



Impact of RF Mismatches on the Performance of Massive MIMO Systems with ZF Precoding

Journal:	<i>SCIENCE CHINA Information Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID:	SCIS-2015-0614
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue on 5G Wireless Communication Networks
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Jul-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Wei, Hao Wang, DongMing; National Mobile Communications Research Lab., 东南大学 Wang, Jiangzhou; University of Kent, Sch Engn and Digital Arts You, XiaoHu; 无线电系, 东南大学
Keywords:	massive MIMO, RF mismatch, TDD operation, channel reciprocity, antenna calibration
Speciality:	Communication System < Information & Communication Engineering

Impact of RF Mismatches on the Performance of Massive MIMO Systems with ZF Precoding

WEI Hao¹, WANG DongMing^{1*}, WANG JiangZhou² & YOU XiaoHu¹

¹National Mobile Communications Research Lab., Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, China;

²School of Engineering and Digital Arts, University of Kent, Canterbury, United Kingdom

Received January 1, 2015; accepted January 1, 2015; published online January 1, 2015

Abstract Thanks to the channel reciprocity, the time division duplex (TDD) operation is more preferred in massive multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems. Avoiding the heavy feedback of downlink channel state information (CSI) from the user equipment (UE) to the base station (BS), the uplink CSI can be exploited for the downlink precoding. However, due to the mismatches of the radio frequency (RF) circuits at both sides of the links, the whole communication channels are usually not symmetric in practical systems. This paper is focused on the RF mismatches at the UEs and the BS respectively for the multi-user massive MIMO systems with zero forcing (ZF) precoding. The closed-form expressions of the ergodic sum-rates are derived for evaluating the impact of RF mismatches on the system performance. Theoretical analysis and simulation results show that the RF mismatches at the UEs only lead to a negligible performance loss. However, it is imperative to perform reciprocity calibration at the BS, because the RF mismatches at the BS contribute to the inter-user interference (IUI) and result in a severe system performance degradation.

Keywords massive MIMO, RF mismatch, TDD operation, channel reciprocity, antenna calibration

Citation Wei H, Wang D M, Wang J Z, et al. Title for citation. *Sci China Inf Sci*, 2015, 58: xxxxxx(15), doi: xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

1 Introduction

Multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) antenna systems and distributed antenna systems (DAS) have been used in wireless communications to provide diversity gain and spatial multiplexing gain [1]. Scaling up MIMO to a large scale, classified as massive MIMO [3] [4], potentially offers higher network capacity and better reliability. Therefore, both massive MIMO and large-scale DAS have become promising techniques for the next generation wireless communication systems [2, 5, 6].

In a massive MIMO system, with the knowledge of the downlink channel state information (CSI), the base station (BS) can use the precoding to simultaneously serve many user equipments (UE) in the same time-frequency resource [7] [8]. However, for frequency division duplex (FDD) systems, the numbers of both the downlink pilots and the channel responses each UE must estimate are proportional to the number of antennas at the BS [5]. Thus, the overhead of the downlink pilots and the feedback of downlink CSI is much heavy and becomes unaccepted due to the large number of BS's antennas. While for time division

* Corresponding author (email: wangdm@seu.edu.cn)

duplex (TDD) operation, transmission signals experience the same physical perturbations in both uplink and downlink directions if the time interval is less than the channel coherence time [9]. Thanks to the channel reciprocity, the BS can obtain the CSI for both uplink and downlink channels through uplink pilots from the UEs. Therefore, TDD operation is more preferred for massive MIMO systems. Furthermore, the BS can use the zero forcing (ZF) precoding to transmit signals by exploiting the estimated CSI. ZF precoding performs appreciably better than conjugate beamforming for the requirement of high spectral efficiency [10], because of its ability to cancel the inter-user interference (IUI) [11].

However, in practical systems, the whole communication channel consists of not only the wireless propagation part, but also the transceiver radio frequency (RF) circuits at both sides of the links [12]. Normally, RF circuits include mixers, filters, analog to digital (A/D) converters, power amplifiers, etc., and are highly related to the temperature and humidity of the environment [13]. Although the wireless propagation channel is reciprocal, the mismatches of the transceiver RF circuits disable the reciprocity of the whole communication channel. Hence, RF mismatches lead to a severe performance degradation of the system because of damaging the ZF precoding and introducing the IUI [14]. Therefore, reciprocity calibration is necessary to maintain the channel symmetry for TDD systems.

To overcome the RF mismatches at both sides of links, total least squares based calibration was proposed for MIMO systems [13]. However, this method is based on exchanging the calibration signals between the transmitter and the receiver, of which the heavy feedback cannot be tolerated for massive MIMO systems. Thus, it is important to address how and how much the RF mismatches affect the system performance, in order to find more feasible calibration methods. There are many researches to study the RF mismatches. On the one hand, hardware calibration should be performed at both the BS and the UE for fully exploiting channel reciprocity [15], since the mismatches at both the BS and the UE can result in capacity drop [16]. On the other hand, [14] and [17] gave the conclusion that it is necessary to only perform calibration at the BS, and there is no need at the UE because the RF mismatches at the UE have little impact on system performance. Nevertheless, the impact of RF mismatches studied in all above papers has been evaluated only by simulations. Therefore, it is essential to perform the theoretical analysis, which is the focus of our paper.

This paper is focused on the RF mismatches at the UEs and the BS respectively for the multi-user massive MIMO systems with ZF precoding. The analysis method can also be applied to large-scale DAS. The main contributions of this paper include: Firstly, the amplitude and phase mismatches of RF gain at the UEs are investigated. The closed-form expressions for the lower bound of ergodic sum-rates are derived to evaluate the impact of RF mismatches on the system performance. Secondly, the amplitude and phase mismatches of RF gain at the BS are investigated. The closed-form expressions for the approximation of ergodic sum-rates are derived to evaluate the impact of RF mismatches on the system performance. Thirdly, according to theoretical analysis and simulation results, it is given that the RF mismatches at the UEs only lead to a negligible performance loss and there is no need to perform calibration at the UEs. However, it is imperative to perform reciprocity calibration at the BS, because the RF mismatches at the BS contribute to the IUI and result in a severe system performance degradation.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The general model of the RF gain for multi-user massive MIMO systems is described in Section II. The impact of both the amplitude and phase mismatches at the UE on the system performance is studied in Section III. In Section IV, the downlink sum-rates of the system considering both the amplitude and phase mismatches at the BS are investigated. Then, simulation results and discussions are presented in Section IV. Finally, conclusions are summarized in Section V.

