


OVERCOMING INTERFERENCE IN SPATIAL MULTIPLEXING MIMO CELLULAR NETWORKS

JEFFREY G. ANDREWS, WAN CHOI, AND ROBERT W. HEATH JR.,
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN



The authors overview several approaches for handling interference in multicell MIMO systems. The discussion is applicable to any multi-antenna cellular network including 802.16e/WiMAX, 3GPP (HSDPA and 3GPP LTE) and 3GPP2 (1xEVDO).

ABSTRACT

Multi-antenna transmission and reception (known as MIMO) is widely touted as the key technology for enabling wireless broadband services, whose widespread success will require 10 times higher spectral efficiency than current cellular systems, at 10 times lower cost per bit. Spectrally efficient, inexpensive cellular systems are by definition densely populated and interference-limited. But spatial multiplexing MIMO systems — whose principal merit is a supposed dramatic increase in spectral efficiency — lose much of their effectiveness in high levels of interference. This article overviews several approaches to handling interference in multicell MIMO systems. The discussion is applicable to any multi-antenna cellular network, including 802.16e/WiMAX, 3GPP (HSDPA and 3GPP LTE), and 3GPP2 (1xEVDO). We argue that many of the traditional interference management techniques have limited usefulness (or are even counterproductive) when viewed in concert with MIMO. The problem of interference in MIMO systems is too large in scope to be handled with a single technique: in practice a combination of complementary countermeasures will be needed. We overview emerging system-level interference-reducing strategies based on cooperation, which will be important for overcoming interference in future spatial multiplexing cellular systems.

THE PROMISE OF MIMO

The idea of using multiple receive and multiple transmit antennas has emerged as one of the most significant technical breakthroughs in modern wireless communications. Theoretical studies and initial prototyping of these multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems have shown order of magnitude spectral efficiency improvements in point-to-point communication. As a result, MIMO is considered a key technology for

improving the throughput of future wireless broadband data systems, which presently are mired at data rates far below their wired and wireless LAN counterparts. For example, contemporary¹ *broadband* cellular systems like HSDPA and 1xEV-DO achieve physical layer data rates around 0.3 (uplink)–0.8 (downlink) b/s/Hz/sector, whereas modern wireless LANs achieve around 4–5 b/s/Hz in both directions.


The multidimensional MIMO channel can be exploited to increase diversity or provide parallel spatial channels, which is known as spatial multiplexing. Transmit and receive diversity is generally considered a more conservative approach; a well-known example is space-time codes [1, 2], which have found wide adoption in third-generation (3G) code-division multiple access (CDMA) cellular systems [3] as well as in 802.16/WiMAX. Assume the transmitter has M_t antennas and the receiver M_r . Diversity increases the robustness of the system by eliminating fades; channel-aware diversity² also raises the average received signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) in proportion to M_t and/or M_r . If the channel is not known, the diversity hardens the SNR to the mean SNR rather than increasing it (i.e., it converts a fading channel to a non-fading channel) as the number of antennas grows large. Even if the average SNR increases linearly with the number of antennas, the capacity growth is *logarithmic*, easily verified with Shannon's formula $C = B \log_2(1 + \text{SNR})$. Spatial multiplexing, on the other hand, divides the incoming data into multiple parallel sub-streams and transmits each on a different spatial dimension (e.g., a different antenna). As long as there are at least as many (sufficiently spaced) receive antennas as transmitted streams, spatial multiplexing increases the capacity *linearly* with the number of streams [4].

In this article we focus primarily on the spatial multiplexing aspect of MIMO since it is the most aggressive approach to increasing the link

¹ As of late 2006.

² For example, coherent combining at the receiver or channel-aware precoding at the transmitter.

This work was supported in part by SOLiD technologies, Korea, and Freescale Semiconductor.



■ Figure 1. Other cell interference in MIMO cellular systems.

capacity, and transmit diversity schemes are already widely implemented.³ Because high data rates are particularly interesting for the downlink, it can be assumed that the number of transmit antennas M_t will be larger than the number of receive antennas M_r due to space and cost restrictions on the mobile unit. It is reasonable to expect that M_r data streams will be transmitted leaving $M_t - M_r$ degrees of freedom for achieving transmit diversity using antenna subset selection [5, 6] or transmit precoding with limited feedback [7], for example.

The main goals of the article are as follows. First, we convey the severity of the interference problem in a cellular scenario, and explain why, a decade after its invention, spatial multiplexing has still not been used in cellular networks. Second, we describe recently developed techniques for combating interference in MIMO systems. While some of these techniques are useful, most of them directly compete with the main goal of spatial multiplexing, which is high capacity. Some of the techniques are in fact counterproductive. Third, we describe the recent trend toward strategic interference reduction based on base station cooperation and distributed antennas (which is also a form of cooperation), and argue that such techniques hold the key to making MIMO realizable in future cellular-based communication systems.

SPATIAL MULTIPLEXING IN CELLULAR SYSTEMS

The vast majority of academic and even industrial research has focused on the point-to-point MIMO model (well summarized in [8]), which ignores nearby competing interference sources.

