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Propagation aspects

- What do we mean by favorable propagation conditions?
- Conventional MIMO vs. massive MIMO from a propagation perspective, what are the differences?
- Spatial resolution, influence of antenna configuration
- Channel richness; is that a problem for massive MIMO?
- What are the specific propagation phenomena that have to be taken into account in large array channel modeling
  - Received power levels
  - Singular values
  - Antenna correlation
  - Near field effects
Favorable propagation conditions?

- In MU-MIMO ($H \Rightarrow G$), “favorable propagation” if
  $\frac{G^H G}{M} \approx \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_2 & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \beta_K \end{bmatrix} \triangleq D, \quad M \gg K$

- $H$ i.i.d. $\Rightarrow$ favorable propagation.

- but...
  - the channel is not i.i.d. for a single user
  - different users have different received power levels
  - variations of statistics occur over a large array (i.e. non WSSUS)
  - large-scale fading can occur over a large array
  - different users can have correlated small-scale and large-scale fading even if they are far away from each other
Physically large arrays open up a new dimension

• In conventional MIMO we use the spatial domain:
  – Angle of Arrival and Angle of Departure

• With physically large arrays we can also use the *range* to the latest scattering point
  – spherical wave fronts instead of plane wave fronts
A small measurement example, compact array

- 128 port antenna array indoors
- outdoor single antenna users
- 2.6 GHz center frequency

Users outdoors at street level

Receive antenna array

4 circles of 16 dual polarized antennas

Receive antenna indoor
System Model

- Base station with $M$ antennas
- $K=2$ users with single antenna
- Signal model
  \[ y = \sqrt{\rho} H z + n \]
  \[ z = U x \]
- Gram matrix
  \[ HH^H = \begin{bmatrix}
  1 + g & \delta \\
  \delta^* & 1 - g
  \end{bmatrix} \]

$g$ measures channel power imbalance
$\delta$ measures correlation between the two channels
Precoding Schemes

• **DPC**

\[
C_{\text{DPC}} = \begin{cases} 
\log_2 \left[ 1 + \rho + \frac{\rho^2 (1 - \rho^2 - |\delta|^2)^2 + 4 \rho^2}{4(1 - \rho^2 - |\delta|^2)} \right], & |\delta|^2 \leq 1 - \rho^2 - \frac{2\rho}{\rho} \\
\log_2 [1 + \rho (1 + g)], & |\delta|^2 > 1 - \rho^2 - \frac{2\rho}{\rho}
\end{cases}
\]

• **ZF**

\[
W_{\text{ZF}} = H^H (HH^H)^{-1}
\]

\[
C_{\text{ZF}} = \begin{cases} 
\log_2 \left[ \frac{2 + \rho (1 - \rho^2 - |\delta|^2)^2}{4(1 - \rho^2)} \right], & |\delta|^2 \leq 1 - \rho^2 - \frac{2\rho}{\rho} \\
\log_2 \left[ 1 + \frac{\rho (1 - \rho^2 - |\delta|^2)}{1 - g} \right], & |\delta|^2 > 1 - \rho^2 - \frac{2\rho}{\rho}
\end{cases}
\]

• **MMSE**

\[
W_{\text{MMSE}} = H^H (HH^H + \alpha I)^{-1}
\]
Performance Comparison

- Numerical evaluation
Performance Comparison

- Measured channels
Performance Comparison

- Measured channels

Linear precoding sum rates as high as 98% of DPC capacity in measured channels.
Summary

• User channels can be decorrelated by using reasonably large antenna arrays at base station
• Linear precoding can achieve almost the same sum rate as optimal but complex DPC technique
• Clear benefits can be seen with a relatively limited number of antennas in realistic propagation environments, given that $M >> K$
Non-stationarities and other channel properties for physically large arrays
Measurement setup

- 128 element virtual linear array as base station, 7.3 m long
- 36 different single antenna user positions in a court yard, 30 positions around building
- 2.6 GHz center frequency, 50 MHz bandwidth
- LOS and NLOS in an outdoor, but controlled environment.
- Extreme but not unrealistic scenarios

BS positions
Measurement principle: virtual array

TX
VNA
RX

RF to optical conv.
Fiber Optic cable
Optical to RF conv.
Power amplifier

LNA
Rx antenna
Channel
Tx antenna
Scenario I: court yards

[Diagram showing NLOS and LOS users in a courtyard setting]
We observe large differences over the array

- A detailed study of received signals revealed that we had large variations over the array:
  - received power level
  - small scale fading distribution
  - angular power spectra
- This implies that the channel cannot be seen as wide sense stationary over the large array, which has implications for
  - modeling
  - simulation
  - theoretical analysis
- For the following analysis we use a 10 element window, in which we can assume that a plane wave assumption and WSSUS holds
Angular power spectrum over the array