The notation adopted in this paper conforms to the following convention. Vectors are denoted in lower case bold: \mathbf{x} . Matrices are upper case bold: \mathbf{A} . \mathbf{I}_M denotes the identity matrix of $M \times M$. $(\cdot)^*$, $(\cdot)^T$ and $(\cdot)^H$ represent conjugate, transpose, and Hermitian transpose, respectively. $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A})$ is the trace of \mathbf{A} . $[\mathbf{A}]_{ij}$ denotes the i th row j th column element of \mathbf{A} . The operator $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ denotes expectation. $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ stands for normal distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2 . $\mathcal{U}[a, b]$ stands for uniform distribution on the interval $[a, b]$.




Figure 1 The transmit and receive RF modules of each antenna. Normally, RF circuits include mixers, filters, A/D converters, power amplifiers, etc..

2 System Model and Fundamentals

In this section, a multi-user massive MIMO system with ZF precoding is considered. The BS is equipped with M antennas, and there are K single-antenna UEs in the system. $M \gg K$ is assumed for the massive MIMO system. The system model of RF mismatches and the receiving signals for the downlink transmission are presented.

2.1 Amplitude and Phase Mismatches of Transceiver RF Circuits

In practice, the whole communication channel consists of not only the wireless propagation part, but also the transceiver RF circuits of antennas at both sides of the link.

As shown in Figure 1, each antenna of the BS and a UE has a transmit RF and a receive RF module. $\mathbf{C}_{BS,t}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{BS,r}$ denote the transmit and receive RF matrices of the BS, respectively. $\mathbf{C}_{UE,t}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{UE,r}$ denote the transmit and receive RF matrices of the UEs, respectively. All of these matrices are diagonal. Define

$$\mathbf{C}_{BS,t} = \text{diag}(t_{BS,1}, \dots, t_{BS,m}, \dots, t_{BS,M}), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{BS,r} = \text{diag}(r_{BS,1}, \dots, r_{BS,m}, \dots, r_{BS,M}), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{UE,t} = \text{diag}(t_{UE,1}, \dots, t_{UE,k}, \dots, t_{UE,K}), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{UE,r} = \text{diag}(r_{UE,1}, \dots, r_{UE,k}, \dots, r_{UE,K}), \quad (4)$$

where $t_{BS,m}$, $r_{BS,m}$ ($m = 1, \dots, M$) and $t_{UE,k}$, $r_{UE,k}$ ($k = 1, \dots, K$) are the RF gains characterized as $t_{BS,m} = |t_{BS,m}| e^{j\phi_{BS,m}^t}$, $r_{BS,m} = |r_{BS,m}| e^{j\phi_{BS,m}^r}$, $t_{UE,k} = |t_{UE,k}| e^{j\phi_{UE,k}^t}$, $r_{UE,k} = |r_{UE,k}| e^{j\phi_{UE,k}^r}$. The amplitudes of the RF gains are assumed to be of log-normal distribution [14] [15], and the phases are assumed to be of uniform distribution [14] [15] [18]. Therefore, we have the following notation: $\ln |t_{BS,m}| \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta_{BS,t}^2)$, $\phi_{BS,m}^t \sim \mathcal{U}[-\theta_t^{\text{BS}}, \theta_t^{\text{BS}}]$; $\ln |r_{BS,m}| \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta_{BS,r}^2)$, $\phi_{BS,m}^r \sim \mathcal{U}[-\theta_r^{\text{BS}}, \theta_r^{\text{BS}}]$; $\ln |t_{UE,k}| \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta_{UE,t}^2)$, $\phi_{UE,k}^t \sim \mathcal{U}[-\theta_t^{\text{UE}}, \theta_t^{\text{UE}}]$; $\ln |r_{UE,k}| \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta_{UE,r}^2)$, $\phi_{UE,k}^r \sim \mathcal{U}[-\theta_r^{\text{UE}}, \theta_r^{\text{UE}}]$.

2.2 Downlink Signal Model

Considering the RF gains, the uplink and downlink channels are given by

$$\mathbf{G}_{UL} = \mathbf{C}_{BS,r} \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{C}_{UE,t}, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{DL} = \mathbf{C}_{UE,r} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{C}_{BS,t}, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times M}$ represents the small-scale channel matrix, and each element h_{km} ($k = 1, \dots, K$; $m = 1, \dots, M$) is a zero mean circularly symmetric complex Gaussian random variable of variance $1/2$ per dimension, which denotes the wireless channel coefficient from the m th antenna of the BS to the k th UE. From (5) and (6), the whole communication channel becomes non-reciprocal due to the RF mismatches, i.e. $\mathbf{G}_{DL} \neq \mathbf{G}_{UL}^T$.

For clarity and brevity of analysis, uplink channel estimation is assumed ideal. Then, when ZF precoding is exploited by the BS, the overall downlink signals at the UEs are written as

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta \mathbf{G}_{\text{DL}} \mathbf{G}_{\text{UL}}^* (\mathbf{G}_{\text{UL}}^T \mathbf{G}_{\text{UL}}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\beta = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\text{Tr}[(\mathbf{G}_{\text{UL}}^T \mathbf{G}_{\text{UL}}^*)^{-1}]}}$$

is the scaling factor to satisfy the transmit power constraint. $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, \dots, y_K]^T$ is the receiving signal vector. $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \dots, x_K]^T$ is the signal vector transmitted to the UEs with the power constraint $\mathcal{E}[x_k x_k^*] = P$. \mathbf{n} is the complex additive white Gaussian noise vector, in which the elements are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) complex Gaussian random variables with zero mean and variance σ_n^2 .

Substituting (5) and (6) into (7), we obtain

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},r} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},t}^{-1} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n}, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{H} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},t} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r}^* \mathbf{H}^H) (\mathbf{H} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},t}^* \mathbf{H}^H)^{-1}. \quad (9)$$

Because of the RF mismatches at the BS, $\mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},t} \neq \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r}$, \mathbf{W} is not equal to an identity matrix. Thus, the non-symmetric characteristic of the transceiver RF circuits will cause the IUI and degrade the system performance.

2.3 Ideal RF Circuit

The case of ideal RF circuit is given for comparison, when there is no mismatch for RF gain. In the ideal case, RF gain matrices become identity matrices, which are given by

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},t}^{\text{ideal}} = \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r}^{\text{ideal}} = \mathbf{I}_M, \quad (10)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},t}^{\text{ideal}} = \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},r}^{\text{ideal}} = \mathbf{I}_K. \quad (11)$$

Then, the overall downlink receiving signals at the UEs are written as

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_{\text{ideal}} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\beta_{\text{ideal}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\text{Tr}[(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^H)^{-1]}}}$$

When the number of antennas at BS is large, according to the characteristic of the Wishart matrices [19], we have

$$\text{Tr}[(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^H)^{-1}] \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{K}{M - K}, \quad (13)$$

where ‘‘a.s.’’ is the abbreviation of ‘‘almost sure’’. Thus, we obtain the signal-to-interference-plus-noise-ratio (SINR) of the i th UE as follows

$$\gamma_i^{\text{ideal}} = \frac{P}{\sigma_n^2} \cdot \beta_{\text{ideal}}^2 = \rho \cdot \frac{M - K}{K}, \quad (14)$$

where $\rho = P/\sigma_n^2$. Then, the sum-rates of all UEs are given by

$$R^{\text{ideal}} = \sum_{i=1}^K R_i^{\text{ideal}} = \sum_{i=1}^K \log(1 + \gamma_i^{\text{ideal}}). \quad (15)$$

At high SNR, we further obtain the lower bound of the sum-rates

$$R_{\text{LB}}^{\text{ideal}} = \sum_{i=1}^K \log(\gamma_i^{\text{ideal}}) = K \cdot \left[\log(\rho) + \log\left(\frac{M - K}{K}\right) \right]. \quad (16)$$

3 Impact of RF Mismatches at UE

For clarity of analysis, the impact of RF mismatches on the system performance at the UE and the BS are investigated separately.