This is reasonable in certain applications. The IEEE 802.11n standard, which is a high data rate MIMO extension of IEEE 802.11g, uses the medium access control protocol to ensure that its short-range links do not suffer from interference, which is reasonable in all but the densest deployments. It is quite a different matter, though, to apply MIMO successfully in cellular systems, since due to cell planning and coverage considerations, cellular systems are interference-limited. Despite these challenges, MIMO is being widely considered for next-generation cellular systems such as IEEE 802.16/WiMAX and Third Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) Long Term Evolution (LTE).

THE OTHER CELL INTERFERENCE PROBLEM IN CELLULAR MIMO SYSTEMS

All well designed cellular systems are by nature interference-limited: if they were not, it would be possible to increase the spectral efficiency by lowering the frequency reuse or increasing the average loading per cell. Note that this article is focused on other cell interference (OCI), as opposed to *self-cell interference* from other users in a cell (as is typical in an uplink CDMA system) or *co-antenna interference* resulting between the spatial multiplexing data streams of a single user. Methods for the latter two types of interference are well understood, and users in each cell of a wireless broadband network are generally orthogonal: through time-division multiple access (TDMA) and orthogonal frequency-division multiple access (OFDMA) in 802.16 systems, or through orthogonal CDMA (Walsh codes) coupled with a chip-level equalizer and TDMA in 3GPP systems.

The downlink of a cellular system is expected to be the most profitable and viable for MIMO communication. Unfortunately, as illustrated in Fig. 1, there will be NM_t interfering signals if there are N non-negligible neighboring base stations. The total interference power does not necessarily increase since the typical assumption in MIMO systems is that the transmit power per antenna is reduced by M_t , so the total transmitted power is the same as in the non-MIMO setting. The number of interfering signals, though, does increase. From straightforward linear algebra arguments, MIMO receivers are able to decode parallel data streams by suppressing the spatial interference between the signals sent from the M_t transmit antennas (using linear signal processing techniques), as long as the number of receive antennas $M_r \geq M_t$. Therefore, an interference-dominated MIMO system requires $M_r \geq (N + 1)M_t$ receive antennas in order to fully suppress OCI (with a linear receiver), which is out of the question on small handsets. In short, the number of interfering streams does not affect the power of the interference, but it has a substantial affect on its statistical distribution.

As the number of interfering streams increases, it is not typically possible to suppress all the OCI with spatial signal processing; instead, the interference is generally treated as noise. As the number of interfering sources becomes large, the interference becomes increasingly Gaussian due

³ In this article the term MIMO, without qualification, should be interpreted to mean spatial multiplexing.

to the central limit theorem, which is worst case according to information theory. In view of this, it is not surprising that recent research on spatial multiplexing in cellular systems has reached the common conclusion that *adding active transmit antennas or data streams at each base station can actually decrease the throughput at low signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) due to the increased dimensionality of spatial interference* [9, 10]. Instead, at low SINR, higher capacity is achieved by focusing power on the best eigenvalue(s) in the channel matrix.


THE GULF BETWEEN "THEORY" AND PRACTICE

It is often joked that "in theory, theory and practice are the same." The large gap between theory and practice is often a result of compromising assumptions made in the development of a theory. For example, consider the conventional wisdom that spatial multiplexing has a fundamental capacity advantage relative to transmit diversity. In many practical situations, even without considering OCI, diversity outperforms spatial multiplexing in terms of both data rate and reliability. For example, both [8, 11] show that at low SINR, space-time block codes achieve higher capacity and throughput than spatial multiplexing, especially if there is nontrivial spatial correlation. For example, Fig. 2 shows that for SINRs below 5 dB in highly correlated channels, or even up to SINRs approaching 20 dB in channels with low correlation, simple orthogonal space time block codes (OSTBCs) achieve higher capacity than spatial multiplexing.

The lesson is not that theory is wrong, but rather that the assumptions made are quite important. Inappropriate assumptions (e.g., high SINR, uncorrelated antenna arrays, neglect of user geometry in the cells) can lead to conclusions that are quite misleading for the majority of users.

Evidence against neglecting interference when considering MIMO techniques is growing. Recent Bell Labs research [12] has pointed out that the typical SINR operating point is about 2 dB in modern cellular systems, at which Shannon capacity has been approached within reasonable limits. Making matters worse, at least 10 percent of the users in a cell have SINRs that are considerably lower than 0 dB in an aggressive time and frequency reuse pattern. Nevertheless, most academic research has continued to ignore OCI because such interference is difficult to handle analytically, and the results for MIMO with OCI are often disappointing since the multiplicative gains in capacity predicted for spatial multiplexing only occur at high SINR. This fact, combined with the lack of additional degrees of freedom to deal with interference, spells disaster for spatial multiplexing in cellular systems.

To make this argument more concrete, consider Fig. 3. Here, the outage probability for a conservative *target* E_b/N_0 of 1.5 dB is plotted for 2×2 and 4×4 MIMO with a linear minimum mean square equalizer (MMSE) receiver that uses the average OCI level to balance OCI-noise enhancement⁴ with spatial interference suppression. As can be seen, even with an optimistic average received SINR (say 10 dB), the outage performance is very poor for spatial multiplexing



■ **Figure 2.** Capacity of spatial multiplexing and OSTBCs vs. SINR for 2×2 MIMO systems with spatial correlation of $\rho = \{0.1, 0.9\}$ [11].

due to the difficulty in balancing the spatial interference and OCI. Furthermore, the outage probability increases as the number of antennas increases, due to the increased spatial dimensionality. In summary, there is a serious conflict between spatial multiplexing and heavily loaded cellular systems. In the rest of the article we enumerate and discuss the prominent strategies for interference-limited multicell MIMO systems — some of which have been proposed very recently — and debate their relative merits.

