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Abstract—We consider a full-duplex (FD) decode-and-forward system in which the time-switching protocol is employed by the multi-antenna relay to receive energy from the source and transmit information to the destination. The instantaneous throughput is maximized by optimizing receive and transmit beamformers at the relay and the time-split parameter. We study both optimum and suboptimum schemes. The reformulated problem in the optimum scheme achieves closed-form solutions in terms of transmit beamformer for some scenarios. In other scenarios, the optimization problem is formulated as a semi-definite relaxation problem and a rank-one optimum solution is always guaranteed. In the suboptimum schemes, the beamformers are obtained using maximum ratio combining, zero-forcing, and maximum ratio transmission. When beamformers have closed-form solutions, the achievable instantaneous and delay-constrained throughput are analytically characterized. Our results reveal that, beamforming increases both the energy harvesting and loop interference suppression capabilities at the FD relay. Moreover, simulation results demonstrate that the choice of the linear processing scheme as well as the time-split plays a critical role in determining the FD gains.

Index Terms—Full-duplex, wireless power transfer, decode-and-forward relay, throughput, outage probability.

I. INTRODUCTION

The emergence of multimedia rich wireless services coupled with ever growing number of subscribers has placed a high demand for radio resources such as bandwidth and energy. Most wireless radios so far have adopted half-duplex (HD) operation where uplink and downlink communication are “orthogonalized” in either time or frequency domain, which leads to a loss of spectral efficiency. An attractive solution to improve the spectral efficiency is to allow full-duplex (FD) simultaneous transmission/reception at the expense of loopback interference (LI) caused by the signal leakage from the transceiver output to the input [1]–[5].

Traditionally, LI suppression has been performed using passive isolation techniques such as placing RF absorber material between antennas, deploying of directional antennas. [6]. These schemes alone are inadequate to suppress the LI below the noise floor level required in most wireless systems. To achieve more effective suppression, a FD node could apply time-domain active techniques to pre-cancel the radio frequency (RF) (analog domain) or baseband (digital domain) LI signal [5], [7]. However, such mitigation schemes require sophisticated electronic implementation [4]. With the ubiquitous use of multi-antenna wireless systems, spatial domain precoding techniques can also be deployed at MIMO FD nodes. Such techniques have received significant interest as an attractive FD solution [8], [9].

On the other hand, many contemporary communication systems are battery powered and have a limited operational lifetime. To this end energy harvesting communications is a new paradigm that can power wireless devices by scavenging energy from external resources such as solar, wind, ambient RF power etc. [10]. However, energy harvesting from such sources are not without challenges due to the unpredictable nature of these energy sources. To this end, wireless energy transfer has been touted as a promising technique for a variety of wireless applications [11]–[13].

RF signals can carry both information and energy and this fundamental tradeoff has been studied in [14], [15]. In order to address practical issues associated with simultaneous information and energy transfer (same signal can not be used for both decoding and rectifying), two practical approaches, i.e., time-switching (TS) and power-splitting (PS) point-to-point system architectures were proposed in [16]. Subsequent works have also considered wireless-powered HD relay transmission with TS and PS architectures, for example, different relay networks have been studied considering amplify-and-forward (AF) and decode-and-forward (DF) relaying [19]–[21], large scale networks [22] and multiple antenna relay systems [23], [24].

Inspired by the benefits of FD and wireless power transfer,
some recent papers have investigated the performance of wireless-powered FD point-to-point [25], [26] and relay systems [27], [28]. In [25] a wireless network model with a hybrid FD access-point (AP) that broadcasts wireless energy to a set of downlink users and at the same time receives information from the users in the uplink has been considered. In [26] software-defined radio implementation of a wireless system that transmits data and power in the same frequency has been presented. In [27], the achievable throughput of FD AF and DF relaying systems with TS has been studied. In [28] the performance of a wireless-powered AF relaying system has been also studied. The protocol in [28] considers energy harvesting from LI and therefore can recycle some part of the relay transmit energy. However, [27] and [28] only assumed single transmit/receive antennas at the relay.