Considering the amplitude and phase mismatches at the UEs, the uplink and downlink channel matrices are rewritten as

$$\mathbf{G}_{\text{UL}} = \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},t}, \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{\text{DL}} = \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},r} \mathbf{H}. \quad (18)$$

Then, substituting (17) and (18) into (7), the downlink signals at the UEs are given by

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_{\text{UE},\text{mis}} \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},r} \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},t}^{-1} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n}, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\beta_{\text{UE},\text{mis}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\text{Tr} \left[\left(\mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},t} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^H \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},t}^* \right)^{-1} \right]}}. \quad (20)$$

From (19), we can see that the RF mismatches at the UE do not contribute to the IUI.

When the number of antennas at the BS is large, one obtain [19]

$$\text{Tr} \left[\left(\mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},t} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^H \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},t}^* \right)^{-1} \right] \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{M-K} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{1}{|t_{\text{UE},i}|^2}. \quad (21)$$

Then, for large M , the SINR of the i th UE is given by

$$\gamma_i^{\text{UE},\text{mis}} = \rho \cdot \beta_{\text{UE},\text{mis}}^2 \cdot \frac{|r_{\text{UE},i}|^2}{|t_{\text{UE},i}|^2}. \quad (22)$$

Therefore, the sum-rates of all UEs under the RF mismatches are given by

$$R^{\text{UE},\text{mis}} = \sum_{i=1}^K R_i^{\text{UE},\text{mis}} = \sum_{i=1}^K \log \left(1 + \gamma_i^{\text{UE},\text{mis}} \right). \quad (23)$$

Using (22), the ergodic rate of the i th UE is given by

$$\mathcal{E} [R_i^{\text{UE},\text{mis}}] = \mathcal{E} \left[\log \left(1 + \rho \cdot \beta_{\text{UE},\text{mis}}^2 \cdot \frac{|r_{\text{UE},i}|^2}{|t_{\text{UE},i}|^2} \right) \right]. \quad (24)$$

With the following Jensen's inequality

$$\mathcal{E} [\log (1 + e^{\ln x})] \geq \log (1 + e^{\mathcal{E}[\ln x]}),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} [R_i^{\text{UE},\text{mis}}] &\geq \log \left\{ 1 + \exp \left(\mathcal{E} \left[\ln \left(\rho \cdot \beta_{\text{UE},\text{mis}}^2 \cdot \frac{|r_{\text{UE},k}|^2}{|t_{\text{UE},i}|^2} \right) \right] \right) \right\} \\ &= \log \left\{ 1 + \exp \left(\ln(\rho) + \ln(M-K) - \mathcal{E} \left[\ln \left(\sum_{i=1}^K \frac{1}{|t_{\text{UE},i}|^2} \right) \right] \right) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Since $\ln(x)$ is a concave function, one obtains

$$\mathcal{E} \left[\ln \left(\sum_{i=1}^K \frac{1}{|t_{\text{UE},i}|^2} \right) \right] \leq \ln \left[\mathcal{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^K \frac{1}{|t_{\text{UE},i}|^2} \right) \right] = \ln (K \cdot e^{2\delta_{\text{UE},t}}). \quad (26)$$

Wei H, *et al.* *Sci China Inf Sci* January 2015 Vol. 58 xxxxxx:6

Substituting (26) into (25), a lower bound of the ergodic sum-rates is given by

$$\mathcal{E}[R^{\text{UE.mis}}]_{\text{LB1}} = K \cdot \log \left\{ 1 + \rho \cdot \frac{M-K}{K} \cdot e^{-2\delta_{\text{UE,t}}^2} \right\}. \quad (27)$$

At high SNR, we further obtain another much lower bound of the ergodic sum-rates

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[R^{\text{UE.mis}}]_{\text{LB2}} &= K \cdot \left[\log \left(\rho \cdot \frac{M-K}{K} \cdot e^{-2\delta_{\text{UE,t}}^2} \right) \right] \\ &= K \cdot \left[\log(\rho) + \log \left(\frac{M-K}{K} \right) - (\log e \cdot 2\delta_{\text{UE,t}}^2) \right] \\ &= R_{\text{LB}}^{\text{ideal}} - \Delta R_{\text{UE}}^{\text{mis}}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where

$$\Delta R_{\text{UE}}^{\text{mis}} = K \cdot \left\{ \log e \cdot 2\delta_{\text{UE,t}}^2 \right\} \quad (29)$$

is the system performance loss due to the RF mismatches at the UEs. According to (29), the sum-rates decrease slightly if the variance of the amplitude mismatch is small, and the phase mismatch causes no degradation on the system throughput. It can be seen that the RF mismatches at the UEs can be handled by transmitting pilots through the precoding to the UEs. The overhead for these supplementary pilots is very small [5], which scales linearly with the number of the UEs.

4 Impact of RF Mismatches at BS

Considering the amplitude and phase mismatches at the BS, the uplink and downlink channel matrices are rewritten as

$$\mathbf{G}_{\text{UL}} = \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS,r}} \mathbf{H}^{\text{T}}, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{\text{DL}} = \mathbf{H} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS,t}}. \quad (31)$$

Then, substituting (30) and (31) into (7), the downlink signals at the UEs are given by

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_{\text{BS.mis}} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n}, \quad (32)$$

where

$$\beta_{\text{BS.mis}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\text{Tr} \left[\left(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS,r}} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS,r}}^* \mathbf{H}^{\text{H}} \right)^{-1} \right]}}. \quad (33)$$

Similar to (21), we have

$$\text{Tr} \left[\left(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS,r}} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS,r}}^* \mathbf{H}^{\text{H}} \right)^{-1} \right] \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{K}{M-K} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M |r_{\text{BS},m}|^2 \right)^{-1}.$$

When the number of antennas at BS is large, e.g.

