Random Matrices in Communication Theory

Rajesh Sundaresan

27 April 2011

Message transmission: an abstraction

- K transmit antennas sending messages
- Message is a signal $x_k \in S \subset \mathbb{C}^K$ carried on antenna k



- Each message is equiprobable
- Message requires energy $\mathbb{E}[|x_k|^2]$
- Can scale the constellation S

Impairments to transmitted signal

- L receive antennas
- Channel gain from transmit antenna k to receive antenna l is H_{lk}
- Received signal:

$$y = Hx + z$$

- $H \in \mathbb{C}^{L \times K}$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^{L}$
- ► H: random iid entries distributed as CN(1), but realisation learnable at the receiver
- ▶ *z*: random $\mathbb{CN}(I_L)$
- Same constellation on each antenna $\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[|x_k|^2] \le P/K = p.$

How do these impairments arise

Random *H* with iid $\mathbb{CN}(1)$ entries:

- Arises because of scattering and many multipaths, with no dominant contribution from a single path
- No direct line of sight path
- If direct line of sight, mean is nonzero also of interest, but not considered here

Random z: Receiver thermal noise in the receiving antenna

I: Receiver problem - MMSE

- Given y and H, process it and identify x
- Test each hypothesis for x, pick the most likely one (after having observed y and H). Exponential complexity. Want simpler receivers
- E.g., A linear receiver that minimises mean squared error (MMSE)

$$\rho := \min_{M \in \mathbb{C}K \times L} \mathbb{E} \left[\|x - My\|^2 \mid H \right]$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Questions: Find the argmin $M_{\rm opt}$. It can depend on H. Find ρ

The solution

Proposition:

•
$$M_{\text{opt}} = p H^* [I_L + pHH^*]^{-1}$$
,
• $\rho = p \operatorname{tr} \{ (I_L + pHH^*)^{-1} \}.$

Observations:

- One random environment H. The optimal receiver can depend on H.
- Scaling very natural for the problem:

$$\rho = \frac{P}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{1}{1 + P\lambda_k \left(\frac{H^*H}{K}\right)}$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Just a scaled Stieltjes transform evaluated at a point.

Proof steps: standard fare in estimation

- ► If x were Gaussian, the best estimate is E[x|y], a linear estimate.
- Even otherwise, look for the best estimate within the affine family (Wiener-Kolmogorov filtering)
- Projection of x onto the affine family
- Let $\mathbb{E}[x] = 0$. Then

$$M_{\text{opt}} = (\mathbb{E}[xy^*]) (\mathbb{E}[yy^*])^{-1}$$
$$= pH^* [I_L + pHH^*]^{-1}$$

MMSE (ρ) evaluation is by direct substitution.

The Marcenko-Pastur law

Theorem: Let L_K be the ESD of H^*H/K , and \overline{L}_K its expectation. The entries are iid, zero mean, with variance 1 and bounded fourth moments. Let $L/K \rightarrow \beta$. Then

$$\begin{array}{cccc} L_{K} & \stackrel{P}{\to} & \mu_{MP} \\ \hline L_{K} & \to & \mu_{MP} \end{array}$$

Proof. The tough exercise via Stieltjes transforms with the antidiagonal trick that I didn't do.

The law μ_{MP} has generalised density

$$f_eta(x) = (1-eta)^+ \,\delta(x) + rac{\sqrt{(x-a)^+(b-x)^+}}{2\pi x}$$

where $a = (1-\sqrt{eta})^2$ and $b = (1+\sqrt{eta})^2$.

Observations: Mass at 0 and bounded support

II : CDMA for Code division multiple access

- K mobiles, each having a message to transmit
- The message x_k for the mobile k is "spread" over L symbols
- ▶ Transmit $x_k[H_{1k} H_{2k} \dots H_{Lk}]$ in the *L* symbols (signature)
- Superposition:

$$y = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \begin{bmatrix} H_{1k} \\ H_{2k} \\ \vdots \\ H_{Lk} \end{bmatrix} x_k + z = Hx + z$$

The twist: H_{lk} randomly picked from ± 1 with equal probability, independent of all others. Then normalised.

- Receiver informed (pseudo noise random bit generator)
- Helps hide information if seed is not known
- Use MMSE again. The same as the previous problem, with expectation over H as well.

III: The best code and Shannon capacity

Code across time and exploit the law of large numbers. (Shannon 1948)

- y(t) = H(t)x(t) + z(t), for t = 1, 2, ..., T.
- For now, fix H(t) = H, fixed for all t, known.
- Code: Messages are {1, 2, ..., M}. Each message maps to a position that the transmitter takes.

$$w \mapsto x^{(w)} \in (\mathbb{C}^K)^T$$

- ▶ Noise corrupts this and receiver gets corrupted $y \in (\mathbb{C}^L)^T$.
- Receiver should make probability of error arbitrarily small.
- ► What is log₂ M (bits per T symbols)? What is the rate T⁻¹ log₂ M? Maximum asymptotic rate? (Capacity)?