Inspired by the current work on wireless-powered FD, in this paper we consider a two-hop MIMO relay system where the multiple antenna FD relay is powered via wireless energy transfer from the source. The main motivation for the adoption of multiple antennas at the relay is two-fold: (1) employment of an antenna array helps the relay to accumulate more energy (2) spatial LI cancellation techniques can be deployed. Specifically, we design receive accumulate more energy (2) spatial LI cancellation techniques can be deployed. Specifically, we design receive and transmit beamformers at the relay and optimize TS parameter to characterize instantaneous as well as delay-constrained throughputs. The main contributions of the paper are summarized as follows:

1) Optimum as well as suboptimum schemes for maximizing the instantaneous throughput are proposed. In the optimum scheme, the beamformer optimization is reformulated in terms of the transmit beamformer which is shown to have closed-form solutions for some scenarios. In other scenarios where such solutions are not available, we reformulate the optimization problem as a semi-definite relaxation (SDR) problem in terms of a transmit beamforming matrix. The resulting optimization can be solved as a convex feasibility problem. We prove that the SDR problem either yields optimum rank-one solution or such solution can always be recovered from the optimum beamforming matrix solution of the SDR problem.

2) In the suboptimum schemes, we employ zero-forcing (ZF), maximum ratio combining (MRC), and maximum ratio transmission (MRT) schemes for obtaining receive and transmit beamformers. More specifically, we solve the optimization problems that arise due to the application of transmit zero-forcing (TZF)/MRC and MRT/receive zero-forcing (RZF) as transmit/receive beamformers.

3) In all of the above schemes, the optimum time-split parameter is analytically determined.

4) For the suboptimum schemes, which yield closed-form solutions, we develop new expressions for the system’s outage probability. These expressions are helpful for investigating the effects of key system parameters on performance metrics such as the outage probability and delay-constrained throughput.

5) We present simple high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) expressions for the outage probability of suboptimum schemes which enable the characterization of the system’s diversity order and array gain.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section II presents the multiple antenna FD relay system model. Section III introduces joint transmit/receive beamforming designs. The instantaneous and delay-constrained throughput of these beamforming schemes are analyzed in Section IV and V, respectively. Numerical results are reported in Section VI. Finally, Section VII concludes the paper and summarizes the key findings.

**Notation:** We use bold upper case letters to denote matrices, bold lower case letters to denote vectors. $\|\cdot\|$, $(\cdot)^\dagger$, $(\cdot)^{-1}$ and $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ denote the Euclidean norm, conjugate transpose operator, matrix inverse and the trace of a matrix respectively; $E\{x\}$ stands for the expectation of the random variable $x$; $P_r(\cdot)$ denotes the probability; $f_X(\cdot)$ and $F_X(\cdot)$ denote the probability density function (pdf) and cumulative distribution function (cdf) of the random variable (RV) $X$, respectively; $CN(\mu, \sigma^2)$ denotes a circularly symmetric complex Gaussian RV $x$ with mean $\mu$ and variance $\sigma^2$; $\Gamma(a)$ is the Gamma function; $\Gamma(a, x)$ is upper incomplete Gamma function [29, Eq. (8.350)]; $K_v(\cdot)$ is the $v$th order modified Bessel function of the second kind [29, Eq. (8.432)]; $\psi(x)$ is the digamma function [30, Eq. (6.3.1)]; $E_n(x)$ is the $E_n$ function [30, Eq. (5.1.4)] and $G^{m,n}_{p,q}\left( z \mid a_1, \cdots, a_m ; b_1, \cdots, b_q \right)$ denotes the Meijer G-function [29, Eq. (9.301)].

## II. System Model and Problem Formulation

We consider a multiple antenna DF relay system consisting of one source $S$, one relay $R$, and one destination, $D$ as shown in Fig. 1. Both $S$ and $D$ are equipped with a single antenna. To enable FD operation, $R$ is equipped with two sets of antennas, i.e., $M_R$ receiving antennas and $M_T$ transmitting antennas. We assume that the $S$ to $D$ link does not exist.