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M |r_{\text{BS},m}|^2 = e^{2\delta_{\text{BS,r}}^2},$$

thus, we obtain

$$\text{Tr} \left[\left(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS,r}} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS,r}}^* \mathbf{H}^{\text{H}} \right)^{-1} \right] \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{K}{M-K} \cdot e^{-2\delta_{\text{BS,r}}^2}. \quad (34)$$

From (32), it can be seen that the non-reciprocity of the RF gain at the BS will result in the IUI. Hence, the receiving signal of the i th UE is

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \beta_{\text{BS.mis}} [\mathbf{W}]_{ii} x_i + \beta_{\text{BS.mis}} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K [\mathbf{W}]_{ij} x_j + n_i, \quad (35)$$

and the SINR of the i th UE is

$$\gamma_i^{\text{BS-mis}} = \frac{\rho \cdot \beta_{\text{BS-mis}}^2 \cdot |[\mathbf{W}]_{ii}|^2}{\rho \cdot \beta_{\text{BS-mis}}^2 \cdot \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K |[\mathbf{W}]_{ij}|^2 + 1}. \quad (36)$$

Then the sum-rates of all UEs under RF mismatches are

$$R^{\text{BS-mis}} = \sum_{i=1}^K R_i^{\text{BS-mis}} = \sum_{i=1}^K \log(1 + \gamma_i^{\text{BS-mis}}). \quad (37)$$

In order to derive $[\mathbf{W}]_{ii}$, we introduce a variable $\tau_m = t_{\text{BS},m}/r_{\text{BS},m}$ ($m = 1, \dots, M$) and define a matrix \mathbf{H}_{ii}^τ ($i = 1, \dots, K$) $\in \mathbb{C}^{K \times M}$ as

$$\mathbf{H}_{ii}^\tau = \begin{bmatrix} h_{11} & \cdots & h_{1m} & \cdots & h_{1M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{(i-1)1} & \cdots & h_{(i-1)m} & \cdots & h_{(i-1)M} \\ h_{i1}\tau_1 & \cdots & h_{im}\tau_m & \cdots & h_{iM}\tau_M \\ h_{(i+1)1} & \cdots & h_{(i+1)m} & \cdots & h_{(i+1)M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{K1} & \cdots & h_{Km} & \cdots & h_{KM} \end{bmatrix} \quad (38)$$

Then, according to the characteristic of the matrix, we have

$$[\mathbf{W}]_{ii} = \frac{\det(\mathbf{H}_{ii}^\tau \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r}^* \mathbf{H}^H)}{\det(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r}^* \mathbf{H}^H)}. \quad (39)$$

Theorem 1. From (39), when the number of BS antennas is large, i.e. $M \rightarrow \infty$, we can get the approximation as follows

$$|[\mathbf{W}]_{ii}|^2 = \frac{e^{\delta_{\text{BS},t}^2 + \delta_{\text{BS},r}^2} \cdot \text{sinc}^2(\theta_{\text{BS},t}) \cdot \text{sinc}^2(\theta_{\text{BS},r})}{e^{4\delta_{\text{BS},r}^2}}. \quad (40)$$

Proof. See Appendix 7.1.

Consequently, in order to investigate $[\mathbf{W}]_{ij}$, we define a matrix \mathbf{H}_{ij}^τ ($i, j = 1, \dots, K$) $\in \mathbb{C}^{K \times M}$ as

$$\mathbf{H}_{ij}^\tau = \begin{bmatrix} h_{11} & \cdots & h_{1m} & \cdots & h_{1M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{(i-1)1} & \cdots & h_{(i-1)m} & \cdots & h_{(i-1)M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{(j-1)1} & \cdots & h_{(j-1)m} & \cdots & h_{(j-1)M} \\ h_{i1}\tau_1 & \cdots & h_{im}\tau_m & \cdots & h_{iM}\tau_M \\ h_{(j+1)1} & \cdots & h_{(j+1)m} & \cdots & h_{(j+1)M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{K1} & \cdots & h_{Km} & \cdots & h_{KM} \end{bmatrix} \quad (41)$$

Then, according to the characteristic of the matrix determinant, we have

$$[\mathbf{W}]_{ij} = \frac{\det(\mathbf{H}_{ij}^\tau \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r}^* \mathbf{H}^H)}{\det(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r}^* \mathbf{H}^H)}. \quad (42)$$

Theorem 2. From (42), when the number of BS antennas is large, i.e. $M \rightarrow \infty$, we can get the following approximation

$$|[\mathbf{W}]_{ij}|^2 = \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{1}{e^{2\delta_{\text{BS},r}^2}} \cdot \left[e^{2\delta_{\text{BS},t}^2} + e^{2\delta_{\text{BS},r}^2} - 2e^{\delta_{\text{BS},t}^2/2 + \delta_{\text{BS},r}^2/2} \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{\text{BS},t}) \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{\text{BS},r}) \right]. \quad (43)$$

Proof. See Appendix 7.2.

Then, the ergodic rate of the i th UE under RF mismatches of BS is given by

$$\mathcal{E} [R_i^{\text{BS.mis}}] = \log \left\{ 1 + \frac{\rho \cdot \frac{M-K}{K} \cdot \lambda_1}{\rho \cdot \frac{(K-1)(M-K)}{K \cdot M} \cdot \lambda_2 + 1} \right\}, \quad (44)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= \text{sinc}^2(\theta_{\text{BS},t}) \cdot \text{sinc}^2(\theta_{\text{BS},r}) \\ \lambda_2 &= e^{2\delta_{\text{BS},t}^2} + e^{2\delta_{\text{BS},r}^2} - 2e^{\delta_{\text{BS},t}^2/2 + \delta_{\text{BS},r}^2/2} \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{\text{BS},t}) \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{\text{BS},r}). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

At high SNR, we further obtain the lower bound of the ergodic sum-rates

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} [R^{\text{BS.mis}}]_{\text{LB}} &= K \cdot \left\{ \log \left(\frac{M}{K-1} \cdot \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \right) \right\} \\ &= R_{\text{LB}}^{\text{ideal}} - \Delta R_{\text{BS}}^{\text{mis}}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where

$$\Delta R_{\text{BS}}^{\text{mis}} = K \cdot \left\{ \log(\rho) + \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) - \log \left[\frac{M \cdot K}{(M-K)(K-1)} \right] \right\} \quad (47)$$

is the performance loss due to the RF mismatches at the BS. It can be seen from (47) that the performance loss is not only related to the RF mismatches, but also increase with the transmit power. From the analysis above, for BS, both amplitude and phase mismatches will result in a severe performance degradation. Hence, it is important and imperative to perform reciprocity calibration at the BS.

Fortunately, we can multiply the precoding matrix by a calibration diagonal matrix \mathbf{C}_{cal} on the left, which satisfies $\mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},t} \mathbf{C}_{\text{cal}} = \alpha_{\text{cal}} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r}$. Then, after the perfect calibration, the receiving signals at the UE can be written as

$$\mathbf{y} = \alpha_{\text{cal}} \beta_{\text{cal}} \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},r} \mathbf{C}_{\text{UE},t}^{-1} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n}, \quad (48)$$

where β_{cal} is the scaling factor under calibration. Comparing with (19), we can see that the IUI caused by the RF mismatches at the BS can be eliminated through the reciprocity calibration.