INTERFERENCE MITIGATION TECHNIQUES FOR WIRELESS BROADBAND NETWORKS


In this section we outline possible OCI mitigation techniques in cellular MIMO systems and discuss their feasibility. The discussed techniques are summarized and compared in Table 1.

CONVENTIONAL APPROACHES TO DEALING WITH INTERFERENCE IN CELLULAR SYSTEMS

The problem of OCI has existed in cellular systems for many years. Traditionally, there are several different approaches to interference management, including frequency reuse, sectoring, and spread spectrum. These techniques can be applied to combat OCI in MIMO cellular systems, but each has important drawbacks.

Frequency reuse has been adopted for OCI reduction in cellular systems due to its simplicity and practicality. With frequency reuse, the available spectrum is divided among cells in a cluster and reused in subsequent clusters. Frequency reuse effectively reduces OCI by spacing the competing transmissions farther away, and particularly benefits users near cell boundaries. This of course reduces the spectral efficiency since for a frequency reuse of f , only $1/f$ of the available spectrum is used each cell. A typical value of f in systems

⁴ The MMSE performance using only thermal noise is shown for comparison; the associated loss is a few dB.



■ **Figure 3.** Outage probability of a cellular MIMO system with target $E_b/N_0 = 1.5$ dB. The shadowing is assumed to have $\sigma = 8$ dB for interference and 2 dB for the desired user. Note that even with this very low target E_b/N_0 , the outage probability is very high.

without spread spectrum is around three. Universal frequency reuse ($f = 1$) is highly desirable since it simplifies the problem of cell planning and reduces the frequency reuse penalty, but this results in intolerably high interference for MIMO systems. Therefore, frequency reuse does not solve the MIMO OCI problem since it is unlikely that MIMO's gains will outweigh the $1/f$ penalty without a very large number of antennas.

Cell sectoring is another technique used to reduce the average interference at the edge of a cell. The idea of sectoring is to employ directive antennas at the tower to restrict radiation at the base station. Sectoring improves the average SINR and improves spectral efficiency since frequencies can be reused in each sector. Cell sectoring, which is highly effective in current cellular systems, has the potential drawback of reducing the multipath diversity in the channel, which in the absence of sufficient local scattering can reduce the benefits of MIMO. Small sectors also result in unbalanced numbers of users per sector, which limits the capacity per user in the highly populated sectors, while wasting capacity in the thinly populated sectors. Sixty degree sectors (six per cell) are considered a practical maximum. Regardless, sectoring is more attractive than large frequency reuse since it does not entail as large a reuse penalty.

Another effective approach in modern cellular systems is to attempt to average the interference levels using spread spectrum techniques, by either direct sequence CDMA or slow frequency hopping in Global System for Mobile Communications (GSM). In these systems OCI is controlled by adjusting the traffic load in each cell to significantly below what would be acceptable in a single-cell system. This acceptable load drops further in a MIMO system due to its susceptibility to interference [13].

MIMO receivers that are interference-aware can significantly attenuate the OCI and hence greatly improve system performance. Most of the multiuser receiver literature is concerned with self-cell interference, but, as noted earlier, this is not likely relevant to future wireless broadband systems. Receivers for dealing with co-antenna interference have been studied extensively in the MIMO literature, including linear, near optimal, and optimal techniques. Incorporating OCI into the co-antenna interference receiver is one of the main challenges in MIMO receiver design. Therefore, we now overview advanced signal processing options available to the receiver to suppress OCI, and explain the key challenges these techniques face if they are to contribute to the adoption of MIMO cellular systems.

(Near) Maximum Likelihood Multiuser Detection — If instantaneous information on the channels of interferers is available, maximal likelihood (ML) multiuser detection (MUD) is known to minimize the bit error probability in a multicellular MIMO system. However, not only is this instantaneous channel information difficult to attain for neighboring base stations, the complexity of such a receiver is prohibitive for a low-power mobile unit. For an $M_r \times M_r$ MIMO system using M -QAM, the complexity is on the order of M^{NM_r} , where N is the number of interferers [14]. Even for simple cases this is well beyond reasonable implementation complexity. An alternative is the sphere decoder, which searches for the optimal solution in a sphere around an estimate of the received codeword. Sphere decoders can deal with moderate NM_r , but still fail for large numbers of antennas or interferers. Additionally, they have variable complexity, making implementation difficult. Very large-scale integrated (VLSI) implementations are under development [15], but their viability in power hungry mobiles is still open to debate.