The scalar case $H \in \mathbb{C}$: K = L = 1



- Noise vector concentrates with a radius \sqrt{T}
- All noise spheres around message points disjoint
- ► All noise spheres are within radius √T(|H|²P + 1) (Near orthogonality)

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

$$M \leq \frac{\alpha_{2T} \left(\sqrt{T(|H|^2 P + 1)} \right)^{2T}}{\alpha_{2T} \left(\sqrt{T} \right)^{2T}} = (1 + |H|^2 P)^T$$

- Yields rate is at most $T^{-1} \log M \leq \log(1 + |H|^2 P)$.
- Can show that this is indeed achievable

Multiple antennas?

Theorem: Let $\{H(t)\}$ is stationary and ergodic. Let H denote H(1). Under sufficient regularity on this process, the capacity per transmit antenna is given by

$$C_{K} = \mathbb{E} \left[K^{-1} \log \det(I_{L} + pHH^{*}) \right]$$
$$= \mathbb{E} \left[K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \log \left(1 + P\lambda_{k} \left(\frac{HH^{*}}{K} \right) \right) \right]$$

for a scenario where receiver knows $H(\cdot)$ and transmitter knows only its distribution. The unit is bits/symbol/antenna.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Evaluation

For Gaussian entries and finite K:

- Density $\propto \Delta(\lambda)^2 \exp\{-\sum_i \lambda_i\} \prod_i \lambda_i^{|K-L|}$
- Laguerre polynomials play the role of Hermite polynomials

$$\blacktriangleright p_{\lambda_1}(\lambda_1) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i(\lambda_1)^2 \lambda_1^{|\mathcal{K}-\mathcal{L}|} e^{-\lambda_1}.$$

Enables evaluation.

Asymptotic case as $K \to \infty$, we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}} = \int_{0}^{\infty} \log(1 + P\lambda) \; d\overline{L}_{\mathcal{K}}(\lambda) o \int_{0}^{\infty} \log(1 + P\lambda) \; d\mu_{MP}(\lambda).$$

 $\log(1+\cdot)$ is not bounded, but exploit monotonicity and concavity. See a later slide.

IV: The random environment case

- Design a code with a certain rate R.
- Encounter a random environment *H*.
- Can have a failed transmission with probability

$$\Pr\left\{\int \log(1+P\lambda) \ dL_{\mathcal{K}}(\lambda) < R\right\}$$
$$= \Pr\left\{\mathcal{K}^{-1}\sum_{k=1}^{K} \log\left(1+P\lambda_{k}\left(\frac{HH^{*}}{K}\right)\right) < R\right\}.$$

For this to converge to 0, need convergence in probability to a constant c, and $R < c - \varepsilon$.

Convergence in probability

Theorem: Let $\xi_{\mathcal{K}} = \int \log(1 + P\lambda) \ dL_{\mathcal{K}}(\lambda)$. Then

$$\xi_{\mathcal{K}} \stackrel{P}{
ightarrow} c = \int \log(1 + P\lambda) \; d\mu_{MP}(\lambda).$$

Proof. There is a common prob. space where $L_K \to \mu_{MP}$ a.s. (Skorohod). Consider the good set. Let $\lambda^{(K)}$ be according to prob. measure L_K with distribution F_K . Let G_K be distribution of $h(\lambda^{(K)}) := \log (1 + P\lambda^{(K)})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{\mathcal{K}} &= \int g \ dG_{\mathcal{K}}(g) = \int [1 - G_{\mathcal{K}}(g)] dg = \int [1 - F_{\mathcal{K}}(h^{-1}(g))] dg \\ &= \int [1 - F_{\mathcal{K}}(\lambda)] h'(\lambda) \ d\lambda \end{aligned}$$

Apply BCT and $(F_K \to F \text{ a.e})$ to get $\xi_K \to c$ a.s. So $\xi_K \to c$ in distribution, which also holds in the original space. Convergence in distribution to a constant implies convergence in probability.

Variations

Fluctuation result:

$$\Pr\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{K}\log\left(1+P\lambda_{k}\left(\frac{HH^{*}}{K}\right)\right) < Kc-u\right\} \to \Phi(u;\sigma^{2})$$

- y = HAx + z, where A is a diagonal matrix. Correlations introduced.
- $\blacktriangleright H = U_r H_w U_t^*$
- ▶ Instead of $K_X = (P/K)I_K$, can tune K_X to H, if transmitter also has knowledge of the channel condition. This is not absurd in some cases.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

References

- I.E.Telatar, "Capacity of multiantenna Gaussian channels," *Eur. Trans. Telecommun. Rel. Technol.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 585-59, Nov. 1999.
- S. Verdú and S. Shamai, "Spectral efficiency of CDMA with random spreading," *IEEE Trans. on Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 622-620, Mar. 1999.
- A. M. Tulino and S. Verdú, Random Matrix Theory and Wireless Communications, Foundations and Trends in Commun. and Inf. Theory, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1-182, 2004, and references therein.