5 Simulation Results

In this section, simulations have been performed to show the impact of RF mismatches on the system performance and validate the theoretical analysis. The simulation parameters are set as follows. The number of antennas at the BS is 256, which serves 12 single-antenna UEs. The amplitudes of the RF gains are assumed to be of log-normal distribution, and the phases are assumed to be of uniform distribution. In simulations, we will give the variance of the amplitude mismatch and the range of the phase mismatch.

5.1 Impact of RF mismatches at the UE

Figure 2 illustrates the impact of the amplitude mismatches of the RF gain at the UEs. Let the amplitude variance of RF mismatches at the UEs $\delta_{\text{UE},t}^2 = \delta_{\text{UE},r}^2 = \delta_{\text{UE}}^2$, and set δ_{UE}^2 be 0.1dB, 1dB, and 2dB respectively. From Figure 2(a), it can be seen that all the ergodic sum-rates for different setups increase with ρ . That is, the amplitude mismatches cause no IUI on the system performance, which is consistent with (27). It is also shown that the curves are very close even though δ_{UE}^2 increases from 0.1dB to 2dB, so that the amplitude mismatches degrade the system performance very slightly. As shown in




Figure 2 (a) Ergodic sum-rates versus the transmit power of the BS; (b) Ergodic sum-rates versus the amplitude variance of RF mismatches δ_{UE}^2 at the UEs.




Figure 3 (a) Ergodic sum-rates versus the transmit power of the BS; (b) Ergodic sum-rates versus the phase range of RF mismatches θ_{UE} at the UE.

Figure 2(b), the performance loss is only about 5% when δ_{UE}^2 is 3dB. Further, ergodic sum-rates decrease approximately linearly with the amplitude variance, which is consistent with the theoretical result (29).

Figure 3 demonstrates the impact of the phase mismatches of the RF gain at the UEs. Let the phase range of RF mismatches at the UE $\theta_{UE,t} = \theta_{UE,r} = \theta_{UE}$, and set θ_{UE} be $\pi/12$, $\pi/6$ and $\pi/3$ respectively. From Figure 3(a), it can be seen that all the ergodic sum-rates for different setups are the same, although their phase ranges θ_{UE} are different. It is also seen from Figure 3(b) that ergodic sum-rates keep constant with the variance of θ_{UE} . Then, we can draw the conclusion that the phase mismatches of the RF gain at the UEs have no impact on the system performance.

5.2 Impact of RF mismatches at the BS

Figure 4 depicts the impact of the amplitude mismatches of the RF gain at the BS. Let the amplitude variance of RF gain at the BS $\delta_{BS,t}^2 = \delta_{BS,r}^2 = \delta_{BS}^2$, and set δ_{BS}^2 be 0.1dB, 1dB, and 2dB respectively. From Figure 4(a), it can be seen that ergodic sum-rates increase gradually with the transmit power, but approach a limit when ρ increases to the high region. In other words, the amplitude mismatches cause the IUI on the system performance, which is proved by (44) and (45). When δ_{BS}^2 increases from 0.1dB to 2dB, the sum-rates decrease significantly because of the IUI. As shown in Figure 4(b), the larger ρ is, the severer the performance loss is, which is consistent with the theoretical result (47). When δ_{BS}^2 is 3dB and ρ is 10dB, the performance loss is almost 30%.


Wei H, et al. *Sci China Inf Sci* January 2015 Vol. 58 xxxxxx:10

Figure 4 (a) Ergodic sum-rates versus the transmit power of the BS; (b) Ergodic sum-rates versus the amplitude variance of RF gain mismatch δ_{BS}^2 at the BS.




Figure 5 (a) Ergodic sum-rates versus the transmit power of the BS; (b) Ergodic sum-rates versus the phase range of RF mismatches θ_{BS} at the BS.

Figure 5 demonstrates the impact of the phase mismatches of the RF gain at BS. Let the phase range of RF mismatches at the BS $\theta_{BS,t} = \theta_{BS,r} = \theta_{BS}$, and set θ_{BS} be $\pi/12$, $\pi/6$ and $\pi/3$ respectively. From Figure 5(a), it can be seen that ergodic sum-rates increase gradually with the transmit power, but approach a limit when ρ increases to the high region. According to (44) and (45), the phase mismatches of the RF gain at BS not only cause the IUI, but also degrade the power of the signal transmitted to the intended user, both of which result in the great loss of the system performance. From Figure 5(b), it can also be seen that the higher the transmit power is, the more severely the ergodic sum-rates decrease, which is consistent with the theoretical result (47). When θ_{BS} is $\pi/3$ and ρ is 10dB, the performance loss is almost 45%, which is unsatisfactory.

From the simulation results, we can draw the conclusion that the RF mismatches at the UEs only lead to a negligible performance loss. However, it is imperative to perform reciprocity calibration at the BS, because the RF mismatches at the BS contribute to the IUI and result in a severe system performance degradation. Therefore, compared with the method in [13], the more feasible calibration methods were proposed in [20] [21]. Only the antennas of the BS were involved to exchange the calibration signals. The UEs were excluded from the calibration procedure and the feedback was not required.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we have carried out investigation in the impact of the RF mismatches on the performance of multi-user massive MIMO systems with ZF precoding. Due to the gain mismatches of the transceiver RF circuits, the whole communication channel is actually not reciprocal, and the uplink CSI cannot be simply used for performing the downlink precoding. According to our theoretical analysis and simulations, for the RF gain mismatches at the UEs, the phase mismatches cause no decrease on the system throughput, and only the amplitude mismatches lead to a slight performance loss. While the RF mismatches at the BS are the major factor of contributing to the IUI, both the amplitude and the phase mismatches result in a severe system performance degradation. Therefore, there is no need to calibrate the RF mismatches at the UE, but it is important and imperative to perform the reciprocity calibration at the BS.

