Interference Alignment in MIMO Networks: Feasibility and Transceiver Design

Óscar González

University of Cantabria

PhD Thesis Defense Advisor: Ignacio Santamaría

> Santander December 4th, 2014









Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
0●	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Interference management in wireless networks

- Weak interference: treat as noise
- Strong interference: decode
- Interference strength comparable to signal strength:
 - ► **Traditional approach:** orthogonalize (TDMA, FDMA,...) Each user gets $\frac{1}{K}$ of channel resources ($\frac{1}{K}DoF$)
 - ► Interference alignment [Cadambe & Jafar, 2008]: Every user gets ¹/₂ of channel resources (¹/₂DoF)
- Users cooperate so that interfering signals overlap at each receiver, leaving more room for desired signals
- ► Achieves many more DoF than previously believed
- ► Ideally, all interfering users are jointly perceived as a single one

Everyone gets half the cake!





Feasibility of linear spatial domain IA: problem statement

Arbitrary K-user interf. channel: $(M_1 \times N_1, d_1) \cdots (M_K \times N_K, d_K)$

 $\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{V}_{1} & \mathbf{V}_{1} \\ \hline \mathbf{V}_{1} & \mathbf{V}_{2} \\ \hline \mathbf{V}_{1} & \mathbf{V}_{2} \\ \hline \mathbf{V}_{1} & \mathbf{V}_{2} \\ \hline \mathbf{V}_{2} & \mathbf{V}_{3} \\ \hline \mathbf{V}_{4} & \mathbf{V}_{4} \\ \hline \mathbf{V}_{5} & \mathbf{V}_{5} \\ \hline \mathbf{V}_{6} & \mathbf{V}_{6} \\ \hline \mathbf{V}_{6} & \mathbf{V}_{7} \\ \hline \mathbf{V}_{7} \mathbf{V$

Interference alignment conditions:

$$\mathbf{U}_k^T \mathbf{H}_{kl} \mathbf{V}_l = \mathbf{0}, \qquad k \neq l,$$

$$\operatorname{rank}(\mathbf{U}_{k}^{T}\mathbf{H}_{kk}\mathbf{V}_{k})=d_{k}, \forall k.$$

Assumptions:

- ► No channel extensions allowed
- Generic choice of channel matrices

Feasibility problem: determine if there exists (at least) a set of precoders, $\{\mathbf{V}_l\}$, and decoders, $\{\mathbf{U}_k\}$, which satisfies the above set of bilinear equations

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	00000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

- ► Conclusive answer for certain symmetric scenarios, e.g., (M × N, d)³, (M × M, d)^K or (M × N, d)^K where d|M and N
- Results for asymmetric scenarios have remained elusive

Theorem (Razaviyayn *et al.*, 2012): Any DoF tuple $(d_1, d_2, ..., d_K)$ that is achievable through IA must satisfy the following $\min(M_k, N_k) \ge d_k, \quad \forall k$ $\max(M_l, N_k) \ge d_l + d_k, \quad \forall (k, l) \in \Phi$ $\sum_{l:(k,l) \in \phi} (M_l - d_l)d_l + \sum_{k:(k,l) \in \phi} (N_k - d_k)d_k \ge \sum_{(k,l) \in \phi} d_l d_k \; \forall \phi \subseteq \Phi$

Remark: Costly evaluation for a necessary (but not sufficient) condition. Only sufficient when d|M and N, e.g., single-beam

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	00000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

- ► Conclusive answer for certain symmetric scenarios, e.g., (M×N, d)³, (M×M, d)^K or (M×N, d)^K where d|M and N
- Results for asymmetric scenarios have remained elusive

Theorem (Razaviyayn *et al.*, 2012): Any DoF tuple
$$(d_1, d_2, ..., d_K)$$

that is achievable through IA must satisfy the following
P2P conditions for every user: $O(K)$
 $\max(M_l, N_k) \ge d_l + d_k, \quad \forall (k, l) \in \Phi$
 $\sum_{l:(k,l)\in\phi} (M_l - d_l)d_l + \sum_{k:(k,l)\in\phi} (N_k - d_k)d_k \ge \sum_{(k,l)\in\phi} d_l d_k \; \forall \phi \subseteq \Phi$

Remark: Costly evaluation for a necessary (but not sufficient) condition. Only sufficient when d|M and N, e.g., single-beam

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	00000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

- ► Conclusive answer for certain symmetric scenarios, e.g., (M×N, d)³, (M×M, d)^K or (M×N, d)^K where d|M and N
- Results for asymmetric scenarios have remained elusive

Theorem (Razaviyayn *et al.*, 2012): Any DoF tuple
$$(d_1, d_2, ..., d_K)$$

that is achievable through IA must satisfy the following
P2P conditions for every user: $O(K)$
Signal+Interf. accommodated at TX or RX: $O(K^2)$
 $\sum_{l:(k,l)\in\phi} (M_l - d_l)d_l + \sum_{k:(k,l)\in\phi} (N_k - d_k)d_k \ge \sum_{(k,l)\in\phi} d_l d_k \ \forall \phi \subseteq \Phi$

Remark: Costly evaluation for a necessary (but not sufficient) condition. Only sufficient when d|M and N, e.g., single-beam

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	00000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

- Conclusive answer for certain symmetric scenarios, e.g., $(M \times N, d)^3$, $(M \times M, d)^K$ or $(M \times N, d)^K$ where d|M and N
- Results for asymmetric scenarios have remained elusive