It is also assumed that $R$ has no external power supply, and is powered through wireless energy transfer from $S$ as in [19], [27]. We adopt the TS protocol [16], [19], hence the entire communication process is divided into two phases, i.e., for a transmission block time $T$, $\alpha$ fraction of the block time is devoted for energy harvesting and the remaining time, $(1-\alpha)T$, is used for information transmission. It is also assumed that the channels experience Rayleigh fading and remain constant over the block time $T$ and varies independently and identically from one block to the other.

During the energy harvesting phase, the received signal $r_e$ at the relay can be expressed as

$$r_e = \frac{P_S}{d_1^\frac{3}{2}} h_{SR} x_e + n_R,$$

where $P_S$ is the source transmit power, $d_1$ is the distance between the source and relay, $\tau$ is the path loss exponent,
\( h_{SR} \) is the \( M_R \times 1 \) channel vector for the \( S-R \) link, i.e., input antennas at \( R \) are connected to the rectennas, \( x_r \) is the energy symbol with unit energy, and \( n_R \) is the additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) at the relay with \( \mathbb{E}\{n_R n_R^\dagger\} = \sigma_R^2 I_{M_R} \). As in [19], we assume that the energy harvested during the energy harvesting phase is stored in a supercapacitor and then fully consumed by \( R \) to forward the source signal to the destination. This type of operation is also known as the “harvest-use” architecture in the literature [21], [27].

We assume that the harvested energy due to the noise (including both the antenna noise and the rectifier noise) is small and thus ignored [19], [27], [31]. Hence, the relay transmit power can be written as

\[
P_r = \frac{\kappa}{d_1^2} P_S \| h_{SR} \|^2 ,
\]

where \( \kappa \triangleq \frac{n_0}{\eta} \) and \( \eta \) denotes the energy conversion efficiency. Now, let us consider the information transmission phase. The received signal at \( R \) can be expressed as

\[
r[n] = \sqrt{P_S} h_{SR} x_S[n] + \sqrt{P_S} h_{RR} x_R[n] + n_R[n],
\]

where \( x_S[n] \) is the source information symbol with unit energy, and \( x_R[n] \) is the transmitted relay signal satisfying \( \mathbb{E}\{x_R[n] x_R[n]^\dagger\} = P_r \). In order to reduce the effects of LI on system performance, a spatial interference cancellation scheme is used at \( R \) and we model the \( M_R \times M_T \) residual LI channel \( H_{RR} \) as a fading feedback channel. To this end, several residual LI channel models have been proposed in the literature, see for e.g., [3]-[5], [32], [33].

Since each implementation of a particular LI cancellation scheme can be characterized by a specific residual power, the elements of \( H_{RR} \) can be modeled as independent identically distributed \( CN(0, \sigma_{RR}^2) \) RVs, which is a common assumption in the literature since the dominant line-of-sight component in each receive antennas” versus “all antennas” design options are expected to follow similar trends reported in this work and achieve comparable performance depending on the operating SNR regime.

The relay transmit signal is given by [4]

\[
x_R[n] = \sqrt{P_r} w_t x_S[n - \delta],
\]

\(^1\) Another design choice would be to use all receive and transmit antennas during the energy harvesting phase. Analyzing this case involves different RVs in SINR expressions and left out as future work due to limited space. Moreover, as observed in single/dual antenna relay implementation [27], “receive antennas” versus “all antennas” design options are expected to follow similar trends reported in this work and achieve comparable performance depending on the operating SNR regime.

\(^2\) Perfect estimation and cancellation of the LI is not possible due to the presence of inevitable transceiver chain impairments [4], [33] and therefore, the results reported in our paper serve as useful theoretical bounds for practical design.