The MMSE Receiver — Due to the complexity problems associated with the ML receiver, a natural approach is to consider a linear approximation to the ML receiver. The zero-forcing spatial receiver performs terribly due to its enhancement of OCI, which suggests the need for an MMSE receiver that balances noise enhancement with spatial interference suppression. Here, two classes of MMSE receivers can be considered: one that knows the interferer's channels (an MMSE multiuser detector) and one that only knows the average OCI (typical MMSE) [16]. As discussed previously with regard to Fig. 3, the MMSE receiver with only average OCI knowledge, while significantly better than a zero-forcing receiver, does not perform particularly well due to the inevitable OCI enhancement.

Naturally, the MMSE multiuser detector has superior performance since it is able to explicitly reject the other-cell interference. It suffers, however, from two important problems. First, as in the ML detector, a major difficulty arises in obtaining instantaneous channel knowledge for the interfering base stations. Second, because M_r antennas at

Technique	Benefit	Key shortcomings	Prospects
Frequency reuse	Reduces OCI very simply and effectively	Low spectral efficiency, frequency planning	Not promising as a long-term solution
Maximum likelihood MUD	Optimum co-reception of signal and interference	Very high complexity, OCI awareness	Moore's law will help complexity, but prohibitive in near future
MMSE MUD	Suppresses OCI with much lower complexity than ML	Requires awareness of OCI, many mobile antennas; simpler versions have only modest performance gain	Requires instantaneous OCI knowledge, under present investigation by industry
OCI-blind MMSE	Like ZF spatial receiver with lower noise enhancement	Enhances OCI rather than suppressing it: very poor performance	Will provide only incremental gain (10–25%), but likely to be implemented
Other-cell interference cancellation	Good performance vs. complexity	Complexity still high, awareness and accuracy of OCI knowledge crucial	Promising in long- to provide additional gain over OCI-blind receivers
Stream control	Reduces OCI; increases robustness	Lowers the data rate	Adaptive stream control is feasible and useful
Multuser diversity	Decreases required transmit power or increases data rate	Competes with other forms of diversity like frequency diversity; log log N growth (i.e., rapidly diminishing returns)	Like to be useful in terms of scheduling, but not very effective for OCI reduction
Cooperative encoding, i.e., dirty paper coding	Optimal performance in theory	Requires very accurate channel knowledge and realtime intercell coordination	Unlikely to be practical in foreseeable future, if ever.
Closed-loop MIMO diversity	Achieves optimum diversity performance	Sacrifices spatial dimensions for multiplexing, channels known at Tx	Likely to be implemented, can lower OCI somewhat.
Beamforming	Reduces OCI	Sacrifices spatial dimensions, channels known at Tx	Has important merits, but implementation difficulties
Cooperative transmission	Reduces OCI, multuser diversity gain relative to frequency reuse	Requires simple cooperation between base stations	Feasible in the short-term
Distributed antenna systems	Reduces OCI through lowered transmit power; better coverage; ease of maintenance	Requires new infrastructure deployment paradigm	Feasible in the short-term with large infrastructure investment

■ **Table 1.** Summary of possible other cell interference mitigation techniques.

each of N interfering base stations must be treated as M_r independent interferers (for a total of $M_r N$ interferers), effectively suppressing all of this interference is very difficult with only $M_r \ll M_r N$ receive antennas. One simplification, which is being looked at by some service providers, is to cancel just the pilot and common channel signals of the strongest interfering base station, which also alleviates the channel estimation requirements. The network-wide capacity gains from doing this are predicted to be around 10–25 percent (the fraction of power these overhead signals contribute), which is perhaps worthy of implementation but not a major leap forward.

Interference Cancelling Receivers — As observed in single-antenna systems, nonlinear receivers often provide a desirable trade-off between performance and complexity [17], relative to ML receivers at one extreme and linear receivers at the other. In multicell MIMO systems, group detection techniques have a natural appeal, in

which information bits for each “group” (cell) are detected sequentially [14]. One of the most popular among various group detection techniques is the group decision feedback MUD, an extension from BLAST. This receiver detects one MIMO system at a time and then feeds the tentative decisions to other group detectors for interference cancellation. Although successive interference cancellation is asymptotically optimal under the assumption of perfect interference cancellation, it is very susceptible to inaccurate channel estimates. Furthermore, interference canceling receivers are still likely too complex for low-power mobile units.

Comments on Channel Information for Interfering Base Stations — An important shortcoming of the above techniques is that most require (near-instantaneous) channel information for the neighboring base stations, which is traditionally not available. In cellular systems, mobile stations periodically monitor pilot channels of neighbor-

Stream control is typically implemented in conjunction with adaptive modulation on a per-user basis. Users that are close to the base station, for example, would naturally support more streams than users on the cell boundaries due to their higher SINR.

ing base stations to assist with handoff. These pilot signals could potentially be used to gather the required channel knowledge for the above multiuser receivers. Still, such schemes appear too complex for the downlink, where each mobile would have to frequently monitor neighboring base stations and process updates to a complicated multiuser detector every channel coherence time.

ADVANCED TRANSMITTER TECHNIQUES

For many systems, in both theory and practice, transmitter adaptation has been shown to be a highly profitable means of exploiting channel conditions. A well-known example is adaptive modulation, which is adopted to achieve high data rates for users with good channels. Another method is closed loop diversity, which approximates the maximum ratio transmission beamforming vector. Transmitter-based techniques have the additional merit in a cellular downlink of transferring the complexity burden from the mobile unit to the base station, where higher complexity is more tolerable and additional antennas may be available. In this section we consider methods of using only self-cell channel knowledge at the transmitter to help suppress OCI using advanced signal processing techniques. Multicell transmitter cooperation is discussed in the next section.