Theorem (Razaviyayn *et al.*, 2012): Any DoF tuple (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_K) that is achievable through IA must satisfy the following P2P conditions for every user: O(K)

Signal+Interf. accommodated at TX or RX: $O(K^2)$

#vars. \geq #eqs. for every subset of eqs.: $O(2^{K^2})$

Remark: Costly evaluation for a necessary (but not sufficient) condition. Only sufficient when d|M and N, e.g., single-beam

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	00000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

- ► Conclusive answer for certain symmetric scenarios, e.g., (M × N, d)³, (M × M, d)^K or (M × N, d)^K where d|M and N
- Results for asymmetric scenarios have remained elusive

Theorem (Razaviyayn *et al.*, 2012): Any DoF tuple (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_K) that is achievable through IA must satisfy the following

P2P conditions for every user: O(K)

Signal+Interf. accommodated at TX or RX: $O(K^2)$

Properness [Yetis *et al.*, 2010]: $O(2^{K^2})$

Remark: Costly evaluation for a necessary (but not sufficient) condition. Only sufficient when d|M and N, e.g., single-beam

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	00000000	000000000000	000

First contribution

Feasibility solved in polynomial time (for scenarios where properness is also sufficient)

Sometimes, more efficiently, e.g. single-beam \rightarrow linear time

 How? Identify the properness conditions with conditions for existence of a feasible flow in a supply-demand network





- 1. Calculate the maximum flow with any polynomial time algorithm: Ford-Fulkerson, Edmonds-Karp, Goldberg
- 2. Check demand fulfillment

 $\label{eq:constraint} \begin{array}{l} \mbox{Demand fulfillment} = \mbox{Feasibility} \\ \mbox{(for those scenarios where properness and feasibility are equivalent)} \end{array}$



- 1. Calculate the maximum flow with any polynomial time algorithm: Ford-Fulkerson, Edmonds-Karp, Goldberg
- 2. Check demand fulfillment

 $\label{eq:def-Demand fulfillment} Demand \ fulfillment = Feasibility \\ (for those scenarios where properness and feasibility are equivalent)$

We still need a general result!

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	00000000000		00000000000	000

Second contribution: a general feasibility test

We need an appropriate mathematical model considering problem invariances (H, U, V) \mathcal{V} \mathcal{H} (H)

 \mathcal{H} : Cartesian product of **projective spaces** for channels

- $\mathcal{S}:$ Cartesian product of Grassmannians for precoders/decoders
- $\mathcal{V}:$ Solution variety satisfying IA conditions

Study of π_1 is fundamental for IA:

- IA transceiver design: $\pi_1^{-1}(H)$
- ► IA feasibility problem: $\pi_1^{-1}(H) \stackrel{?}{=} \emptyset$
- Number of IA solutions: $|\pi_1^{-1}(H)|$

González, Beltrán & Santamaría, ISIT 2012, TIT 2014

Interference Alignment in MIMO Networks: Feasibility and Transceiver Design

(U, V)

Introduction 00	Feasibility ○○○○○●○○○○○	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion 000

Algebraic approach [Razaviyayn *et al.*, 2012; Bresler *et al.*, 2014] Case 1: #vars < #eqs or dim(V) < dim(H)



Ο,

π₁(V) cannot cover most of H:
 No solution for every choice of H out of a zero-measure set

Case 2: $\#vars \ge \#eqs$ or $\dim(\mathcal{V}) \ge \dim(\mathcal{H})$

1. $\pi_1(\mathcal{V})$ covers the whole \mathcal{H} : Solution for every choice of H

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Algebraic approach [Razaviyayn *et al.*, 2012; Bresler *et al.*, 2014] Case 1: #vars < #eqs or dim(V) < dim(H)



О.

π₁(V) cannot cover most of H:
 No solution for every choice of H out of a zero-measure set

Case 2: $\#vars \ge \#eqs$ or $\dim(\mathcal{V}) \ge \dim(\mathcal{H})$



- 1. $\pi_1(\mathcal{V})$ covers the whole \mathcal{H} : Solution for every choice of H
- 2. $\pi_1(\mathcal{V})$ is a zero-measure set of \mathcal{H} **No solution** for every choice of H out of a zero-measure set

The whole ${\mathcal V}$ projects onto ${\mathcal H}$ in a singular way

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	0000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

How to distinguish Case 2.2 from Case 2.1? In Case 2.2...

Tangent space of $\mathcal V$ does not project onto the whole tangent space of $\mathcal H$

- Formally, every point of $\mathcal V$ is a critical point of π_1
- By definition, the derivative of π₁ at critical points is not surjective, which is equivalent to θ, i.e.

$$(\dot{U}_1,\ldots,\dot{U}_K,\dot{V}_1,\ldots,\dot{V}_K)\mapsto\left\{\dot{U}_k^{\mathsf{T}}H_{kl}V_l+U_k^{\mathsf{T}}H_{kl}\dot{V}_l
ight\}$$

being not surjective (rank deficient)

- ► Tools from differential topology (Ehresmann's Theorem) prove
 - θ is almost everywhere surjective (feasible)
 - θ is nowhere surjective (infeasible)

It is enough to test for surjectivity at some affine representative, $(\dot{\mathbf{U}}_1, \dots, \dot{\mathbf{U}}_K, \dot{\mathbf{V}}_1, \dots, \dot{\mathbf{V}}_K)$, of a vector in the tangent space of \mathcal{V}

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	0000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Theorem: An IA scenario is feasible iff for almost every choice of \mathbf{H}_{kl} , and for any choice of \mathbf{U}_k , \mathbf{V}_l satisfying the IA conditions, the linear mapping defined by

$$(\dot{\mathbf{U}}_1,\ldots,\dot{\mathbf{U}}_K,\dot{\mathbf{V}}_1,\ldots,\dot{\mathbf{V}}_K)\mapsto\left\{\dot{\mathbf{U}}_k^T\mathbf{H}_{kl}\mathbf{V}_l+\mathbf{U}_k^T\mathbf{H}_{kl}\dot{\mathbf{V}}_l\right\}$$

is surjective.

