

CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
香港城市大學

Adaptive Transmission in MIMO Wireless
Systems with Imperfect Channel State Information
不完備信道信息下 MIMO 無線系統中的
自適應傳輸技術

Submitted to
Department of Electronic Engineering
電子工程學系
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
哲學博士學位

by

Kuang Quan
況 泉

December 2010
二零一零年十二月

Abstract

Traditionally, adaptive transmission or link adaptation (LA) is a technique which dynamically adjusts the transmission parameters in time, such as modulation size and transmission power, according to the time-varying channel conditions to improve the system performance. Crucial to the LA is the requirement of the channel state information (CSI) at the transmitter (CSIT). However, it is unrealistic to assume perfect CSIT due to channel estimation errors, feedback delay, or quantization errors. The optimal design of LA algorithms with imperfect CSIT for multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) channel links is challenging because the presence of the additional spatial domain makes either the optimization problems difficult to solve or the resulting algorithms end up with prohibitively large complexity. To bypass the difficulty, most of the existing designs have restricted the adaptation to one domain only, resulting in performance degradation.

The objective of this thesis is to study channel-adaptive techniques for multiple-antenna wireless communication systems with imperfect or partial CSIT to jointly exploit the temporal and spatial dimensions. We consider space-time coded MIMO systems over flat Rayleigh fading channels with beamforming to exploit the CSIT. First, we propose low-complexity spatial power allocation schemes to minimize the bit error rate (BER) for fixed data rate transmission. We take into account the uncertainty in the received signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) by defining a new compressed SNR criterion. Compared to the existing spatial power allocation algorithms, the proposed schemes are more computationally efficient, while not sacrificing the performance.

Next, we propose novel strategies to allocate the transmit power both in the space and time domains to further reduce the BER, based on the proposed low-complexity spatial-only power allocation schemes. The total transmit power is subject to the long term (time) average constraint and varied from symbol to symbol according to the CSIT. The spatial-temporal power adaptation provides

exponential diversity gain at moderate SNR when the imperfection in CSIT is small, making it outperform the spatial-only power strategies and the existing methods. The diversity gain asymptotically reduces to polynomial at very high SNR, due to the imperfection of the CSIT. The effects of peak-to-average power ratio (PAPR) on the power adaptation schemes are evaluated. It is shown that the proposed joint power adaptation schemes maintain the superiority over the existing ones at moderate and high PAPR.

Another important function of adaptive transmission is its ability to increase the average spectral efficiency (ASE) while maintaining the BER requirement of the quality of service. For this objective, we propose variable-rate transmission schemes combined with joint spatial-temporal power allocation, where the modulation constellation, the total (temporal) power, the spatial power allocation and the transmit beam patterns are jointly adjusted. Although the variable-rate method integrated with temporal power allocation was well established in single-input single-output (SISO) systems, the design of variable-rate MIMO systems with spatial-temporal power adaptation remains unsolved due to the complication induced by the two-dimensional power adaptation. We solve the problem by introducing a new variable to decouple the original optimization problem into an inner and an outer one. Thanks to this transformation, a closed-form rate adaptation scheme, a closed-form temporal power control policy and a simple spatial power allocation algorithm are obtained. The complexity of the whole algorithm is reduced to one-dimensional root finding for a monotonic function. Compared to the existing methods, the proposed one greatly improves the ASE.

Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	x
Notation	xiii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation	1
1.2 State of art	3
1.2.1 History of link adaptation	3
1.2.2 Adaptive MIMO systems	6
1.2.2.1 MIMO signaling	6
1.2.2.2 Combine LA with MIMO	10
1.3 Contributions and thesis outline	13
1.3.1 Contributions	13
1.3.2 Thesis outline	15
2 System description	17
2.1 CSI model	17

2.2	System structure	19
2.3	Receive processing	22
3	Adaptive spatial power allocation	26
3.1	Introduction	26
3.2	Perfect CSI	28
3.3	BER criterion with imperfect CSIT	29
3.4	Optimal solution with imperfect CSIT	30
3.4.1	Solving the optimization problem	30
3.4.2	Necessary and sufficient condition to determine beam number	32
3.4.3	Asymptotic properties for high SNR and low SNR	33
3.4.4	Comparison of the optimality criteria	36
3.5	Compressed SNR solution with imperfect CSIT	37
3.5.1	Maximizing compressed SNR	37
3.5.2	Optimizing the compression factor	39
3.5.3	Closed-form solution of the compression factor	41
3.6	Simulation results	43
3.7	Conclusion	50
4	Joint spatial-temporal power allocation	52
4.1	Introduction	52
4.2	Perfect CSI	54
4.3	Joint design with imperfect CSIT	56
4.3.1	Applying the optimal spatial solution	58
4.3.2	Applying the CSNR solution	63
4.4	Separate design with imperfect CSIT	65
4.5	Peak power constraint	69
4.6	Performance analysis	71
4.6.1	Performance comparison	71

4.6.2	Diversity gain	78
4.7	Conclusion	83
5	VR transmission and joint S-T power allocation	84
5.1	Review of VRVP in SISO	86
5.1.1	Continuous rate	87
5.1.2	Discrete rate	89
5.2	VR and joint S-T power allocation with perfect CSI	91
5.3	VR and joint S-T power allocation with imperfect CSIT	92
5.3.1	Problem Formulation	92
5.3.2	Continuous Rate	94
5.3.3	Discrete Rate	98
5.3.4	Special Cases	100
5.3.4.1	Equal spatial power allocation	100
5.3.4.2	Constant power transmission	102
5.3.4.3	Constant power and equal spatial allocation	102
5.4	Numerical results	102
5.5	Conclusion	107
6	Conclusions and future work	109
6.1	Conclusions	109
6.2	Future work	112
	Derivations and proofs	113
Appendix 3.A	Derivation of Eq.(3.10)	113
Appendix 3.B	Proof of the Theorem 1	114
Appendix 3.C	Derivation of Eq.(3.41)	115
Appendix 4.A	Derivation of Eq.(4.27)	116
Appendix 4.B	Proof of Eq.(4.22)	117
Appendix 4.C	Derivation of Eq.(4.45)	117

Appendix 4.D Derivation of Eq.(4.56)	118
Appendix 5.A Solution to the optimization problem (5.28)	120
Appendix 5.B Proof of the Theorem 3	121
Appendix 5.C Numerical calculation of γ_0	122
Appendix 5.D Numerical calculation of μ	123
Bibliography	124
Publications	137

List of Tables

3.1	Complexity of the spatial power allocation methods	50
3.2	Operation time of the spatial power allocation methods	51
4.1	Number of points for numerical integration of (4.27) for the 3X1 MIMO system with QPSK at different SNR , to satisfy the specific accuracy in the average power constraint.	62
4.2	Complexity of the spatial-temporal power allocation schemes	76
4.3	Operation time of the spatial-temporal power allocation schemes . .	76

List of Figures

1.1	Major functions in an adaptive system	5
1.2	Classification of different MIMO communication schemes based CSIT	7
2.1	System diagram	19
2.2	Precoder	20
3.1	Probability of choosing the beam number in a 3×3 MIMO system under different SNR, $\sigma_e^2 = 0.1$, QPSK, G_3 code	35
3.2	Plots of the objective function for an arbitrary channel realization in a 3×3 MIMO system, $\sigma_e^2 = 0.1$, QPSK, G_3 code. The upper subplot corresponds to case I, and the lower one corresponds to case II.	40
3.3	Optimal μ value at different SNR for an arbitrary channel realization in a 3×3 MIMO system, $\sigma_e^2 = 0.1$, QPSK, G_3 code	42
3.4	BER performance of the proposed optimal scheme and the JSO scheme [JSO02], $M = 3, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.1$, G_3 code	44
3.5	BER performance of the proposed optimal scheme and the JSO scheme [JSO02], $M = 4, N = 2, \sigma_e^2 = 0.55$, G_4 code	45
3.6	Power allocation for a random channel realization $\tilde{\beta} = \{2.8519, 2.0133, 0\}$, $M = 3, N = 2, \sigma_e^2 = 0.4$, G_3 code, 64-QAM	46
3.7	BER performance of 64-QAM, $M = 3, N = 2, \sigma_e^2 = 0.4$, G_3 code.	46