Scatterers come and go
LOS component varies in strength
Angle of arrival changes over the array
Angular power spectrum, 10 ant. sub-array

- Angular spread is limited
- Scatterers come and go
- Large variations over the array
Received power level, 10 antenna sub-array

Power variations of 5 dB over the array
Interaction with nearby objects
The received amplitudes can be described as Ricean/Rayleigh with varying K-factor. NLOS court generally have low K-factors.
Near field effects improve de-correlation

- Objects (scatterers) within the Rayleigh distance contribute to make the large antenna even larger
- Users within the Rayleigh distance will create spherical wavefronts at the array
- Scatterers are not visible over the whole array
- There is large scale fading over the array
- Rayleigh distance of the antenna $d_R = 2(L_a)^2/\lambda = 945$ m
Antenna correlation

Antenna correlation coefficients, assuming WSSUS over the array (which is not strictly correct)

The antenna correlation is reasonably low, and somewhat larger in the NLOS court due to the limited angular spread
Eigenvalue distribution, NLOS and i.i.d.

1000 permutations of 4 randomly selected users out of the 26 available 128 and 20 base station antennas, respectively.

Stable eigenvalues in the 128 antenna case, not too different from the i.i.d. case.
Eigenvalue distribution, LOS and i.i.d.

1000 permutations of 4 randomly selected users out of the 26 available 128 and 20 base station antennas, respectively.

Very similar performance
The excess antennas makes the eigenmodes stable
User correlation, orthogonality between users

Example of user correlation coefficients, 128 and 20 antennas, resp.
LOS court, users 6, 20, 15, 18

\[
R_{128}^{LOS} = \begin{pmatrix}
1.0000 & 0.0207 & 0.0716 & 0.0308 \\
0.0207 & 1.0000 & 0.0119 & 0.0125 \\
0.0716 & 0.0119 & 1.0000 & 0.0166 \\
0.0308 & 0.0125 & 0.0166 & 1.0000
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
R_{20}^{LOS} = \begin{pmatrix}
1.0000 & 0.0634 & 0.0933 & 0.0208 \\
0.0634 & 1.0000 & 0.0320 & 0.1199 \\
0.0933 & 0.0320 & 1.0000 & 0.0264 \\
0.0208 & 0.1199 & 0.0264 & 1.0000
\end{pmatrix}
\]

On the average the correlation goes down with the number of antennas, the correlation is reasonably low.
In conventional multi-link MIMO high correlation can occur when...

Two MS are close to each other

Two MS and BS are on the same line

Wave-guiding effects occur

- Two MS are close to each other
- Two MS and BS are on the same line
- Wave-guiding effects occur

Example scenarios:
- Outdoor microcell and indoor corridor
- MS1 and MS2 on the same line
When can we suffer from high correlation between users in massive MIMO?

- If the angles of the dominating multipath components do not differ enough to give a relative phase shift of more than $\pi$ over the array
  - Less than 0.5 degree difference is enough for the previous measurement setup
When can we suffer from high correlation between users in massive MIMO?

- If the angles of the dominating multipath are the same, but the difference in distance is not enough to give spherical de-correlation.
When can we suffer from high correlation between users in massive MIMO?

- When there are strong common clusters that we are not able to resolve (small cluster angular spread)
Consequences for modeling

- The environment is not stationary over a physically large array
  - scatterers come and go
- We need to include a LOS component with varying power to account for Rayleigh/Ricean variations
- We should introduce large scale fading over the array
- A modified COST 2100 geometric model could work as a baseline for modeling, or use detailed ray-tracing
- The propagation situation is actually better than expected due to the spatial non-stationarities
Scenario II: Campus

- Single omni-directional antenna at user side
- Center frequency at 2.6 GHz
- Bandwidth of 50 MHz
Angular power spectrum in LOS and NLOS

a) LOS scenario (MS 2)
A “difficult” scenario, potentially with low rank and high correlation between users

b) NLOS scenario (MS 7)
A “better” scenario with rich scattering and likely low correlation between users
Capacity/sum-rate in the downlink

Dirty-paper coding (DPC) capacity

\[ C_{\text{DPC}} = \max_P \log_2 \det \left( I + \frac{\rho K}{M} H^H P H \right) \]

Total power constraint: \( \sum_{i=1}^{K} P_i = 1 \)

Zero-forcing (ZF) sum-rate

\[ C_{\text{ZF}} = \max_P \sum_{i=1}^{K} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\rho K}{M} P_i \right) \]

Total power constraint: \( \sum_{i=1}^{K} P_i \left[ (HH^H)^{-1} \right]_{ii} = 1 \)

\( \rho = 10 \text{ dB (interference-free per-user SNR)} \)

Increased array gain when \( M \) increases is harvested as reduced transmit power
Compact vs. physically large arrays