Remark 1: Apart from data-dependent transmit power, energy consumption in the power amplifier/RF circuitry and processing power of the LI cancellation technique employed could have a significant impact on FD transceiver operation [34]. Towards this end, recent advances made with very low energy consumption micro-controllers and RF circuitry is already making it possible to use harvested power in realistic applications [35]. Nevertheless, performance analysis of wireless-powered FD transceiver operation with circuit and processing power consumption is an interesting future direction worth more research.
III. J oint R eceive/T ransmit B eamforming

In this section, we consider the beamforming design problem to solve the optimization problem (9) for a given $\alpha$. In this case, (9) turns to a problem of maximizing the minimum two-hop SINR, which is expressed as

$$\max_{\|w_r\| = \|w_t\| = 1} \min \left( \frac{\frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2}{\|w_r\|^2 \|h_{RR}w_t\|^2}, \frac{\frac{\rho_2}{d_1^r} \|h_{SR}\|^2}{\|w_t\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_r\|^2} \right).$$

In the following subsections, we propose optimum as well as different suboptimum schemes for solving (10). In the optimum approach, we propose SDR problem but show that relaxation does not change the optimality of the solution, whereas in the suboptimum schemes, different linear receiver/transmitter techniques are employed at $R$.

A. Optimum Scheme

Since the second-hop SNR does not depend on $w_r$, we can maximize the first-hop SINR w.r.t $w_t$ by fixing $w_t$. In this case, the optimization problem (10) is re-formulated as

$$\max_{\|w_t\| = 1} \frac{\frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2}{\|w_t\|^2 \|h_{RR}w_t\|^2 + 1},$$

which is a generalized Rayleigh ratio problem [36]. It is well known that (11) is globally maximized when

$$w_t = \left( \frac{\frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 H_{RR}w_t H_{RR}^H + I}{\frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 H_{RR}w_t H_{RR}^H + I} \right)^{-1} h_{SR},$$

Accordingly, by substituting $w_t$ into (11) and applying the Sherman Morrison formula [37], the first term inside the min operator in (10) is obtained as

$$\psi \triangleq \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \left( \frac{\frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 H_{RR}w_t H_{RR}^H + I}{\frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 H_{RR}w_t H_{RR}^H + I} \right)^{-1} h_{SR} = \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \frac{\frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{SR}H_{RR}w_t\|^2}{1 + \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RR}w_t\|^2}.$$

Now, the optimization problem in (10) is re-expressed as

$$\max_{\|w_t\| = 1} \min \left( \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \frac{\frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{SR}H_{RR}w_t\|^2}{1 + \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RR}w_t\|^2}, \frac{\frac{\rho_2}{d_1^r} \|h_{SR}\|^2}{\|w_t\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2} \right),$$

which is still difficult to solve due to its nonconvex nature.

One of the key results of the optimum scheme is presented in the following proposition.  

Proposition 1: The optimal $w_{t,o}$ is given by

$$w_{t,o} = \begin{cases} 
    w_{mSINR}, & \text{if } f_1(w_{mSINR}) \leq f_2(w_{mSINR}) \\
    w_{MRT}, & \text{if } f_2(w_{MRT}) \leq f_1(w_{MRT}) \\
    \text{is obtained from the feasibility problem } \mathcal{P}, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}$$

where

$$f_1(w_t) = \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \left( \|h_{SR}\|^2 - \frac{\frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{SR}H_{RR}w_t\|^2}{1 + \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RR}w_t\|^2} \right),$$

$$f_2(w_t) = \frac{\frac{\rho_2}{d_1^r}}{\|w_t\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2},$$

$$w_{mSINR} = \max_{w_t} f_1(w_t)$$

$$= \min_{w_t} \left( \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 w_t H_{RR}^H h_{SR} H_{RR} w_t \right)$$

$$w_{MRT} = \max_{w_t} f_2(w_t) = \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2$$

$$t \in \left[ 0, \min \left( \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2, \frac{\rho_2}{d_1^r} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2 \right) \right]$$

and $\mathcal{P}$ is

$$\mathcal{P} : \text{ Find } w_t, y$$

s.t.

$$ty \leq \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 y$$

$$-\frac{\frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 h_{SR} H_{RR} w_t H_{RR}^H h_{SR}}{\|h_{RD}w_t\|^2}$$

$$y = \text{tr} \left( W_t \left( I + \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 h_{RR}^H H_{RR} \right) \right)$$

$$t \leq \frac{\frac{\rho_2}{d_1^r}}{\|w_t\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2}$$

$$\text{tr} \left( W_t \right) = 1, W_t \succeq 0.$$  

The maximum value of $t$ for which the problem $\mathcal{P}$ is feasible gives the relaxed optimum solution $w_t$.