3.8	BER performance of different spatial power allocation schemes, $M = 2, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.05$, QPSK, Alamouti code	48
3.9	BER performance of different spatial power allocation schemes, $M = 3, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.2$, G_3 code	48
3.10	BER performance of different spatial power allocation schemes, $M = 4, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.35$, 16-QAM, G_4 code	49
3.11	BER performance of different spatial power allocation schemes, $M = 4, N = 2, \sigma_e^2 = 0.55$, 64-QAM, G_4 code	49
4.1	BER of 16-QAM versus average SNR for 3X1 MIMO system with perfect CSI.	57
4.2	Temporal power value against CSIT, $M = 3, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.05$, QPSK, G_3 code, SNR=2.5dB	70
4.3	Temporal power value against CSIT, $M = 3, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.05$, QPSK, G_3 code, SNR=25dB	70
4.4	BER evaluation by different numerical methods for the proposed CSNR S-T power adaptation scheme, $M = 3, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.1$, G_3 code.	73
4.5	BER performance for different power adaptation schemes, $\sigma_e^2 = 0.05$, $M = 3, N = 1$, H_3 code and QPSK. No power adaptation means constant power in time and equal power allocation in space.	75
4.6	BER performance for different power adaptation schemes, $\sigma_e^2 = 0.05$, $M = 2, N = 1$, G_2 code and BPSK. No power adaptation means constant power in time and equal power allocation in space.	75
4.7	BER performance for different power adaptation schemes with different modulation, $M = 2, N = 2, \sigma_e^2 = 0.05$, G_2 code.	77

4.8	BER performance for different power adaptation schemes with different estimation error, $M = 3, N = 1$, H_3 code and QPSK. No power adaptation means constant power in time and equal power allocation in space.	78
4.9	BER performance under additional peak power constraints, $M = 3, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.1$, H_3 code and QPSK.	79
4.10	Diversity analysis for spatial-temporal power adaptation under different system configurations.	82
5.1	Average spectral efficiency for different power adaptation policies, $M = 2, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.1$, G_2 code, $BER_{tgt} = 10^{-3}$	104
5.2	BER performance of different power adaptation policies, $M = 2, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.1$, G_2 code, $BER_{tgt} = 10^{-3}$	104
5.3	Average spectral efficiency for different power adaptation policies, $M = 2, N = 1, \sigma_e^2 = 0.1$, G_2 code, $BER_{tgt} = 10^{-6}$	105
5.4	Average spectral efficiency of the proposed VR-VP-NE policy under different estimation error, $M = 2, N = 1$, G_2 code, $BER_{tgt} = 10^{-3}$.	105
5.5	BER performance of the proposed VR-VP-NE policy under different estimation error, $M = 2, N = 1$, G_2 code, $BER_{tgt} = 10^{-3}$	106
5.6	Average spectral efficiency of the proposed VR-VP-NE policy for different antenna configurations: $M = 2, N = 2$, G_2 code; $M = 4, N = 1$, H_4 code; $BER_{tgt} = 10^{-3}$	107
5.7	Comparison of the average spectral efficiency for the proposed 2D-VR-VP-NE policy with the Zhou's approach: $M = 4, N = 1$, $BER_{tgt} = 10^{-3}$, G_2 code, only the largest two beams are used	108