- Cylindrical antenna array
  - Compact: 30 cm wide x 30 cm high
  - Can resolve elevation
  - Directional dual polarized patch antenna elements
    \( \lambda/2 \) spacing,

- Linear antenna array
  - Physically large: 8 m long
  - Can not resolve elevation
  - Omni-directional antenna elements
    \( \lambda/2 \) spacing
DPC and ZF in NLOS (MS 7),
Distance between 4 users 1.5-2 m

Lines: average capacity/sum-rate over 50 MHz and 2000 random selections of $M$ antennas

Shaded regions: 5%-95% outage
DPC and ZF in LOS (MS 2), tricky case
Distance between 4 users 1.5-2 m

Lines: average capacity/sum-rate over 50 MHz and 2000 random selections of $M$ BS antennas

Shaded regions: 5%-95% outage
DPC and ZF in LOS (MS 1-4) Distance between 4 users >10 m

Lines: average capacity/sum-rate over 50 MHz and 2000 random selections of $M$ antennas

Shaded regions: 5%-95% outage
Some observations

• In the studied realistic propagation environment, we have characteristics that allow for efficient use of very-large MIMO, even with less-complex linear precoding scheme
  – In the most “difficult” case studied, closely spaced users with LOS, the worst combination of cylindrical array with ZF reaches 55% of ideal performance
  – In other cases, both linear and cylindrical arrays with ZF reach 80-90% of ideal performance
• The limit for “large” MIMO, in terms of number of BS antennas, is in a reasonable range of about 10 times the number of users
### Channel Models for massive MIMO

**Important channel properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Single-link MIMO</th>
<th>Multi-link MIMO</th>
<th>massive MIMO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fading correlation</td>
<td>Small-scale fading</td>
<td>Large-scale-fading</td>
<td>Small- and <strong>large-scale fading</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial / temporal correlation</td>
<td>Intra-link</td>
<td>Inter-link</td>
<td>Intra- and <strong>inter-link</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Channel models for massive MIMO

Massive MIMO extension of existing channel models?

• Non-physical models
  – Analytical model (e.g., Kronecker, i.i.d.)
    • hard to model large-scale fading and non-stationarities
  – Stochastic models (e.g., Tapped-delay line)
    • hard to model non-stationarities

• Physical models (e.g., Ray-tracing, Geometry based stochastic channel models)
  – Related to distribution of scatterers
  – Good for narrowband power and finding dominant components, inaccurate for weak components, diffraction, diffuse scattering; these effects strongly influence performance
  – spherical waves inherent in the models
Comparison of approaches

• Modeling of transfer matrix
  – Depends on antenna configuration
  – Is what channel sounder measures, and wireless system “sees”

• Double-directional model
  – Models multipath components with DOA and DOD
  – Independent of antenna configuration
  – Basic setup requires more parameters, but realistic models easier to implement
  – Note that DOA and DOD changes over the array, as opposed to the classical approach

• Conversion between models
  – Nonphysical model can easily be obtained from physical model
    • sum the contributions from the multipath components
  – Getting physical from nonphysical model is difficult (high-resolution algorithms)
Double-Directional Propagation Modeling

- Separation of antennas and propagation (Steinbauer et al., 2001)

\[ H_{ss}(s) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_{ss}} a_{l}^{RX} \left( g_{l}^{RX} \right)^{T} \cdot e^{j(2\pi f \tau_l + \xi)} \cdot \Gamma_{l} \cdot g_{l}^{TX} \left( a_{l}^{TX} \right)^{T} \]

MIMO channel \quad Multi \quad paths \quad Rx \quad array \quad Antenna \quad gain

Propagation time \quad Polarimetric \quad weight

Antenna \quad gain \quad Tx \quad array
GSCM Philosophy

• Parametric approach, WSSUS not required
  – create a virtual map of scatterers and trace each contribution
• Based on clustering approach
  – scatterers with similar parameters are grouped together
• Multi-layer approach:
  – Radio environments
  – Large-scale effects
  – Small-scale effects
Geometry-Based Stochastic Channel Model

- Signals propagate through the same scatterers
  - Inter-link spatial correlation
  - Correlated shadow fading
Visibility Regions (VRs)

- Each cluster is associated with one visibility region: when the MS moves into the VR of a cluster, the cluster becomes visible.
- There is a transition region when entering a visibility region.
The COST 2100 Channel Model

- Geometry-based stochastic channel model
- Relies on COST 259/273 approach, basis for WINNER and 3GPP/3GPP2 SCM models

Pros
- Allows dynamic channel simulation
- Scalable for massive MIMO extension

Cons
- Lacking parameters for some interesting scenarios

A Matlab implementation is available at Google code
MIMO capability

- Multipath components are described also in the angular domain.
- Because the COST 2100 channel model is double directional, it can be used to simulate MIMO channels for any array configuration.
- The COST 2100 model is independent of antennas: the channel is combined with the antenna array description to provide the MIMO channel matrix.

