$, the Lagrangian function is concave in \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{Q} and convex in μ . The solution (saddle point of the min-max problem) can be found via inner-outer iterations.

Inner Problem: For given μ , we solve the maximization problem in (17) with respect to \mathbf{r} , \mathbf{Q} and π .

• Subproblem (a): Since $f_{\mu}(\mathbf{r})$ is concave in $\mathbf{r} \geq 0$, the maximum of $f_{\mu}(\mathbf{r})$ is easily achieved by imposing the KKT conditions:

$$\frac{\partial g(\mathbf{r})}{\partial r_k} - \mu_k \leq 0, \quad \forall k \quad (19)$$

where equality must hold for all k such that the solution is positive, i.e., $r_k^* > 0$.

• Subproblem (b): As said, this problem is a weighed ergodic rate sum maximization and, for $N \rightarrow \infty$ can be solved by Algorithm 1.

Outer Problem: Once the optimal \mathbf{r}^* , \mathbf{Q}^* and π^* are obtained for given μ , the minimization of $\mathcal{G}(\mu)$ with respect to $\mu \geq \mathbf{0}$ can be obtained by a subgradient-based method. For any fixed μ', μ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\mu') &= \max_{\mathbf{r}} f_{\mu'}(\mathbf{r}) + \max_{\mathbf{Q}} h_{\mu'}^{\infty}(\mathbf{Q}, \pi^*) \\ &\geq f_{\mu'}(\mathbf{r}^*) + h_{\mu'}^N(\mathbf{Q}^*, \pi^*) \\ &= \mathcal{G}(\mu) + \sum_{k=1}^A (\mu'_{\pi_k^*} - \mu_{\pi_k^*}) (R_{\pi_k^*} - r_{\pi_k^*}) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $R_{\pi_k^*}$ is the π_k^* group rate obtained from Algorithm 1 with weights μ . Then, the vector with components $R_{\pi_k^*} - r_{\pi_k^*}$ is a subgradient for $\mathcal{G}(\mu)$ and the dual variables $\mu_{\pi_k^*}$ are updated at each n -th outer iteration as

$$\mu_{\pi_k^*}^{(n+1)} = \mu_{\pi_k^*}^{(n)} - s \left(R_{\pi_k^*}^{(n)} - r_{\pi_k^*}^{(n)} \right), \quad \forall k \quad (21)$$


for some step size $s > 0$. It should be noticed that by setting $s = 1$ this subgradient update plays the same role of the virtual queue update in the dynamic scheduling policy of [10], [11].

As an application example of the above general optimization, we focus on the two special cases of *proportional fairness scheduling* (PFS) and *hard fairness scheduling* (HFS), also known as max-min fairness scheduling. PFS corresponds to the network utility function $g(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{k=1}^K C \log(r_k)$ for some constant $C > 0$. In this case, the optimality condition (19) at outer iteration n yields $r_k^{(n)} = \frac{C}{\mu_k^{(n)}}$.


HFS corresponds to the network utility function $g(\mathbf{r}) = \min_{k=1, \dots, A} C r_k$. The optimization problem can be re-written as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{r, \mathbf{Q}, \pi} \quad & Cr \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & r \leq \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\log \frac{|\mathbf{I} + \Theta_{k:A}|}{|\mathbf{I} + \Theta_{k+1:A}|} \right], \quad \forall k \\ & \text{tr}(\mathbf{Q}) \leq Q \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Replicating the same approach of before for this case, with the corresponding changes, at the outer iteration n we find $r^{(n)} = \frac{1}{A} \sum_{k=1}^A R_{\pi_k^*}^{(n)}$.



(a) Proportional fairness scheduling



(b) Hard fairness scheduling

Fig. 1. Individual group rates normalized by N for $\gamma = 4$ and $K = 4$ in the 2-cell model

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We present numerical examples for a one-dimensional 2-cell model ($M = 2$) and two-dimensional three-sector 7-cell model ($M = 21$). In both models, the system parameters and pathloss model are based on the mobile WiMAX system specification [20], except for cell radius 1.0 km and no shadowing assumption. In the 2-cell model, we suppose two one-sided cells with BSs located at -1 km and 1 km, with $\gamma = 4$, and $K = 8$ user groups equally spaced between the BSs. We consider the case of full BS cooperation and no cooperation with a symmetric partition of the users, namely: $L = 2$, $\mathcal{K}_1 = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $\mathcal{K}_2 = \{5, 6, 7, 8\}$. Fig. 1 illustrates the individual group rates normalized by N in the large system limit and compares them with the achievable rates obtained by using Monte Carlo simulation in finite dimension. In the simulation with finite N , the BSs are equipped with γN antennas and N users are located at each of K locations. The channel vectors are randomly generated and the dynamic scheduling of [11] and water-filling algorithm [21] are applied to each realization of the channel vectors. In plots (a) and (b), the PFS and HFS are considered, respectively. Remarkably, the large-system results and the finite-dimensional simulation almost overlap even for $N = 1$. Notice that the dynamic scheduling policy should provide multi-user diversity gain and in general should achieve higher rates than the large system limit, which is not able to exploit the dynamic fluctuations of the small-scale fading due to “channel hardening”. However, it appears that in the regime where the pathloss is dominant over the randomness of the multi-antenna channels and the number of users is not much larger than the number of BS antennas, the multi-user diversity gain is negligible and the asymptotic




Fig. 2. Ergodic user rate distribution in the 7-cell model

analysis produces results very close to the simulations with dynamic scheduling. Notice that in HFS case all the users achieve the same individual rate which is higher than the smallest rate of the PFS case.