Affine representatives (matrices) \Rightarrow Linear Algebra

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	0000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Theorem: An IA scenario is feasible iff for almost every choice of \mathbf{H}_{kl} , and for any choice of \mathbf{U}_k , \mathbf{V}_l satisfying the IA conditions, the linear mapping defined by

$$(\dot{\mathbf{U}}_1,\ldots,\dot{\mathbf{U}}_K,\dot{\mathbf{V}}_1,\ldots,\dot{\mathbf{V}}_K)\mapsto\left\{\dot{\mathbf{U}}_k^T\mathbf{H}_{kl}\mathbf{V}_l+\mathbf{U}_k^T\mathbf{H}_{kl}\dot{\mathbf{V}}_l\right\}$$

is surjective.

Affine representatives (matrices) \Rightarrow Linear Algebra

It is easy to devise a simple numerical feasibility test:

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Theorem: An IA scenario is feasible iff for almost every choice of \mathbf{H}_{kl} , and for any choice of \mathbf{U}_k , \mathbf{V}_l satisfying the IA conditions, the linear mapping defined by

 $(\dot{\mathbf{U}}_1,\ldots,\dot{\mathbf{U}}_K,\dot{\mathbf{V}}_1,\ldots,\dot{\mathbf{V}}_K)\mapsto \left\{\dot{\mathbf{U}}_k^T\mathbf{H}_{kl}\mathbf{V}_l+\mathbf{U}_k^T\mathbf{H}_{kl}\dot{\mathbf{V}}_l\right\}$

is surjective.

Affine representatives (matrices) \Rightarrow Linear Algebra

It is easy to devise a simple numerical feasibility test:

► Step 1: Find an arbitrary IA solution ←

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	0000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Theorem: An IA scenario is feasible iff for almost every choice of \mathbf{H}_{kl} , and for any choice of \mathbf{U}_k , \mathbf{V}_l satisfying the IA conditions, the linear mapping defined by

$$(\dot{\mathbf{U}}_1,\ldots,\dot{\mathbf{U}}_K,\dot{\mathbf{V}}_1,\ldots,\dot{\mathbf{V}}_K)\mapsto\left\{\dot{\mathbf{U}}_k^T\mathbf{H}_{kl}\mathbf{V}_l+\mathbf{U}_k^T\mathbf{H}_{kl}\dot{\mathbf{V}}_l
ight\}$$

is surjective.

Affine representatives (matrices) \Rightarrow Linear Algebra

It is easy to devise a simple numerical feasibility test:

- ► Step 1: Find an arbitrary IA solution
- ► Step 2: Rank checking ←

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Step 1: Find an arbitrary IA solution

- ► We need to find an arbitrary set (H_{kl}, U_k, V_l) such that the IA conditions are satisfied
- The following canonical representatives trivially satisfy the alignment conditions:
 - ► Precoders/decoders:

$$\mathbf{V}_{l} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{d_{l}} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(M_{l}-d_{l}),d_{l}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{U}_{k} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{d_{k}} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(N_{k}-d_{k}),d_{k}} \end{bmatrix}$$

► Channels:

$$\mathbf{H}_{kl} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{d_k, d_l} & \mathbf{A}_{kl} \\ \mathbf{B}_{kl} & \mathbf{C}_{kl} \end{bmatrix}$$

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Step 2: Rank checking

To check if the matrix Ψ defining the mapping

$$\theta: \left(\{\dot{\mathbf{U}}_k\}_{k\in\Phi_R}, \{\dot{\mathbf{V}}_l\}_{l\in\Phi_T}\right) \; \mapsto \; \left\{\dot{\mathbf{U}}_k^T \mathbf{B}_{kl} + \mathbf{A}_{kl} \dot{\mathbf{V}}_l\right\}_{(k,l)\in\Phi}$$

is full row rank.

Example: 3-user channel



Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	0000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Numerical results

What can this test be used for?

- ► Check the feasibility of an arbitrary interference channel
 - ► Floating point test is numerically robust for 100+ antennas/node, e.g., (86 × 139, 25)⁸
 - Exact arithmetic test gives a conclusive answer
 Feasibility problem belongs to the BPP complexity class
- ► Extensive evaluation of feasibility in families of systems
 - Disprove conjectures by finding counterexamples:

System	$(11 \times 29, d)^4$	$(19 \times 71, d)^5$	$(29 \times 139, d)^6$
Conj. ¹ DoF MN/M+N	7.975	14.989	23.994
Actual DoF	8	15	24

 Powerful tool to obtain research insights, intuitions, establish new conjectures, etc.