Proof: Note that $w_{mSINR}$ is the eigenvector corresponding to the minimum eigenvalue of the matrix $(I + \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^t} \|h_{SR}\|^2 H_{RR}^H H_{RR})^{-1} (H_{RR}^H H_{RR} H_{SR} H_{SR}^H H_{RR})$. The solution of $w_t$ that maximizes $f_1(w_t)$ is $w_{mSINR}$, whereas $f_2(w_t)$ is maximized by $w_{MRT}$. Now consider the following cases:

- $f_1(w_{mSINR}) \leq f_2(w_{mSINR})$: In this case the two possible scenarios for $w_t \neq w_{mSINR}$ are $f_1(w_t) \leq f_2(w_t)$ and $f_1(w_t) > f_2(w_t)$. In the former case, $f_1(w_t) = f_2(w_t)$ but if $f_1(w_t) \leq f_2(w_t)$ since $f_1(w_t) \leq f_1(w_{mSINR})$. In the latter case, $f_1(w_t) = f_2(w_t)$ but it follows that $f_2(w_t) \leq f_1(w_{mSINR}) \leq f_2(w_{MRT})$. Therefore, $w_{mSINR}$ is the optimum precoder when $f_1(w_{mSINR}) \leq f_2(w_{MRT})$.

- $f_2(w_{MRT}) \leq f_2(w_{MRT})$: The two possible scenarios are $f_2(w_t) \leq f_1(w_t)$ and $f_2(w_t) > f_1(w_t)$ where $w_t \neq w_{MRT}$. In the former case, $f_1(w_t) = f_2(w_t)$ but it follows that $f_2(w_t) \leq f_1(w_{MRT})$ since $f_2(w_t) \leq f_2(w_{MRT})$. In the latter case, $f_1(w_t) = f_2(w_t)$ but it follows that $f_2(w_t) \leq f_1(w_{MRT}) \leq f_2(w_{MRT})$. Therefore, $w_{MRT}$ is the optimum precoder when $f_2(w_{MRT}) \leq f_1(w_{MRT})$.

- For remaining cases, to the best of our knowledge, there is no closed-form solution for the optimization problem (14). Introducing an auxiliary variable $t \geq 0$, (14) is
expressed as
\[
\max_{\|w_t\| = 1, t} \; t \;
\]
\[
\text{s.t.} \; t \leq \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \left( \|h_{SR}\|^2 - \frac{\rho_1}{2d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\| \|h_{RR}w_t\|^2 \right) - \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2 \]
\[
+ \frac{\rho_2}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2.
\]
This is a nonconvex quadratic optimization problem with nonconvex constraint. To solve the problem in (17), we first apply SDR technique by using a positive-semidefinite matrix \( W_t = w_t w_t^H \) and relaxing the rank-constraint on \( W_t \). Moreover, define the auxiliary variable
\[
y = \text{tr} \left( W_t \left( I + \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 H_{RR}H_{RR}^H \right) \right).
\]
The relaxed optimization problem (17) in terms of \( W_t, y, \) and \( t \) is
\[
\max_{W_t, y, t} \; t \;
\]
\[
\text{s.t.} \; ty \leq \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 y
\]
\[
- \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 h_{SR}^H H_{RR}^H h_{SR} + \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2 \]
\[
y = \text{tr} \left( W_t \left( I + \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 H_{RR}^H H_{RR} \right) \right)
\]
\[
t \leq \frac{\rho_2}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2 \]
\[
\text{tr} \left( W_t \right) = 1, \; W_t \succeq 0.
\]
The optimization problem (18) is still nonconvex. However, for a given \( t \), the problem turns to a convex feasibility problem given in (16). We show that there is no need to solve this feasibility problem for all possible values of \( t \). This can be demonstrated as follows. Note that the constraints of the problem (18) show that \( t \) can be upper bounded as
\[
t \leq \min \left( \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2, \frac{\rho_2}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2 \right).
\]
Consequently, we can start solving the feasibility problem (16) in the decreasing order for \( t \). The largest value of \( t \) for which the problem is feasible yields the optimum \( W_t \). If the optimum \( W_t \) is rank-one, then the relaxed problem (18) is equivalent to the original problem.