7 Appendices

7.1 Proofs of Theorem 1

According to (38), by moving the i th row to the top, we transform \mathbf{H}_{ii}^τ into

$$\mathbf{H}_{ii\text{-reform}}^\tau = \begin{bmatrix} h_{i1}\tau_1 & \cdots & h_{im}\tau_m & \cdots & h_{iM}\tau_M \\ h_{11} & \cdots & h_{1m} & \cdots & h_{1M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{(i-1)1} & \cdots & h_{(i-1)m} & \cdots & h_{(i-1)M} \\ h_{(i+1)1} & \cdots & h_{(i+1)m} & \cdots & h_{(i+1)M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{K1} & \cdots & h_{Km} & \cdots & h_{KM} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Then, we write $\mathbf{H}_{ii\text{-reform}}^\tau$ as $\mathbf{H}_{ii\text{-reform}}^\tau = [\mathbf{a}_i^{\tau\text{T}} \mathbf{A}_i^{\text{T}}]^\text{T}$, where

$$\mathbf{a}_i^\tau = [h_{i1}\tau_1, \dots, h_{im}\tau_m, \dots, h_{iM}\tau_M], \quad \mathbf{A}_i = \begin{bmatrix} h_{11} & \cdots & h_{1m} & \cdots & h_{1M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{(i-1)1} & \cdots & h_{(i-1)m} & \cdots & h_{(i-1)M} \\ h_{(i+1)1} & \cdots & h_{(i+1)m} & \cdots & h_{(i+1)M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{K1} & \cdots & h_{Km} & \cdots & h_{KM} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Correspondingly, we transform \mathbf{H} into

$$\mathbf{H}_{i\text{-reform}} = \begin{bmatrix} h_{i1} & \cdots & h_{im} & \cdots & h_{iM} \\ h_{11} & \cdots & h_{1m} & \cdots & h_{1M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{(i-1)1} & \cdots & h_{(i-1)m} & \cdots & h_{(i-1)M} \\ h_{(i+1)1} & \cdots & h_{(i+1)m} & \cdots & h_{(i+1)M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{K1} & \cdots & h_{Km} & \cdots & h_{KM} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and write $\mathbf{H}_{i\text{-reform}}$ as $\mathbf{H}_{i\text{-reform}} = [\mathbf{a}_i^\text{T} \mathbf{A}_i^\text{T}]^\text{T}$, where $\mathbf{a}_i = [h_{i1}, \dots, h_{im}, \dots, h_{iM}]$. Define

$$\Phi_{ii}^\tau = \mathbf{H}_{ii\text{-reform}}^\tau \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r}^* \mathbf{H}^\text{H}$$

Wei H, et al. *Sci China Inf Sci* January 2015 Vol. 58 xxxxxx:12

$$\Phi_i = H_{i_reform} C_{BS,r} C_{BS,r}^* H^H, \quad (A.3)$$

then, according to (39) and the characteristic of the determinant, one obtains

$$|[W]_{ii}|^2 = \frac{\det(\Phi_{ii}^\tau \Phi_{ii}^{\tau H})}{\det(\Phi_i \Phi_i^H)}. \quad (A.4)$$

Further, according to the properties of block matrices, we have

$$\det(\Phi_{ii}^\tau \Phi_{ii}^{\tau H}) = \det\left(\begin{bmatrix} u_{ii}^\tau & \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^\tau \\ \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^{\tau H} & U_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \end{bmatrix}\right) = \det(U_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) \cdot \det(u_{ii}^\tau - \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^\tau U_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^{\tau H}), \quad (A.5)$$

where $u_{ii}^\tau = \psi_i^\tau \psi_i^{\tau H}$, $\mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^\tau = \psi_i^\tau \Psi_{\bar{i}}^H$, $U_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} = \Psi_{\bar{i}} \Psi_{\bar{i}}^H$, and $\psi_i^\tau = \mathbf{a}_i^\tau C_{BS,r} C_{BS,r}^* H^H$, $\Psi_{\bar{i}} = \mathbf{A}_{\bar{i}} C_{BS,r} C_{BS,r}^* H^H$. When the number of BS antennas is large, i.e. $M \rightarrow \infty$, we can get the simple approximations as follow

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^M |h_{ij}|^2 |r_{BS,j}|^2 &= \mathcal{E} [|r_{BS,j}|^2] = e^{2\delta_{BS,r}^2}, \\ \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^M h_{ij} h_{kj}^* |r_{BS,j}|^2 &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (A.6)$$

Thus, the approximation of $\Psi_{\bar{i}}$ is given by

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \cdot [\Psi_{\bar{i}}]_{s,v} = \begin{cases} e^{2\delta_{BS,r}^2} & s = v, s \leq i - 1 \\ e^{2\delta_{BS,r}^2} & s + 1 = v, s \geq i \\ 0 & \text{others} \end{cases}, \quad (A.7)$$

and

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} [\Psi_{\bar{i}}^H (\Psi_{\bar{i}} \Psi_{\bar{i}}^H)^{-1} \Psi_{\bar{i}}]_{s,v} = \mathbf{I}_i^{(0)}. \quad (A.8)$$

For simplicity of discussion, we defining the matrices as follow

$$[\mathbf{I}_i^{(0)}]_{s,v} = \begin{cases} 1 & s = v \neq i \\ 0 & \text{others} \end{cases}, \quad [\mathbf{I}_i^{(1)}]_{s,v} = \begin{cases} 1 & s = v = i \\ 0 & \text{others} \end{cases}. \quad (A.9)$$

Therefore, according to (A.8), we obtain

$$u_{ii}^\tau - \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^\tau U_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^{\tau H} = \psi_i^\tau \psi_i^{\tau H} - \psi_i^\tau [\Psi_{\bar{i}}^H (\Psi_{\bar{i}} \Psi_{\bar{i}}^H)^{-1} \Psi_{\bar{i}}] \psi_i^{\tau H} = \psi_i^\tau \mathbf{I}_i^{(1)} \psi_i^{\tau H} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^M |h_{ij}|^2 t_{BS,j} r_{BS,j}^* \right)^2. \quad (A.10)$$

Since

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^M |h_{ij}|^2 t_{BS,j} r_{BS,j}^* = \mathcal{E} [t_{BS,j} r_{BS,j}^*] = e^{\delta_{BS,t}^2/2 + \delta_{BS,r}^2/2} \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{BS,t}) \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{BS,r}), \quad (A.11)$$

then,

$$\det(u_{ii}^\tau - \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^\tau U_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^{\tau H}) = M^2 \cdot e^{\delta_{BS,t}^2 + \delta_{BS,r}^2} \cdot \text{sinc}^2(\theta_{BS,t}) \cdot \text{sinc}^2(\theta_{BS,r}). \quad (A.12)$$

Similar with (A.5),

$$\det(\Phi_i \Phi_i^H) = \det\left(\begin{bmatrix} u_{ii} & \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^H & U_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \end{bmatrix}\right) = \det(U_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) \cdot \det(u_{ii} - \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}} U_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{i\bar{i}}^H), \quad (A.13)$$

Wei H, et al. *Sci China Inf Sci* January 2015 Vol. 58 xxxxxx:13

where $u_{ii} = \boldsymbol{\psi}_i \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^H$, $\mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} = \boldsymbol{\psi}_i \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\bar{i}}^H$, and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_i = \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r} \mathbf{C}_{\text{BS},r}^* \mathbf{H}^H$. Consequently, we have

$$u_{ii} - \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \mathbf{U}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^H = \boldsymbol{\psi}_i \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^H - \boldsymbol{\psi}_i \left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\bar{i}}^H (\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\bar{i}} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\bar{i}}^H)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\bar{i}} \right] \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^H = \boldsymbol{\psi}_i \mathbf{I}_i^{(1)} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^H = \left(\sum_{j=1}^M |h_{ij}|^2 |r_{\text{BS},j}|^2 \right)^2. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Then, according to (A.6), one obtains

$$\det \left(u_{ii} - \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \mathbf{U}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^H \right) = M^2 \cdot e^{4\delta_{\text{BS},r}^2}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