¹Wang, Sun, Jafar, ISIT, 2012



























Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Motivation

Why should we care about the number of solutions?

- ► Further reveals the mathematical richness of the problem
 - Link the IA problem to other, well-studied, combinatorial/graph theory counting problems
- Generalizes the feasibility problem

Infeasible \Leftrightarrow Number of solutions = 0

- ▶ Prediction of large system performance [Schmidt *et al.*, 2010]
- Measure of the algebraic complexity required to compute a solution [Bresler *et al.*, 2014]



Third contribution: number of solutions, a general formula The dimension of the solution set is $s = \dim(\mathcal{V}) - \dim(\mathcal{H})$

▶ Negative: 0 solutions
 ▶ Positive: 0 or ∞ solutions
 ▶ Zero: Finite number of solutions

Theorem: If s = 0, for every choice of $\{H_{kl}\}$ out of a zero measure set, the IA problem has exactly *S* alignment solutions given by

$$S = C \oint_{H \in ||\mathbf{H}_{kl}||_F = 1} \det(\mathbf{\Psi} \mathbf{\Psi}^H) dH = C \cdot E[\det(\mathbf{\Psi} \mathbf{\Psi}^H)]$$

How does this generalize our feasibility results?

- ► Checking feasibility: Pick a canonical IA solution at random and check whether det $(\Psi\Psi^H) \neq 0$
- Counting solutions: Average det(ΨΨ^H) over all canonical solutions with unit Frobenius norm

González, Santamaría & Beltrán, TIT, 2nd review round

Introduction Fe	easibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00 01	00000000000	0000000	00000000000	000

Example: the $(2 \times 2, 1)^3$ system, 2 solutions²

► We take uniformly distributed canonical solutions:

$$\mathbf{H}_{kl} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & a_{kl} \\ b_{kl} & c_{kl} \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \bar{\mathbf{H}}_{kl} = \frac{\mathbf{H}_{kl}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{kl}\|_F},$$

where $a_{kl}, b_{kl}, c_{kl} \sim CN(0, 2)$, i.i.d.

• The 6×6 matrix Ψ defining the mapping is

$$\boldsymbol{\Psi} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{b_{12}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{12}\|_F} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{a_{12}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{12}\|_F} & 0\\ \frac{b_{13}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{13}\|_F} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{a_{13}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{13}\|_F}\\ 0 & \frac{b_{21}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{21}\|_F} & 0 & \frac{a_{21}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{21}\|_F} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \frac{b_{23}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{23}\|_F} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{a_{23}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{23}\|_F}\\ 0 & 0 & \frac{b_{31}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{31}\|_F} & \frac{a_{31}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{31}\|_F} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & \frac{b_{32}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{32}\|_F} & 0 & \frac{a_{32}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{32}\|_F} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

²Cadambe & Jafar, 2008

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	00000000000	0000000	00000000000	000

Example: the $(2 \times 2, 1)^3$ system (cont'd)

The number of solutions is

$$S = C \oint_{H \in ||\mathbf{H}_{kl}||_F} \det(\mathbf{\Psi}\mathbf{\Psi}^H) dH = C \cdot E[|\det(\mathbf{\Psi})|^2]$$

where $C = 3^6 = 729$ for this scenario

► Expanding the determinant of Ψ (squared) along its first column we get

$$S = 3^6 \cdot 2 \cdot E \left[\left| \frac{b_{12}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{12}\|_F^2} \right|^2 \right]^6$$

where
$$\left|\frac{b_{12}}{\|\mathbf{H}_{12}\|_F^2}\right|^2 \sim \text{Beta}(1,2)$$
 with mean $1/3$
• Consequently,

$$S = 3^6 \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^6 = 2$$
 solutions

 Introduction
 Feasibility
 Number of solutions
 Transceiver design
 Conclusion

 00
 00000000000
 00000000000
 00000000000
 000

Single-beam scenarios: Closed-form solution

Theorem: The number of IA solutions for an arbitrary single-beam scenario with s = 0 is given by

$$S = rac{\mathsf{per}(\mathbf{T})}{\prod_k (N_k - 1)! \prod_l (M_l - 1)!}$$

where T is the matrix built by replacing the non-zero elements of Ψ by ones and per(T) denotes its permanent.

- Permanent much harder to compute than determinant
- Permanents of 0/1 matrices appear in many counting problems
 - ► Perfect matchings in bipartite graphs, regular digraphs,...
 - ► Closed-form formulas, e.g., $(2 \times (K - 1), 1)^K$ systems, $S = \text{round}\left(\frac{K!}{e}\right)$
 - Bounds on the growth rate of the number of solutions
Multi-beam scenarios: Monte Carlo approximation

```
Input: Relative error, \varepsilon; number of antennas, \{M_k\} and \{N_k\},
           and streams, \{d_k\}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}
Output: Approximate number of IA solutions, E_n
begin
     n \leftarrow 1
     repeat
          Generate a set of random matrices \{\mathbf{A}_{kl}\}, \{\mathbf{B}_{kl}\} and \{\mathbf{C}_{kl}\}
          with i.i.d. \mathcal{CN}(0,2) entries
          Build canonical channel matrices \{\mathbf{H}_{kl}\}
          Normalize every channel matrix \mathbf{H}_{kl} such that \|\mathbf{H}_{kl}\|_F = 1
          Build the matrix \Psi
          D_n \leftarrow C \det(\mathbf{\Psi} \mathbf{\Psi}^H)
          Calculate mean, E_n, and variance, \sigma_n
          n \leftarrow n+1
     until \frac{\sigma_n}{\sqrt{nE_n}} < \varepsilon
```