Closed-Loop MIMO Diversity Schemes — Given $M_t > M_r$ antennas, it is possible to improve the diversity performance of spatial multiplexing by using channel state information at the transmitter. One example is antenna subset selection where the best M_r of M_t antennas are selected, but antenna selection is not particularly effective in wideband systems due to the plentiful frequency diversity [6]. Other closed loop possibilities include eigenbeamforming and transmit precoding [18]. These schemes require knowledge of channel state information at the transmitter; efficient limited feedback strategies for this purpose have been developed recently [7]. Closed loop diversity schemes provide a diversity improvement of $M_t - M_r + 1$ and additional array gain, which reduces the required transmit power for spatial multiplexing and hence the interference caused to neighboring cells. On a system-wide level, these approaches have about the same impact on OCI as transmit diversity with power control.

Stream Control in MIMO Systems — One simple but effective means of reducing OCI is simply to spatially multiplex $M < \min(M_t, M_r)$ data streams. This concept is known as *stream control* when used to reduce interference [19] and as *multimode adaptation* when combined with transmit precoding as a means to achieve additional diversity with low complexity receivers (e.g., [20]). Although the nominal transmitted data rate of each user is reduced compared to sending the maximum possible number of streams, stream control can actually improve the overall system capacity in many cases. In fact, for low SINRs, sending a single stream using transmit beamforming is usually optimal from a sum capacity perspective. Stream control does not

confront the problem of OCI directly; rather, it acquiesces by gracefully reducing the number of streams, thus achieving the double benefit of concentrating its own power on its best eigenvalue(s) while reducing the dimensionality of the interference it causes to others.

Stream control is typically implemented in conjunction with adaptive modulation on a per-user basis. Users close to the base station, for example, would naturally support more streams than users on the cell boundaries due to their higher SINRs. Due to their proximity to the base station, the transmit power to those users can be reduced even when transmitting multiple streams, so the interference generated to other cells is within limits. In summary, adaptive stream control is a possible method for managing OCI in a MIMO cellular system and will likely be a component of any holistic OCI management solution, but is not itself necessarily the OCI solution since it simply tries to avoid the problem.

MIMO Combined with Transmit Beamforming for Interference Reduction — Beamforming is a term applied to a large number of different techniques, including eigenbeamforming and precoding, as already discussed. In the context of dealing with interference, however, beamforming typically refers to a class of signal processing techniques used to maximize the signal energy sent to the desired user, while minimizing the interference sent toward interfering users. Beamforming may be used to focus energy or to support multiple users through a concept known as spatial division multiple access (SDMA). Beamforming in both forms can be combined with spatial multiplexing to give multiple high data rate streams, although the dimensions used for beamforming do reduce the number of simultaneous data streams that can be transmitted. Typically, beamforming for interference reduction is better suited to battling self-cell interference since it requires the complete interference statistics for each user at the transmitter, but in doing so it reduces the OCI. Reducing OCI directly is difficult since it is hard for the base station to acquire appropriate statistical interference knowledge due to the asymmetry between the interference experienced at the mobiles (from other base stations) and the interference experienced at the base station (from other mobiles).

Multiuser Diversity — In a data system, when there are $N > 1$ active users, it is possible to take advantage of multiuser diversity by scheduling transmissions to users with good channels [21]. Although originally proposed for single-antenna systems, there are several different extensions possible for MIMO systems. The best approaches use a modification of SDMA where multiple users share the same spatial channel (this is sum capacity optimal), although gains are still possible when all the antennas are allocated to a single user. Capacity gains with multiuser diversity grow as $\log \log N$ in Rayleigh fading channels, so the majority of the capacity gains are achieved with just a few users. In wideband channels, however, the gain from SDMA multiuser diversity techniques rapidly decreases due to the abun-

dant frequency diversity. Therefore, multiuser diversity is more effectively exploited in the frequency domain, for example, by assigning different subcarriers to different users in an OFDMA system. In summary, multiuser diversity simply provides another form of diversity in the system and can reduce OCI somewhat when combined with transmit power control.

STRATEGIC APPROACHES TO THE OCI PROBLEM


As discussed above and summarized in Table 1, the numerous recently proposed methods for mitigating OCI in cellular MIMO systems have some important shortcomings when viewed in a practical context. Although some of these techniques have important merits and are being actively researched and considered, it is useful to consider strategic approaches to handling OCI in cellular systems that do not require real-time information about OCI. In this section we overview system-level techniques that can in principle be combined with the previously discussed advanced signal processing algorithms to yield even larger gains, if and when those become viable. A general theme is that network level cooperation can be used to coordinate transmissions, resulting in overall OCI reduction. While these techniques will effectively reduce OCI and increase spectral efficiency for any interference-limited cellular system, the gains are particularly impressive for multicell MIMO systems due to their severe degradation in the face of OCI.

NETWORKED MIMO: BASE STATION COOPERATION

We first consider the scenario where the base stations are networked together and can share different amounts of information with each other. Communication between base stations already occurs in order to coordinate handoffs and other network-level operations.