Using the proposed asymptotic analysis, validated by the simple 2-cell system, we can obtain ergodic rate distributions for much larger systems, for which a full-scale simulation would be very demanding. We considered a two-dimensional cell layout where 7 hexagonal cells form a network and each cell consists of three 120-degree sectors. Three BSs are co-located at the center of each cell such that each BS handles one sector in the no cooperation case. Each sector is split into the 4 diamond-shaped equal-area grids and one user group is placed at the center of each grid. Therefore there are total $M = 21$ BSs and $K = 84$ user groups in the network. In addition, we assume the 7 cells are wrap-around in a torus topology, such that each cell is virtually surrounded by the other 6 cells and all the cells have the symmetric inter-cell interference distribution. The antenna orientation and pattern follows [22]. Fig. 2 shows the user rate distribution under three levels of cooperation, (a) no cooperation ($L = 21$), (b) cooperation among the co-located 3 sector BSs ($L = 7$), and (c) full cooperation over 7-cell network ($L = 1$). The simulation is very intricate especially in case (c). From the asymptotic rate results, it is shown that in case (b), the rate gain over the case (a) is primarily obtained for the users around cell centers, while the gain is achieved over all the location in case (c).

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Caire and S. Shamai (Shitz), "On the achievable throughput of a multiantenna Gaussian broadcast channel," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 49, pp. 1691–1706, July 2003.
- [2] A. J. Goldsmith, S. A. Jafar, N. J. Jindal, and S. Vishwanath, "Capacity Limits of MIMO Channels," *IEEE J. Select. Areas Commun.*, vol. 21, pp. 684–702, June 2003.
- [3] H. Weingarten, Y. Steinberg, and S. Shamai (Shitz), "The capacity region of the Gaussian multiple-input multiple-output broadcast channel," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, pp. 3936–3964, Sept. 2006.
- [4] A. D. Wyner, "Shannon-theoretic approach to a Gaussian cellular multiple access channel," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 40, pp. 1713–1727, Nov. 1994.
- [5] S. Shamai (Shitz) and A. D. Wyner, "Information-theoretic considerations for symmetric, cellular, multiple-access fading channels – Part I," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 43, pp. 1877–1894, Nov. 1997.
- [6] —, "Information-theoretic considerations for symmetric, cellular, multiple-access fading channels – Part II," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 43, pp. 1895–1911, Nov. 1997.
- [7] O. Somekh and S. Shamai (Shitz), "Shannon-theoretic approach to a Gaussian cellular multiple-access channel with fading," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 46, pp. 1401–1425, July 2000.
- [8] A. Sanderovich, O. Somekh, H. Poor, and S. Shamai (Shitz), "Uplink Macro Diversity of Limited Backhaul Cellular Network," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 55, pp. 3457–3478, Aug. 2009.
- [9] P. Viswanath, D. Tse, and R. Laroia, "Opportunistic Beamforming using Dumb Antennas," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 48, pp. 1277–1294, June 2002.
- [10] L. Georgiadis, M. Neely, and L. Tassiulas, *Resource Allocation and Cross-Layer Control in Wireless Networks*. Foundations and Trends in Networking, 2006, vol. 1, no. 1.
- [11] H. Shirani-Mehr, G. Caire, and M. J. Neely, "MIMO Downlink Scheduling with Non-Perfect Channel State Knowledge," *submitted to IEEE Trans. on Commun.* (posted on arXiv:0904.1409 [cs.IT]), 2009.
- [12] J. Mo and J. Walrand, "Fair End-to-End Window-Based Congestion Control," *IEEE/ACM Trans. on Networking*, vol. 8, pp. 556–567, Oct. 2000.
- [13] S.-H. Moon, Y.-T. Kim, H. Huh, I. Lee, and G. Caire, "Weighted Sum-Rate of Multi-Cell MIMO Downlink Channels in the Large System Limit," *accepted for 2010 IEEE International Conference on Communications*, 2009.
- [14] D. Aktas, M. N. Bacha, J. S. Evans, and S. V. Hanly, "Scaling Results on the Sum Capacity of Cellular Networks with MIMO Links," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, pp. 3264–3274, July 2006.
- [15] A. M. Tulino, A. Lozano, and S. Verdu, "Impact of Antenna Correlation on the Capacity of Multiantenna Channels," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 7, pp. 2491–2509, July 2005.
- [16] N. Jindal and A. J. Goldsmith, "Capacity and Optimal Power Allocation for Fading Broadcast Channels With Minimum Rates," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 49, pp. 2895–2909, November 2003.
- [17] N. Jindal, W. Rhee, S. Vishwanath, S. A. Jafar, and A. J. Goldsmith, "Sum Power Iterative Water-Filling for Multi-Antenna Gaussian Broadcast Channels," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 51, pp. 1570–1580, April 2005.
- [18] D. Tse and P. Viswanath, *Fundamentals of Wireless Communication*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [19] A. M. Tulino, A. Lozano, and S. Verdu, "Capacity-Achieving Input Covariance for Single-User Multi-Antenna Channels," *IEEE Trans. on Wireless Commun.*, vol. 5, pp. 662–671, March 2006.
- [20] WiMAX Forum, "Mobile WiMAX - Part I. A Technical Overview and Performance Evaluation," Aug. 2006.
- [21] W. Yu, "Sum-capacity computation for the Gaussian vector broadcast channel via dual decomposition," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, pp. 754–759, Feb. 2006.
- [22] IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group, "IEEE 802.16m Evaluation Methodology Document (EMD)," Jan. 2009.