Introduction 00	Feasibility 000000000000	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion 000

Some examples

	$\left(2 imes (K-1),1 ight)^{K}$	$(3 imes (K-2),1)^K$	$(5 \times (2K - 3), 2)^{K}$
K	Exact / Approx.	Exact / Approx.	Approx.
3	2 / 2 \pm 1.0 %	$1~/~1~\pm$ 0.5 %	1
4	9 / 9 \pm 1.6 %	9 / 9 \pm 1.6 %	$3700\pm0.1~\%$
5	44 / 44 \pm 2.6 %	216 / 216 \pm 1.5 %	72581239 \pm 17.8 %
6	265 / 266 \pm 3.3 %	7570 / 7291 \pm 5.5 %	-

Number of solutions grows rapidly





- Observation: Most of the sum-rate gain is obtained by picking the best out of a small subset of solutions
- ► Is there a systematic way to compute distinct IA solutions?



Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Research on IA has given rise to a plethora of algorithms, most of them based on **alternating minimization** Originally proposed to minimize the interference leakage³

$$\mathsf{IL} = \sum_{k \neq l} \| \mathbf{U}_k^H \mathbf{H}_{kl} \mathbf{V}_l \|_F^2$$

- Typically slow (linear convergence rate)
 - Bounces and circles around minima
- Monotone convergence
- No guaranteed convergence
- No systematic way of getting L different solutions



Precoders, $\{V\}$

³Gomadam *et al.*, 2011

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Research on IA has given rise to a plethora of algorithms, most of them based on **alternating minimization** Originally proposed to minimize the interference leakage³

$$\mathsf{IL} = \sum_{k \neq I} \| \mathbf{U}_k^H \mathbf{H}_{kI} \mathbf{V}_I \|_F^2$$

- Typically slow (linear convergence rate)
 - Bounces and circles around minima
- ► Monotone convergence
- ► No guaranteed convergence
- No systematic way of getting L different solutions



³Gomadam *et al.*, 2011

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Research on IA has given rise to a plethora of algorithms, most of them based on **alternating minimization** Originally proposed to minimize the interference leakage³

$$\mathsf{IL} = \sum_{k \neq I} \| \mathbf{U}_k^H \mathbf{H}_{kI} \mathbf{V}_I \|_F^2$$

- Typically slow (linear convergence rate)
 - Bounces and circles around minima
- ► Monotone convergence
- ► No guaranteed convergence
- No systematic way of getting L different solutions



³Gomadam *et al.*, 2011

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

$$\mathsf{IL} = \sum_{k \neq l} \|\mathbf{U}_k^H \mathbf{H}_{kl} \mathbf{V}_l\|_F^2$$

- Typically slow (linear convergence rate)
 - Bounces and circles around minima
- Monotone convergence
- No guaranteed convergence
- No systematic way of getting L different solutions



Precoders, $\{V\}$

³Gomadam *et al.*, 2011

Interference Alignment in MIMO Networks: Feasibility and Transceiver Design

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

$$\mathsf{IL} = \sum_{k \neq l} \|\mathbf{U}_k^H \mathbf{H}_{kl} \mathbf{V}_l\|_F^2$$

- Typically slow (linear convergence rate)
 - Bounces and circles around minima
- Monotone convergence
- No guaranteed convergence
- No systematic way of getting L different solutions



Precoders, $\{V\}$

³Gomadam *et al.*, 2011

Interference Alignment in MIMO Networks: Feasibility and Transceiver Design

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

$$\mathsf{IL} = \sum_{k \neq I} \| \mathbf{U}_k^H \mathbf{H}_{kI} \mathbf{V}_I \|_F^2$$

- Typically slow (linear convergence rate)
 - Bounces and circles around minima
- ► Monotone convergence
- ► No guaranteed convergence
- No systematic way of getting L different solutions

Interference Alignment in MIMO Networks: Feasibility and Transceiver Design



³Gomadam *et al.*, 2011

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

$$\mathsf{IL} = \sum_{k \neq I} \| \mathbf{U}_k^H \mathbf{H}_{kI} \mathbf{V}_I \|_F^2$$

- Typically slow (linear convergence rate)
 - Bounces and circles around minima
- ► Monotone convergence
- ► No guaranteed convergence
- No systematic way of getting L different solutions

Interference Alignment in MIMO Networks: Feasibility and Transceiver Design



³Gomadam *et al.*, 2011

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Homotopy continuation

Basic idea: define a parametrized transformation or **homotopy** that gradually deforms a trivially solvable system, or **start system**, into the **target system** that we want to solve

A simple homotopy: a series of MIMO channels obtained as a convex combination of a start channel, $\overline{\mathbf{H}}_{kl}$, and the target channel, \mathbf{H}_{kl}

$$\mathbf{G}_{kl}(\mathbf{U}_k^H, \mathbf{V}_l, t) := \mathbf{U}_k^H \underbrace{((1-t)\overline{\mathbf{H}}_{kl} + t\mathbf{H}_{kl})}_{\mathbf{H}_{kl}(t)} \mathbf{V}_l, \quad \forall k, l \in \Phi \text{ and } t \in [0, 1]$$

The combination is controlled by the continuation parameter, t

González & Santamaría, ICASSP 2011; González, Fanjul & Santamaría, ICASSP 2014

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	000

Homotopy Continuation



00 00000000000 000000000 0000000000 000	Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
	00	00000000000	00000000	0000000000	000

Start system: the *inverse* IA problem

How do we find an appropriate easy-to-solve system?