Joint Encoding and Dirty Paper Coding — If the received interference signals are known to the transmitters, cooperative encoding among neighboring base stations can suppress OCI. Such a joint encoding scheme is an example of so-called dirty paper coding (DPC), which has been shown to achieve the (maximum theoretical) capacity of the multiuser MIMO downlink channel [22]. However, joint encoding is nearly impossible to achieve in practical systems because it requires precise time and phase synchronization of the signals transmitted from multiple base stations, and exact channel knowledge at all the transmitters. Even though cellular systems have base station controllers (BSCs) or radio network controllers (RNCs), which control multiple base stations, the precise accuracy required for DPC renders this technique a theoretical upper bound rather than a practical solution.

Cooperative Scheduling — Since instantaneous full channel knowledge is a daunting requirement for a cellular network, a simpler possibility is to allow the base stations to simply take turns transmitting. Recent work (e.g., [23–25]) has




■ **Figure 4.** Shannon capacity of TDMA systems with cooperatively scheduled transmission and dynamic frequency reuse ($f = 7$). The expanded multiuser diversity gain from cooperatively scheduled transmission is about 1 b/s/Hz.

investigated the possibility of neighboring base stations scheduling their transmissions in a cooperative fashion. This is a generalization of the concept of spatial frequency reuse, where simple intercell coordination is used to select appropriate users system-wide for each time slot. As a simple example, two base stations should not simultaneously transmit at full power to mobile stations on their mutual cell boundaries.

Just as frequency reuse achieves OCI reduction at the expense of the frequency reuse factor, cooperatively scheduled transmission reduces OCI at the expense of a transmit duty cycle. There are two important advantages of cooperatively scheduled transmission relative to traditional frequency reuse. The first is universal frequency reuse (i.e., 1:1 reuse), which simplifies frequency planning. Second, cooperatively scheduled transmission achieves an additional multiuser diversity gain of $\sqrt{\log N}$ if the base stations schedule opportunistically among N neighboring base stations. In contrast to cooperative encoding, cooperative scheduling requires only minimal information (i.e., a single scalar like maximum throughput) to be shared among neighboring base stations, and hence is comparable to handoff in terms of the amount of coordination required between base stations. Additionally, unlike other forms of multiuser diversity that rely on small-scale fading, this macrodiversity gain (from both Rayleigh and lognormal fading) does not compete with other forms of microdiversity (like frequency diversity) and is thus likely to be far more effective in an actual deployment.

For a 2×2 MIMO system with cooperatively scheduled transmission, the capacity gain of cooperatively scheduled transmission over a traditional frequency reuse system ($f = 7$) is shown

Another strategic approach to reducing the other-cell interference problem is to adopt a distributed antenna architecture, which has been considered in the past as an effective means of extending coverage, eliminating dead spots, and lowering the blocking probability.



■ **Figure 5.** An example of a distributed antenna cellular architecture for seven cells, each serviced by seven total antennas: one at the original base station and six remote antenna modules spread throughout the cell [28].

in Fig. 4, where all the users in each cell are assumed to be randomly (uniformly) distributed. As expected, cooperatively scheduled transmission exploits expanded multiuser diversity and achieves higher capacity than traditional frequency reuse ($f = 7$). The expanded multiuser diversity gain in terms of capacity is about 1 b/s/Hz. It should be stressed that the main motivation for cooperatively scheduled transmission is not to increase the overall capacity relative to universal time and frequency reuse (the $1/N$ duty factor precludes this), but to increase the effective SINR of the many users near cell boundaries. We expect practical base station cooperation techniques to become popular in the next few years.

DISTRIBUTED ANTENNA ARCHITECTURES

Another strategic approach to reducing the OCI problem is to adopt a distributed antenna architecture, which has been considered in the

past as an effective means of extending coverage, eliminating dead spots, and lowering the blocking probability [26]. In such an architecture, antenna modules are geographically distributed throughout the original cell to reduce the access distance for each node, and are connected to a home base station (or central unit) via dedicated wires, fiber optics, or an exclusive radio frequency (RF) link. An example of the distributed antenna cellular structure is given in Fig. 5. Distributed antenna systems (DASs) are a low-cost alternative to micro- or picocells, since typically distributed antenna units are small (and hence easily mountable), and only require a power amplifier and very minimal other hardware; the vast majority of processing is performed at the central base station, which has additional advantages in terms of trunking efficiency, maintenance, and ease of handoff. Numerous equipment manufacturers and service providers are aggressively pur-

suing DAS architectures, which are the subject of a forthcoming book [27].

Since a distributed antenna architecture lowers the aggregate transmit power, it is natural that such a scheme will lower the amount of interference caused to neighboring cells. By transmitting to each user from the antenna closest to it (or, more precisely, with the best channel), a form of macroscopic spatial diversity is also introduced to the system, with the net result of a much higher average received SINR, with particularly large gains for users near the distributed antennas (and hence the cell edges). Figure 6 shows the ergodic capacity of a distributed antenna system with various transmission schemes when the target mobile stations are uniformly distributed and channel state information is available only at the receivers (CSIR). As can be seen, the capacity gain is quite dramatic [28]. This large improvement is due to the fact that three times more users are outside of the radius $1/2R$ within a cell, assuming uniform distribution. Although this was only for a 1×1 system (i.e., $M_r = M_t = 1$), it is intuitive that the capacity gains will be similar for a MIMO system since the transmit powers scale linearly with M_r . The large capacity gain achieved from deploying distributed antennas could be key to the success of large-scale MIMO cellular systems with universal frequency reuse.