In the following, we show that the relaxed optimization (18) or convex feasibility problem (16) provides an optimum rank-one solution. To this end, we present another key result of the optimum scheme in the following proposition.

\textbf{Proposition 2:} The rank-one optimum \( W_t \) can always be guaranteed in (18).

\textit{Proof:} The proof is based on Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions and given in Appendix I. \hfill \blacksquare

\subsection{B. TZF Scheme}

We now present some suboptimum beamforming solutions. The first is the TZF scheme, where relay takes advantage of the multiple transmit antennas to completely cancel the LI [8]. To ensure this is feasible, the number of the transmit antennas at relay should be greater than one, i.e., \( M_R > 1 \). In addition, MRC is applied at the relay input, i.e., \( w_{r} = \frac{h_{SR}}{\|h_{SR}\|} \). After substituting \( w_{r} \) into (10), the optimal transmit beamforming vector \( w_t \) is obtained by solving the following problem:
\[
\max_{\|w_t\| = 1} \; \|h_{RD}w_t\|^2
\]
\[
\text{s.t.} \; h_{SR}^H H_{RR}w_t = 0.
\]
We know that \( A \triangleq H_{RR}^H h_{SR}^H H_{RR} \) is a rank-one Hermitian matrix with eigenvalue \( \lambda \triangleq \|h_{SR}^H H_{RR}\|^2 \) and eigenvector \( x \triangleq \|h_{SR}^H h_{SR}\| \). Consequently, the eigenvalue decomposition of \( A \) can be given by \( x^H (I - \frac{1}{\lambda} A) x = 0 \) which implies that \( x^H (I - \frac{1}{\lambda} A) w_t = 0 \) for all \( w_t \neq 0 \). Comparing this with the ZF constraint in (19), it is clear that we can take \( w_t = Bw_t \), where \( B \triangleq I - \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{h_{SR}^H h_{SR}}{\|h_{SR}^H h_{SR}\|^2} \), without violating the ZF constraint. As such, the objective function in (19) reduces to \( \|h_{RD}Bw_t\|^2 \) which is maximized with \( w_t = k_B h_{RD}^H \). Since \( \|w_t\| = 1 \) and \( B = B^2 \), it is clear that \( k_B = \frac{1}{\|Bh_{RD}\|} \). Consequently, the transmit beamformer for the TZF scheme is given by
\[
w_t^{ZF} = \frac{B h_{RD}^H}{\|B h_{RD}\|}.
\]

\subsection{C. RZF Scheme}

As an alternative solution, the transmit beamforming vector can be set using the MRT principle, i.e., \( w_t = \frac{h_{RD}}{\|h_{RD}\|} \), and \( w_{r} \) is designed with the ZF criterion \( w_{r}^H H_{RR}w_{r} = 0 \). To ensure feasibility of RZF, \( R \) should be equipped with \( M_R > 1 \) receive antennas. Substituting the MRT solution for \( w_{r} \) into (10), the optimal receive beamforming vector \( w_{r} \) is the solution of the following problem:
\[
\max_{\|w_{r}\| = 1} \; \|w_{r}^H h_{SR}\|^2
\]
\[
\text{s.t.} \; w_{r}^H H_{RR}h_{RD} = 0.
\]
Using similar steps as in the TZF scheme, the optimal combining vector \( w_{r} \) is obtained as
\[
w_{r}^{ZF} = \frac{D h_{SR}}{\|D h_{SR}\|},
\]
where \( D \triangleq I - \frac{h_{SR} h_{SR}^H h_{RD} h_{RD}^H}{\|h_{RD}^H h_{RD}\|^2} \).