• Consider the **inverse IA problem**:

Given \mathbf{U}_{k}^{H} and \mathbf{V}_{l} , find $\overline{\mathbf{H}}_{kl}$ such that

$$\mathbf{U}_{k}^{H}\overline{\mathbf{H}}_{kl}\mathbf{V}_{l}=\mathbf{0},\quad\forall k,l\in\Phi$$

- ► A linear equation per each $\overline{\mathbf{H}}_{kl}$ (total of K(K-1) equations which are solved independently)
- Every solution can be parametrized as

$$\overline{\mathbf{H}}_{kl} = \mathbf{X}_{kl} - \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A}_k^H \mathbf{X}_{kl} \mathbf{B}_l \mathbf{B}_l^H$$

where \mathbf{A}_k and \mathbf{B}_l are orthonormal bases of \mathbf{U}_k and \mathbf{V}_l , respectively, and \mathbf{X}_{kl} is a non-zero arbitrary matrix.

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	000

Path-following procedure

A first order approximation of the homotopy function

$$\mathbf{G}_{kl}(\mathbf{U}_{k}^{H} + \Delta \mathbf{U}_{k}^{H}, \mathbf{V}_{l} + \Delta \mathbf{V}_{l}, t + \Delta t) = \mathbf{U}_{k}^{H}\mathbf{H}_{kl}(t)\mathbf{V}_{l} + \mathbf{U}_{k}^{H}\mathbf{H}_{kl}(t)\mathbf{V}_{l} + \mathbf{U}_{k}^{H}\mathbf{H}_{kl}(t)\Delta \mathbf{V}_{l} + \mathbf{U}_{k}^{H}\mathbf{H}_{kl}(t)\Delta \mathbf{V}_{l} + \mathbf{U}_{k}^{H}(\mathbf{H}_{kl} - \overline{\mathbf{H}}_{kl})\mathbf{V}_{l}\Delta t \quad \forall k, l \in \Phi$$

gives rise to a two-step path-following procedure:

- 1. Euler prediction
- 2. Newton correction



If the current point is in the path, we want the predicted solution at $t + \Delta t$ to be as close to the path as possible:

$$\mathbf{G}_{kl}(\mathbf{U}_{k}^{H}+\Delta\mathbf{U}_{k}^{H},\mathbf{V}_{l}+\Delta\mathbf{V}_{l},t+\Delta t)pprox\mathbf{0}$$

Precoder and decoder updates, ΔV_I and ΔU^H_k, are obtained by solving the system of linear equations:

$$\Delta \mathbf{U}_{k}^{H} \mathbf{H}_{kl}(t) \mathbf{V}_{l} + \mathbf{U}_{k}^{H} \mathbf{H}_{kl}(t) \Delta \mathbf{V}_{l} = -\mathbf{U}_{k}^{H} (\mathbf{H}_{kl} - \overline{\mathbf{H}}_{kl}) \mathbf{V}_{l} \Delta t \quad \forall k, l \in \Phi$$



If the current point $({\mathbf{U}_k}, {\mathbf{V}_l}, t)$ is not as close to the path as we would like, i.e. the entries of $\mathbf{G}_{kl}(\mathbf{U}_{k}^{H},\mathbf{V}_{l},t)$ are larger than a predefined tolerance, we can hold t constant by setting $\Delta t = 0$ and obtain the Newton correction step.

• Again, precoder and decoder updates, $\Delta \mathbf{V}_{l}$ and $\Delta \mathbf{U}_{k}^{H}$ are obtained by solving a system of linear equations:

 $\Delta \mathbf{U}_{\nu}^{H} \mathbf{H}_{kl}(t) \mathbf{V}_{l} + \mathbf{U}_{\nu}^{H} \mathbf{H}_{kl}(t) \Delta \mathbf{V}_{l} = -\mathbf{U}_{\nu}^{H} \mathbf{H}_{kl}(t) \mathbf{V}_{l}, \ \forall k, l \in \Phi$

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	000

Features

Quadratic convergence rate

- ► Faster than previously known algorithms in tight systems
- ► Systematic way to compute *L* distinct solutions:
 - L trivial system solutions \Rightarrow L target system solutions
 - Possibility to use "pre-computed solutions"
- Simple extension to other networks (X networks, structured channels, etc.)
 - Rank conditions explicitly enforced by adding U^H_kH_{kk}V_k = I as an additional equation (involves a change of basis at RX)

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	000

Gauss-Newton algorithm

Observation: for ICs, a sequence Newton step converges globally **Explanation:**

- Newton step for system solving can be regarded as a Gauss-Newton method for IL minimization
- ► In GN the cost function is approximated by a convex function

Interference leakage convexifies as it approaches zero

- ► We can distinguish two operational regimes:
 - 1. Approximation ($IL \ge \mu$): non-monotone convergence
 - 2. Exact ($IL < \mu$): quadratic convergence

Comparison GN vs HC:

 Faster convergence at the expense of the capacity to track different solutions

González, Lameiro & Santamaría, SPL, 2014



Convergence speed: $(5 \times 5, 2)^4$ system, 3700 solutions





Sum-rate performance: $(3 \times 3, 1)^5$ system, 216 solutions



Incremental SNR algorithm by Schmidt *et al.*, 2013 (best-performing algorithm in single-beam networks)

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	● 00

Conclusions and further work

- Closed-form feasibility conditions for single-beam systems
- Numerical feasibility test for general scenarios
- Closed-form number of solutions for single-beam systems
- Monte Carlo approx. of no. of sols. in general scenarios
- Gauss-Newton and homotopy continuation algorithms
- Closed-form results for multi-beam networks (derive DoF bounds by network flow analysis, feasibility results from structure of Ψ,...)
- Combinatorial interpretation of the number of solutions in multi-beam networks
- Algorithms on Riemannian manifolds, e.g. Grassmann, Stiefel
- Distributed versions of both HC and GN algorithms
- Extensions to rank-deficient or structured channels, asymmetric complex-signaling,...

Introduction

Publications derived from this thesis

- J1 Ó. González, C. Beltrán, and I. Santamaría, "A Feasibility Test for Linear Interference Alignment in MIMO Channels with Constant Coefficients", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 1840–1856, Mar. 2014.
- J2 Ó. González, C. Lameiro, and I. Santamaría, "A Quadratically Convergent Method for Interference Alignment in MIMO Interference Channels", *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 1423–1427, Nov. 2014.
- J3 Ó. González, C. Beltrán, and I. Santamaría, "On the Number of Interference Alignment Solutions for the K-User MIMO Channel with Constant Coefficients", submitted to IEEE Transactions on Information Theory (2nd review round), Jan. 2013 arXiv: 1301.6196.
- J4 J. Fanjul, Ó. González, and I. Santamaría, "Homotopy continuation algorithms for interference alignment in arbitrary networks", in preparation.
- C1 Ó. González and I. Santamaría, "Interference Alignment in Single-Beam MIMO Networks Via Homotopy Continuation", in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, Prague, Czech Republic, May 2011, pp. 3344–3347.
- C2 Ó, González, I. Santamaría, and C. Beltrán, "A General Test to Check the Feasibility of Linear Interference Alignment", in 2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), Cambridge, MA, USA, Jul. 2012, pp. 2481–2485.
- C3 Ó. González, C. Lameiro, J. Vía, C. Beltrán, and I. Santamaría, "Computing the Degrees of Freedom for Arbitrary MIMO Interference Channels", in 2013 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing (ICASSP), Vancouver, Canada, May 2013, pp. 4399–4403.
- C4 Ó. González, I. Santamaría, and C. Beltrán, "Finding the Number of Feasible Solutions for Linear Interference Alignment Problems", in 2013 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), Istanbul, Turkey, Jul. 2013, pp. 384–388.
- C5 Ó. González, J. Fanjul, and I. Santamaría, "Homotopy Continuation for Vector Space Interference Alignment in MIMO X Networks", in 2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustic, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), Florence, Italy, May 2014, pp. 6232–6236.

Introduction	Feasibility	Number of solutions	Transceiver design	Conclusion
00	000000000000	00000000	00000000000	00●

Other production and impact indicators

- ► Interference Alignment Toolbox (IAbox)
 - http://github.com/masdeseiscaracteres/IAbox
- Online feasibility test (1500 executions, 45 locations, 17 countries) http://gtas.unican.es/IAtest



- ► Related publications:
 - IA: experimental work, transceiver design,...
 - MIMO systems
 - Physical layer security
- Total production:
 - 6 journal papers (3 published, 2 under review, 1 in preparation)
 - ► 15 conference papers

Introduction

Number of solutions

Transceiver design

Conclusion

Other production and impact indicators

 Interference Alignment Toolbox (IAbox) http://github.com/masdeseiscaracteres/IAbox
 Online feasibility test (1500 executions, 45 locations, 17 countries) http://gtas.unican.es/IAtest

Google Scholar

Citation indices	All	Since 2009
Citations h-index	261 8	261 8
i10-index	0 7	7
2010 2011 2012 2013	2014	

Related publications:

- IA: experimental work, transceiver design,...
- MIMO systems
- Physical layer security
- Total production:
 - 6 journal papers (3 published, 2 under review, 1 in preparation)
 - ► 15 conference papers

Thank you for your attention

Network capacity - the holy grail of information theory



- Capacity: set of all possible rates supported by a network
- Studied for decades but still open (even for the 2-user IC)
- Several approximations attempted: Degrees of freedom (DoF)
 - Pre-log factor of the capacity
 - High-SNR slope of sum-rate
 - Number of non-interfering signal dimensions

Our main focus: Interference alignment (IA)

- Achievability of 1/2 DoF/(user and signaling dimension) in an interference channel [Cadambe & Jafar, 2008]
- ► IA has been shown to be DoF-optimal in many other scenarios

Outline



Can we do better? - A network flow approach



Supply-Demand Theorem (Gale, 1957; Mirsky, 1968): A feasible flow exists if and only if

$$\sum_{k\in B} b_k - \sum_{l\in \bar{A}} a_l \leq \sum_{\substack{k\in B\\l\in A}} c_{kl}, \quad \forall A, B \subseteq \mathcal{K}$$

Identifying the properness conditions with the S-D Theorem:

$$\sum_{l:(k,l)\in\phi}(M_l-d_l)d_l+\sum_{k:(k,l)\in\phi}(N_k-d_k)d_k\geq \sum_{(k,l)\in\phi}d_ld_k\;\forall\phi\subseteq\Phi$$

• Supplies:
$$a_l = (M_l - d_l)d_l$$

• Demands:
$$b_k = d_k \max(\sum_l d_l - N_k, 0)$$

• Capacity:
$$c_{kl} = d_k d_l \ \forall (k, l) \in \Phi, c_{kl} = 0$$
 otherwise

Theorem: If the maximum flow, F, in the transport network does not fulfill the aggregate demand, i.e.,

$$F < \sum_k d_k \max(\sum_l d_l - N_k, 0)$$

Then, no other feasible flow exists and the system is not feasible.