THE FUTURE OF MIMO IN WIDE AREA WIRELESS NETWORKS

This article has attempted to establish that one of the key challenges facing the deployment of MIMO technology in cellular networks is the sensitivity of MIMO receivers to interference. Since cellular systems are inherently interference-limited, this introduces a fundamental conflict. On one hand, system designs should minimize transmit power and maximize spatial reuse in order to reduce the interference caused to neighboring cells. On the other hand, spatial multiplexing MIMO systems by nature increase the number of interfering sources and are effective mostly in high SINR.

Traditional approaches to multicell interference management have included static techniques: frequency reuse, sectoring, and spread spectrum. Frequency reuse and spread spectrum are not bandwidth-efficient solutions, which defeats the purpose of MIMO, while sectoring is effective but is already near its limits. Recent research approaches to this difficult problem have focused on advanced signal processing techniques at the receiver and transmitter as a means of reducing or canceling the perceived interference. As this article has documented, however, most of these techniques suffer from important practical shortcomings in terms of complexity and required channel information that make their successful application to cellular systems unlikely in the near to medium term.

As an alternative, this article has advocated strategic approaches that require very little channel knowledge and effectively reduce other cell




Figure 6. Average ergodic capacity with CSIR vs. the path loss exponent for one transmit and receive antenna. The capacity gain from distributed antenna systems is dramatic even with universal frequency reuse.

interference through macrodiversity. Allowing for some simple back-channel communication among neighboring base stations, as is typically the case due to the need to coordinate handoffs and other operations, base station cooperation will be essential for interference reduction. Even larger gains in interference reduction are possible with a distributed antenna architecture, already widely considered as a means to extend coverage. In the future we expect that a suite of several of the techniques overviewed in this article are likely to be deployed in order to manage the interference problem in spatial multiplexing wireless networks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge feedback and input from M. Shafi (NZ Telecom), A. Ghosh (AT&T Labs), E. Onggosanusi (TI), S. Yi (SOLiD), H. Dai (N.C. State), N. Jindal (Minnesota), and S. Talwar (Intel). We would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. M. Alamouti, "A Simple Transmit Diversity Technique for Wireless Communications," *IEEE JSAC*, vol. 16, no. 8, Oct. 1998, pp. 1451–58.
- [2] V. Tarokh, N. Seshadri, and A. Calderbank, "Space-Time Codes for High Data Rate Wireless Communications: Performance Criterion and Code Construction," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 2, Mar. 1998, pp. 744–65.
- [3] R. Derryberry *et al.*, "Transmit Diversity in 3G CDMA Systems," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 40, no. 4, Apr. 2002, pp. 68–75.
- [4] E. Telatar, "Capacity of Multi-Antenna Gaussian Channels," *Euro. Trans. Telecommun.*, vol. 6, Nov.–Dec. 1999, pp. 585–95.
- [5] R. W. Heath, S. Sandhu, and A. Paulraj, "Antenna Selection for Spatial Multiplexing Systems with Linear Receivers," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 5, no. 4, Apr. 2001, pp. 142–44.
- [6] A. F. Molisch and M. Z. Win, "MIMO Systems with Antenna Selection," *IEEE Microwave*, vol. 5, no., Mar. 2004, pp. 46–56.

In the future, we expect that a suite of several of the techniques overviewed in this article are likely to be deployed in order to manage the interference problem in spatial multiplexing wireless networks.