\[
H(t, \tau) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_p \alpha_{np} \delta(\tau - \tau_{np}) \mathbf{s}_{MS}(\Omega_{np}^{MS}) \mathbf{s}_{BS}^T(\Omega_{np}^{BS})
\]

\[
H(t, f) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_p \alpha_{np} e^{-j2\pi f \tau_{np}} \mathbf{s}_{MS}(\Omega_{np}^{MS}) \mathbf{s}_{BS}^T(\Omega_{np}^{BS})
\]
Extension of the COST 2100 model

- Deploy visibility regions also at the base station – varying power levels
- Spherical wavefronts inherent in the model
- Allows for dynamic users
- Correlation properties inherent

BS

MS
Angular power spectrum and cluster power variations (LOS scenario)

Cluster from around 130°
Angular power spectrum and cluster power variations (NLOS scenario)

Cluster from around 100°

Cluster from around 20°
Distribution of cluster visibility regions

**LOS group**

**NLOS group**

CDF

Clusters with VR outside array
Clusters with VR inside array

Length of cluster visibility region [wavelength]
Summary and Conclusions I

• Massive MIMO channels are different from conventional MIMO
  – variations over the array
  – non-WSSUS
  – spherical wavefronts
• Standard MIMO models can not be used if one want to capture a realistic channel behavior
• Power imbalances between users have to be taken into account
Summary and Conclusions II

• A modified COST 2100 channel model can model the channel behavior well
  – introduce visibility regions over the array
• Correlated large scale fading might be important for performance prediction
• The non-stationarities actually make the situation better than expected
• It seems that the channel is rich enough to provide enough degrees of freedom
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Questions?
Modeling polarization

• For systems relaying on polarization diversity, the channel model should take the depolarization induced by scattering and by antennas into account
• Each MPC must be described by a matrix (instead of a scalar)
Modeling polarization

- Polarization of a single MPC is decomposed
- Antenna array polarization and orientation array pattern matrix
- Channel depolarization due to interactions polarization matrix

$$H(t, \tau) = \exp\left(j2\pi v_k t\right) C_r(\theta_{r,k}, \phi_{r,k}) \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_{\theta\theta,k} & \gamma_{\theta\phi,k} \\ \gamma_{\phi\theta,k} & \gamma_{\phi\phi,k} \end{bmatrix} C_t(\theta_{t,k}, \phi_{t,k})^T \delta(\tau - \tau_k)$$

$$C_r(\theta_{r,k}, \phi_{r,k}) = \begin{bmatrix} c_{\theta_1}(\theta_{r,k}, \phi_{r,k}) \\ c_{\phi_1}(\theta_{r,k}, \phi_{r,k}) \\ \vdots \\ c_{\theta_n}(\theta_{r,k}, \phi_{r,k}) \\ c_{\phi_n}(\theta_{r,k}, \phi_{r,k}) \end{bmatrix}$$

- \(\theta\)-pattern of array
- \(\phi\)-pattern of array

\(\theta\)-pattern of a vertical linear antenna

\(\phi\)-pattern of a vertical linear antenna
Dense multipath components

- **DMC** = dense or diffuse multipath components, caused by diffuse scattering or by non resolved specular paths
- Several studies found that the DMCs are clustered around the specular MPCs
- Clustering of DMC extends the cluster spectrum with extra power decaying in angular and time domains

![Diagram](image)

+ : specular MPC
○ : DMC

Centroid of SC cluster
MPCs for the DMC
DMC local cluster

Power [dB]
Delay [ns]
Putting DMC and polarization together

- The COST 2100 model combines the polarization and DMC behavior
- The DMC is also polarization selective!
Multi-link aspects

- Multi-link channel sounding by Aalto and Lund University
- Existence of common scatterers or clusters of scatterers: some clusters are seen by different pairs of Tx-Rx
- The presence of common clusters causes inter-link correlations

![Power propagated through the same scatterer [%]](image)
Multi-link aspects

- Link-common clusters are connected to multiple VRs, each VR determining cluster connections to BSs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VR₁</th>
<th>VR₂</th>
<th>VR₃</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS₁</td>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS₂</td>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>C₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS₃</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations in Measurements

- Waveguiding in a corridor led to complete overlap of scatterers (all power propagates through the same scatterers!)
Common Scattereds (Clusters)

- Classification

(a) BS-common

(b) MS-common

(c) BS-MS-common
Review: Multi-Link MIMO modeling

- Terminal cooperation among multiple cells
- Co-channel interference reduction among multiple cells
- Multiple access in a single cell
- Broadcast in a single cell