Identifying the properness conditions with the S-D Theorem:

$$\sum_{l:(k,l)\in \phi} (M_l-d_l)d_l + \sum_{k:(k,l)\in \phi} (N_k-d_k)d_k \geq \sum_{(k,l)\in \phi} d_ld_k \; orall \phi\subseteq \Phi$$

• Supplies:
$$a_l = (M_l - d_l)d_l$$

• Demands:
$$b_k = d_k \max(\sum_l d_l - N_k, 0)$$

► Capacity: $c_{kl} = d_k d_l \ \forall (k, l) \in \Phi, c_{kl} = 0$ otherwise

Theorem: If the maximum flow, F, in the transport network does not fulfill the aggregate demand, i.e.,

Goldberg's maximum flow algorithm $O(K^3)$

Then, no other feasible flow exists and the system is not feasible.

Example 1: Demand not fulfilled \Rightarrow Infeasible system



Figure: Maximum flow for the $(4 \times 2, 1)(2 \times 2, 1)^2(2 \times 4, 1)$ system

Remark: The opposite does not hold, see next example

Example 2: Demand fulfilled \Rightarrow Feasible system



Figure: Maximum flow for the $(4 \times 4, 1)(2 \times 2, 1)^3$ system

A feasible flow fulfilling the demands does not mean the system is feasible

OK, but is it feasible or not?

Single-beam systems

- Properness is a necessary and sufficient condition for the feasibility of single-beam systems
 - 1. Maximum flow algorithms provide a conclusive answer in polynomial time
 - 2. A closed-form solution is also possible

Theorem: Consider a fully connected IC where the users are sorted such that $M_k \ge M_{k+1}$ and $N_k \le N_{k+1}$ if $M_k = M_{k+1}$. Then, interference alignment in this network is feasible if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \max(\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{N}_i, 0)^{**} \geq \sum_{i=1}^k (\mathcal{M}_i - 1) \; orall k \in \mathcal{K}$$

where ** denotes the I-restricted conjugate partition.

Single-beam systems

- Properness is a necessary and sufficient condition for the feasibility of single-beam systems
 - 1. Maximum flow algorithms provide a conclusive answer in polynomial time
 - 2. A closed-form solution is also possible

Theorem: Consider a fully connected IC where the users are sorted such that $M_k \ge M_{k+1}$ and $N_k \le N_{k+1}$ if $M_k = M_{k+1}$. Then, interference alignment in this network is feasible if and only if

Linear time-complexity: O(K)

where ** denotes the I-restricted conjugate partition.

Example 1: Infeasible system $(4 \times 2, 1)(2 \times 2, 1)^2(2 \times 4, 1)$

TX/RX antennas, supplies and demands

► I-restricted conjugate partition of *b*:



► Does *b*^{**} majorize *a*?

 $(2,4,6,6) \not\geq (3,4,5,6) \Rightarrow$ Infeasible
Example 2: Feasible system $(4 \times 4, 1)(2 \times 2, 1)^3$

TX/RX antennas, supplies and demands

$$M = (4, 2, 2, 2) \qquad a = (M_i - 1) = (3, 1, 1, 1)$$

$$N = (4, 2, 2, 2) \qquad b = (K - N_i) = (0, 2, 2, 2)$$

► I-restricted conjugate partition of *b*:



► Does *b*^{**} majorize *a*?

 $(3,5,6,6) \ge (3,4,5,6) \Rightarrow Feasible$

Interference Alignment in MIMO Networks: Feasibility and Transceiver Design

Appendices



A conjecture on the DoF of $(M \times N, d)^{\kappa}$ systems



A conjecture on the DoF of $(M \times N, d)^{\kappa}$ systems

Two regimes: below and above the threshold

$$\lambda = 1/2 \left(K - 1 - \sqrt{(K - 1)^2 - 4} \right)$$
:

1. Piecewise linear regime (proved by Liu and Yang, 2013):

$$d^{\star} = \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma(p)+1}{\gamma(p)(K+1)}M, & \gamma'(p) \leq \frac{M}{N} \leq \gamma(p) \\ \frac{\gamma(p)+1}{K+1}N, & \gamma(p) \leq \frac{M}{N} \leq \gamma'(p+1) \end{cases} p \in \mathbb{Z}^{+} \\ \gamma(p) = \frac{\sum_{k=-(p-1)}^{(p-1)} \lambda^{k}}{\sum_{k=-p}^{p} \lambda^{k}} \text{ and } \gamma'(p) = \lambda \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{p-2} \lambda^{2k}}{\sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \lambda^{2k}}. \end{cases}$$

2. Properness-limited regime (remains unproven):

$$d^{\star} = \frac{M+N}{K+1}.$$