- [7] D. J. Love *et al.*, "What is the Value of Limited Feedback for MIMO Channels?" *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 42, no. 10, Oct. 2004, pp. 54–59.
- [8] D. Gesbert *et al.*, "From Theory to Practice: An Overview of MIMO Spacetime Coded Wireless Systems," *IEEE JSAC*, vol. 21, no. 3, Apr. 2003, pp. 281–302.
- [9] R. Blum, "MIMO Capacity with Interference," *IEEE JSAC*, vol. 21, no. 5, June 2003, pp. 793–801.
- [10] S. Catreux, P. F. Driessen, and L. J. Greenstein, "Attainable Throughput of an Interference-Limited Multiple-Input Multiple-Output (MIMO) Cellular System," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 49, no. 8, Aug. 2001, pp. 1307–11.
- [11] A. Forenza *et al.*, "Switching between OSTBC and Spatial Multiplexing with Linear Receivers in Spatially Correlated MIMO Channels," *Proc. IEEE VTC*, Melbourne, Australia, May 2006.
- [12] R. Valenzuela, "Fundamental Limits and Evolution of Broadband Wireless Access Networks," *Texas Wireless Symp.*, Austin, TX; <http://www.ece.utexas.edu/wncg/events/symposium2005/>, Nov. 2005.
- [13] W. Choi and J. G. Andrews, "Spatial Multiplexing in Cellular MIMO-CDMA Systems with Linear Receivers: Outage Probability and Capacity," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 4, no. 7, July 2007, pp. 2612–21.
- [14] H. Dai, A. Molisch, and H. Poor, "Downlink Capacity of Interference-Limited MIMO Systems with Joint Detection," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 3, no. 2, Mar. 2004, pp. 442–53.
- [15] A. Burg, *et al.*, "Performance Trade-Offs in the VLSI Implementation of the Sphere Decoding Algorithm," *IEEE 3G Mobile Commun. Technologies Conf.*, London, UK, Oct. 2004.
- [16] W. Choi, J. G. Andrews, and R. W. Heath, "Multiuser Antenna Partitioning for MIMO-CDMA Systems," *IEEE Trans. Vehic. Tech.*, vol. 56, no. 5, Sept. 2007, pp. 2448–56.
- [17] J. G. Andrews, "Interference Cancellation for Cellular Systems: A Contemporary Overview," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 2, Apr. 2005, pp. 19–29.
- [18] A. Scaglione *et al.*, "Optimal Designs for Space-Time Linear Precoders and Decoders," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 50, no. 5, May 2002, pp. 1051–64.
- [19] R. Blum and J. Winters, "On Optimum MIMO with Antenna Selection," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 6, no. 8, Aug. 2002, pp. 322–24.
- [20] R. W. Heath and D. J. Love, "Multimode Antenna Selection for Spatial Multiplexing Systems with Linear Receivers," *IEEE Trans. Sig. Processing*, vol. 53, Aug. 2005, pp. 3042–56.
- [21] P. Viswanath, D. Tse, and R. Laroia, "Opportunistic Beamforming Using Dumb Antennas," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 6, June 2002, pp. 1277–94.
- [22] A. Goldsmith *et al.*, "Capacity Limits of MIMO Channels," *IEEE JSAC*, vol. 21, no. 5, June 2003, pp. 684–702.
- [23] W. Choi and J. G. Andrews, "The Capacity Gain from Base Station Cooperative Scheduling in a MIMO DPC Cellular System," *Proc. IEEE Int'l. Symp. Info. Theory*, Seattle, WA, June 2006.
- [24] H. Zhang and H. Dai, "Co-Channel Interference Mitigation and Cooperative Processing in Downlink Multicell Multiuser MIMO Networks," *Euro. J. Wireless Commun. and Networking*, 4th qtr. 2004, pp. 222–35.

- [25] G. J. Foschini *et al.*, "The Value of Coherent Base Station Coordination," *Proc. Conf. Info. Sci. and Sys.*, Johns Hopkins Univ., Mar. 2005.
- [26] A. Saleh, A. J. Rustako, and R. S. Roman, "Distributed Antennas for Indoor Radio Communications," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 35, Dec. 1987, pp. 1245–51.
- [27] H. Hu, Y. Zhang, and J. L., Eds., *Distributed Antenna Systems: Open Architecture for Future Wireless Communications*, CRC Press, 2007.
- [28] W. Choi and J. G. Andrews, "Downlink Performance and Capacity of Distributed Antenna Systems in a Multicell Environment," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 6, no. 1, Jan. 2007, pp. 69–73.

BIOGRAPHIES

JEFFREY G. ANDREWS [SM] (jandrews@ece.utexas.edu) received a B.S. with High Distinction from Harvey Mudd College, and his M.S. and Ph.D. in electrical engineering from Stanford University. He is presently an assistant professor of electrical and computer engineering at the University of Texas at Austin, where he is associate director of the Wireless Networking and Communications Group (WNCG). His industry experience includes a full-time position with Qualcomm and consulting with Microsoft, NASA, Palm, and the WiMAX Forum. He is a recipient of the NSF CAREER award, an associate editor for *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, and co-author of *Fundamentals of WiMAX: Understanding Wireless Broadband Networking* (Prentice Hall, 2007).

WAN CHOI [M] (wchoi@icu.ac.kr) received his B.S. and M.S. in electrical engineering from Seoul National University in 1996 and 1998, respectively, and a Ph.D. in electrical and computer engineering from the University of Texas at Austin in 2006. He is now an assistant professor at the School of Engineering, Information and Communications University (ICU), Daejeon, Korea. He was a senior member of technical staff with the R&D Division of Korea Telecom (KT) Freetel from 1998 to 2003, where he researched 3G CDMA systems. He is the recipient of the IEEE Vehicular Technology Society Jack Neubauer Memorial Award in 2002 and the IEEE Vehicular Technology Society Dan Noble Fellowship Award in 2006. While at the University of Texas at Austin, he was the recipient of a William S. Livingston Graduate Fellowship.

ROBERT W. HEATH, JR. [SM] (rheath@ece.utexas.edu) received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from the University of Virginia and his Ph.D. from Stanford University, all in electrical engineering. He is currently an associate professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Texas at Austin and a member of the WNCG. He has consulted with several international companies and is the founder of MIMO Wireless Inc. He was an editor for *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, an associate editor for *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, and is currently a member of the Signal Processing for Communications Technical Committee of the IEEE Signal Processing Society. He is the recipient of the David and Doris Lybarger Endowed Faculty Fellowship in Engineering.