By the approximations above, we can derive the simple close-form expression of $|\mathbf{W}_{ii}|^2$ as

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{W}_{ii}|^2 &= \frac{\det(\mathbf{U}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) \cdot \det \left(u_{ii}^\tau - \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^\tau \mathbf{U}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{\tau H} \right)}{\det(\mathbf{U}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}) \cdot \det \left(u_{ii} - \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \mathbf{U}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^H \right)} \\ &= \frac{\det \left(u_{ii}^\tau - \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^\tau \mathbf{U}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{\tau H} \right)}{\det \left(u_{ii} - \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} \mathbf{U}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}^H \right)} \\ &= \frac{e^{\delta_{\text{BS},t}^2 + \delta_{\text{BS},r}^2} \cdot \text{sinc}^2(\theta_{\text{BS},t}) \cdot \text{sinc}^2(\theta_{\text{BS},r})}{e^{4\delta_{\text{BS},r}^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

7.2 Proofs of Theorem 2

According to (41), by subtracting the i th row from the j th row and moving the j th row to the top, we transform \mathbf{H}_{ij} into

$$\mathbf{H}_{ij}^{\tau 1 \text{ reform}} = \begin{bmatrix} h_{i1}(\tau_1 - 1) & \cdots & h_{im}(\tau_m - 1) & \cdots & h_{iM}(\tau_M - 1) \\ h_{11} & \cdots & h_{1m} & \cdots & h_{1M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{i1} & \cdots & h_{im} & \cdots & h_{iM} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{(j-1)1} & \cdots & h_{(j-1)m} & \cdots & h_{(j-1)M} \\ h_{(j+1)1} & \cdots & h_{(j+1)m} & \cdots & h_{(j+1)M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{K1} & \cdots & h_{Km} & \cdots & h_{KM} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Then, we write $\mathbf{H}_{ij}^{\tau 1 \text{ reform}}$ as $\mathbf{H}_{ij}^{\tau 1 \text{ reform}} = \left[\mathbf{a}_i^{\tau 1 T} \mathbf{A}_j^T \right]^T$, where

$$\mathbf{a}_i^{\tau 1} = [h_{i1}(\tau_1 - 1), \dots, h_{im}(\tau_m - 1), \dots, h_{iM}(\tau_M - 1)].$$

Correspondingly, we transform \mathbf{H} into

$$\mathbf{H}_{j \text{ reform}} = \begin{bmatrix} h_{j1} & \cdots & h_{jm} & \cdots & h_{jM} \\ h_{11} & \cdots & h_{1m} & \cdots & h_{1M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{(j-1)1} & \cdots & h_{(j-1)m} & \cdots & h_{(j-1)M} \\ h_{(j+1)1} & \cdots & h_{(j+1)m} & \cdots & h_{(j+1)M} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{K1} & \cdots & h_{Km} & \cdots & h_{KM} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Wei H, et al. *Sci China Inf Sci* January 2015 Vol. 58 xxxxxx:14

and write \mathbf{H}_{j_reform} as $\mathbf{H}_{j_reform} = \left[\mathbf{a}_j^T \ \mathbf{A}_j^T \right]^T$, where

$$\mathbf{a}_j = [h_{j1}, \dots, h_{jm}, \dots, h_{jM}].$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{ij}^{\tau 1} &= \mathbf{H}_{ij_reform}^{\tau 1} \mathbf{C}_{BS,r} \mathbf{C}_{BS,r}^* \mathbf{H}^H \\ \Phi_j &= \mathbf{H}_{j_reform} \mathbf{C}_{BS,r} \mathbf{C}_{BS,r}^* \mathbf{H}^H, \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

then, according to (42) and the characteristic of the determinant, one obtains

$$|[\mathbf{W}]_{ij}|^2 = \frac{\det(\Phi_{ij}^{\tau 1} \Phi_{ij}^{\tau 1H})}{\det(\Phi_j \Phi_j^H)}. \tag{B.4}$$

Further, according to the properties of block matrices, we have

$$\det(\Phi_{ij}^{\tau 1} \Phi_{ij}^{\tau 1H}) = \det\left(\begin{bmatrix} u_{ii}^{\tau 1} & \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1} \\ \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1H} & \mathbf{U}_{jj} \end{bmatrix}\right) = \det(\mathbf{U}_{jj}) \cdot \det(u_{ii}^{\tau 1} - \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1} \mathbf{U}_{jj}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1H}), \tag{B.5}$$

where $u_{ii}^{\tau 1} = \psi_i^{\tau 1} \psi_i^{\tau 1H}$, $\mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1} = \psi_i^{\tau 1} \Psi_j^H$, $\mathbf{U}_{jj} = \Psi_j \Psi_j^H$, and $\psi_i^{\tau 1} = \mathbf{a}_i^{\tau 1} \mathbf{C}_{BS,r} \mathbf{C}_{BS,r}^* \mathbf{H}^H$, $\Psi_j = \mathbf{A}_j \mathbf{C}_{BS,r} \mathbf{C}_{BS,r}^* \mathbf{H}^H$. Similar with (A.8), we can get the approximation as follows

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left[\Psi_j^H (\Psi_j \Psi_j^H)^{-1} \Psi_j \right]_{s,v} = \mathbf{I}_j^{(0)}. \tag{B.6}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$u_{ii}^{\tau 1} - \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1} \mathbf{U}_{jj}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1H} = \psi_i^{\tau 1} \psi_i^{\tau 1H} - \psi_i^{\tau 1} \left[\Psi_j^H (\Psi_j \Psi_j^H)^{-1} \Psi_j \right] \psi_i^{\tau 1H} = \psi_i^{\tau 1} \mathbf{I}_j^{(1)} \psi_i^{\tau 1H} = \left| \sum_{k=1}^M h_{ik} h_{jk}^* (t_{BS,k} - r_{BS,k}^*) r_{BS,k} \right|^2. \tag{B.7}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \cdot \left| \sum_{k=1}^M h_{ik} h_{jk}^* (t_{BS,k} - r_{BS,k}^*) r_{BS,k} \right|^2 &= \mathcal{E} \left[|t_{BS,k}|^2 + |r_{BS,k}|^2 - 2t_{BS,k} r_{BS,k} \right] \cdot \mathcal{E} \left[|r_{BS,k}|^2 \right] \\ &= e^{2\delta_{BS,r}^2} \cdot \left[e^{2\delta_{BS,t}^2} + e^{2\delta_{BS,r}^2} - 2e^{\delta_{BS,t}^2/2 + \delta_{BS,r}^2/2} \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{BS,t}) \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{BS,r}) \right], \end{aligned} \tag{B.8}$$

then,

$$\det(u_{ii}^{\tau 1} - \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1} \mathbf{U}_{jj}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1H}) = M \cdot e^{2\delta_{BS,r}^2} \cdot \left[e^{2\delta_{BS,t}^2} + e^{2\delta_{BS,r}^2} - 2e^{\delta_{BS,t}^2/2 + \delta_{BS,r}^2/2} \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{BS,t}) \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{BS,r}) \right]. \tag{B.9}$$