\subsection{D. MRC/MRT Scheme}

Finally, we consider the MRC/MRT scheme, where \( w_{r} \) and \( w_t \) are set to match the first hop and second hop channel, respectively. Hence,
\[
w_{r}^{MRC} = \frac{h_{SR}}{\|h_{SR}\|}, \; w_t^{MRT} = \frac{h_{RD}}{\|h_{RD}\|}.
\]
It is worthwhile to note that the optimum, TZF, and RZF schemes reduce to the MRC/MRT scheme in the absence of LI. Although the MRC/MRT scheme is not optimal in the presence of LI, it could be favored in situations where compatibility with HD systems is a concern. Moreover, as we
show in Section VI, the MRC/MRT scheme exhibits a very good performance as compared to other schemes under mild LI effect. Note that the MRC/MRT scheme requires only the knowledge of $h_{SR}$ and $h_{RD}$, whereas the other three schemes require the knowledge of $h_{SR}$, $h_{RD}$, and $H_{RR}$.

IV. OPTIMIZING $\alpha$ FOR INSTANTANEOUS THROUGHPUT

In this section, we optimize $\alpha$ for the FD beamforming schemes proposed in the previous section and maximize the instantaneous throughput which is given by [27]

$$R_0(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha) \log_2(1 + \gamma_{FD}).$$

(24)

This expression reveals an interesting trade-off between the duration of energy harvesting and the instantaneous throughput. A longer energy harvesting time increases the harvested energy and consequently the second hop SNR, however decreases the available time for information transmission and vice-versa. Therefore, an appropriate system design can optimize the instantaneous throughput by adjusting $\alpha$.

A. Optimum Scheme

Substituting the optimum $w_{t,o}$, the instantaneous rate as a function of $\alpha$ is

$$R_{Opt}(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha) \log_2 \left(1 + \|h_{SR}\|^2 \right) \times \min \left( \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \left(1 - \frac{\kappa_1 \|h_{SR}^\dagger H_{RR}w_{t,o}\|^2}{1 + \frac{\kappa_1}{\rho_1} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|H_{RR}w_{t,o}\|^2} \right), \frac{\kappa_2}{d_2^2} \|h_{RD}w_{t,o}\|^2 \right).$$

(25)

Let $b_0 = \frac{\mu_2}{\rho_1} \|h_{RD}w_{t,o}\|^2$, $b_1 = \frac{\mu_2}{\rho_1} \|h_{SR}^\dagger H_{RR}w_{t,o}\|^2$, and $b_2 = \frac{\mu_2}{\rho_1} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|H_{RR}w_{t,o}\|^2$. Hence, (25) is written as

$$R_{Opt}(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha) \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \right) \times \min \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha b_1}{1 + \frac{\alpha b_2}{1 - \alpha}}, \frac{\alpha b_0}{1 + \frac{\alpha b_2}{1 - \alpha}} \right).$$

(26)

Thus, the optimal $\alpha$ is obtained by solving

$$\alpha^*_Opt = \arg \max_{0<\alpha<1} R_{Opt}(\alpha).$$

(27)

Denote $f = \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2$ and $\tilde{f} = f b_0$. The above optimization problem can be solved analytically as shown in the following proposition.

**Proposition 3:** The optimal $\alpha^*_Opt$ is given by

$$\alpha^*_Opt = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{W(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}) + 1}}{\frac{\alpha}{\rho_1} - 1}, & \text{if } e^{W(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}) + 1} < \alpha_0 \tilde{f} + 1; \\ \frac{\alpha_0}{1 - \alpha}, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

(28)

where $W(x)$ is the Lambert $W$ function in which $W(x)$ is the solution of $\exp(W) = x$ and noting that $b_1 \leq b_2$ from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\alpha_0$ is given by

$$\alpha_0 = \frac{(b_2 - b_1 - b_0) + \sqrt{b_0^2 + (b_2 - b_1)^2 + 2b_0(b_1 + b_2)}}{2b_0b_2}.$$