Similar with (A.13), (A.14) and (A.15), we obtain

$$\det(\Phi_j \Phi_j^H) = \det\left(\begin{bmatrix} u_{jj} & \mathbf{u}_{j\bar{j}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{j\bar{j}}^H & \mathbf{U}_{\bar{j}\bar{j}} \end{bmatrix}\right) = \det(\mathbf{U}_{\bar{j}\bar{j}}) \cdot \det(u_{jj} - \mathbf{u}_{j\bar{j}} \mathbf{U}_{\bar{j}\bar{j}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{j\bar{j}}^H), \tag{B.10}$$

and

$$\det(u_{jj} - \mathbf{u}_{j\bar{j}} \mathbf{U}_{\bar{j}\bar{j}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{j\bar{j}}^H) = M^2 \cdot e^{4\delta_{BS,r}^2}. \tag{B.11}$$

Therefore, we can derive the simple close-form expression of $|[\mathbf{W}]_{ij}|^2$ as

$$|[\mathbf{W}]_{ij}|^2 = \frac{\det(\mathbf{U}_{\bar{j}\bar{j}}) \cdot \det(u_{ii}^{\tau 1} - \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1} \mathbf{U}_{\bar{j}\bar{j}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1H})}{\det(\mathbf{U}_{\bar{j}\bar{j}}) \cdot \det(u_{jj} - \mathbf{u}_{j\bar{j}} \mathbf{U}_{\bar{j}\bar{j}}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{j\bar{j}}^H)}$$

Wei H, et al. *Sci China Inf Sci* January 2015 Vol. 58 xxxxxx:15

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\det \left(\mathbf{u}_{ii}^{\tau 1} - \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1} \mathbf{U}_{jj}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{ij}^{\tau 1 H} \right)}{\det \left(\mathbf{u}_{jj} - \mathbf{u}_{jj} \mathbf{U}_{jj}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_{jj}^H \right)} \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{1}{e^{2\delta_{BS,r}^2}} \cdot \left[e^{2\delta_{BS,t}^2} + e^{2\delta_{BS,r}^2} - 2e^{\delta_{BS,t}^2/2 + \delta_{BS,r}^2/2} \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{BS,t}) \cdot \text{sinc}(\theta_{BS,r}) \right]. \quad (\text{B.12})
\end{aligned}$$

References

- 1 Zheng L Z, Tse D. Diversity and multiplexing: a fundamental tradeoff in multiple-antenna channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2003, 49: 1073-1096.
- 2 Wang D M, Wang J Z, You X H, et al. Spectral efficiency of distributed MIMO systems. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 2013, 31: 2112-2127.
- 3 Marzetta T L. Noncooperative cellular wireless with unlimited numbers of base station antennas. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2010, 9: 3590-3600.
- 4 Rusek F, Persson D, Lau B K, et al. Scaling up MIMO: Opportunities and challenges with very large arrays. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 2013, 30: 40-60.
- 5 Erik L, Edfors O, Tufvesson F, et al. Massive MIMO for next generation wireless systems. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 2014, 2: 186-195.
- 6 Ma Z, Zhang Z, Ding Z, et al. Key techniques for 5G wireless communications: network architecture, physical layer, and MAC layer perspectives. *Science China Information Sciences*, 2015, 58: 041301.
- 7 Huh H, Caire Giuseppe, Papadopoulos H C, et al. Achieving massive MIMO spectral efficiency with a not-so-large number of antennas. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2011, 11: 3226-3239.
- 8 Zhu H L, Wang J Z. Radio resource allocation in multiuser distributed antenna systems. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2013, 31: 2058-2066.
- 9 Smith G S. A direct derivation of a single-antenna reciprocity relation for the time domain. *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, 2004, 52: 1568-1577.
- 10 Hong Y, Marzetta T L. Performance of conjugate and zero-forcing beamforming in large-scale antenna systems. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 2013, 31: 172-179.
- 11 Ngo H Q, Larsson E G, Marzetta T L. Energy and spectral efficiency of very large multiuser MIMO systems. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 2013, 61: 1436-1449.
- 12 Bourdoux A. Non-reciprocal transceivers in OFDM/SDMA systems: Impact and mitigation. In: Bourdoux A, Come B, Khaled N. *Proceedings of IEEE Radio and Wireless Conference (RAWCON 03)*, Boston, USA, 2003. 183-186.
- 13 Kaltenberger F. Relative channel reciprocity calibration in MIMO/TDD systems. In: Kaltenberger F, Jiang H, Guillaud M, eds. *Proceedings of IEEE Future Network and Mobile Summit*, Florence, Italy, 2010. 1-10.
- 14 Huang F, Wang Y F, Yang J, et al. Antenna mismatch and calibration problem in coordinated multi-point transmission system. *IET Communications*, 2012, 6: 289-299.
- 15 R1-092359. Hardware calibration requirement for dual layer beamforming. Huawei, 3GPP TSG RAN WG1 57, Online Available: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/wg1_r11/TSGR1_51b/Docs/, 2009, 6: 1-10.
- 16 R1-092016. On the need for UE calibration for enhanced downlink transmission. Ericsson, 3GPP TSG RAN WG1 57, Online Available: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/wg1_r11/TSGR1_57/Docs/, 2009, 5: 1-4.
- 17 R1-100426. Channel reciprocity modeling and performance evaluation. Alcatel-Lucent, 3GPP TSG RAN WG1 59, Online Available: http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/wg1_r11/TSGR1_59b/Docs/, 2010, 1: 1-10.
- 18 Geng J. Antenna gain mismatch calibration for cooperative base stations. In: Geng J, Pan C K, Huang F, eds. *Proceedings of IEEE Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC-Fall)*, San Francisco, USA, 2011. 1-5.
- 19 Maiwald D, Kraus D. Calculation of moments of complex wishart and complex inverse wishart distributed matrices. *IEE Proceedings-Radar, Sonar and Navigation*, 2000, 147: 162-168.
- 20 Shepard C. Argos: Practical many-antenna base stations. In: Shepard C, Yu H, Anand N, eds. *Proceedings of the 18th annual international conference on Mobile computing and networking*, Istanbul, Turkey, 2012. 53-64.
- 21 Rogalin R, Bursalioglu O Y, Papadopoulos H, et al. Scalable synchronization and reciprocity calibration for distributed multiuser MIMO. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2014, 13: 1815-1831.