**Proof:** The following two cases are considered:

1) if $\frac{\alpha b_1}{1 - \alpha} < 1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\rho_1} \frac{b_0}{1 - \alpha_0}$ or $\alpha < \frac{\alpha_0}{1 + \alpha_0}$, we have

$$R_{Opt}(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha) \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \tilde{f} \right).$$

Therefore, taking the first order derivative of $R_{Opt}(\alpha)$ with respect to $\alpha$, and using the procedure described in [27], the optimal time portion $\alpha$ can be obtained as

$$\alpha^*_Opt = \frac{e^{W(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}) + 1}}{\frac{\alpha}{\rho_1} - 1}.$$ 

(29)

2) Otherwise, if $\alpha > \frac{\alpha_0}{1 + \alpha_0}$, the instantaneous throughput in (26) is given by

$$R_{Opt}(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha) \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{f b_1}{1 + \frac{\alpha b_1}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\alpha b_2}{1 - \alpha}} \right).$$

Taking the first derivative of $R_{Opt}(\alpha)$ with respect to $\alpha$ yields

$$\frac{dR_{Opt}(\alpha)}{d\alpha} = - \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{f b_1}{1 + \frac{\alpha b_1}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\alpha b_2}{1 - \alpha}} \right),$$

which is strictly smaller than zero. Therefore, $R_{Opt}(\alpha)$ is a decreasing function with respect to $\alpha$, and hence the optimal $\alpha$ is given by

$$\alpha^*_Opt = \frac{\alpha_0}{1 + \alpha_0}.$$ 

(30)

B. TZF Scheme

Substituting $w_{z,t}^{ZF}$ into (7), the instantaneous throughput of the TZF scheme is given by

$$R_i(TZF)(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha) \log_2 \left(1 + \min \left( \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2, \frac{\kappa_2}{d_2^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|H_{RR}w_{t,o}\|^2 \right) \right).$$

(31)

Hence, the optimal $\alpha$ can be obtained by solving the following optimization problem

$$\alpha^*_ZF = \arg \max_{0<\alpha<1} R_i(TZF)(\alpha).$$

(32)

In (32), since $R_i(TZF)(\alpha)$ is concave with respect to $\alpha$, $\alpha^*_ZF$ can be obtained by solving the equation $\frac{dR_i(TZF)(\alpha)}{d\alpha} = 0$. Using the similar approach as in the optimum scheme, $\alpha^*_ZF$ can be derived as

$$\alpha^*_ZF = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{W(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}) + 1}}{\frac{\alpha}{\rho_1} - 1}, & \text{if } e^{W(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}) + 1} < \frac{\alpha}{\alpha_1} + 1; \\ \frac{\alpha_1}{1 + \alpha_1}, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

(33)

where $\alpha_1 = \frac{\mu_2}{\rho_1} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|H_{RD}\|^2$, $a_2 = \frac{d_2^2}{\rho_1 \|h_{SR}\|^2}$, and $\alpha_1 = a_1 a_2$.

C. RZF Scheme

Substituting $w_{z,t}^{ZF}$ into (7), the instantaneous throughput of the RZF scheme can be written as

$$R_i(RZF)(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha) \log_2 \left(1 + \min \left( \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \|H_{SR}\|^2, \frac{\kappa_2}{d_2^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|H_{RD}\|^2 \right) \right).$$

(34)
Accordingly, the optimal $\alpha$ can be obtained as
\[
\alpha_{\text{opt}}^* = \begin{cases} 
\frac{e^{W\left(\frac{a_3-1}{a_3}+\frac{1}{a_3}\right)}-1}{a_3-1+e^{W\left(\frac{a_3-1}{a_3}+\frac{1}{a_3}\right)}} + 1; & \text{if } e^{W\left(\frac{a_3-1}{a_3}+\frac{1}{a_3}\right)}+1 < \frac{a_3}{a_2} + 1; \\
1 + \frac{a_2}{1 + \alpha_3}; & \text{otherwise,} 
\end{cases}
\]
where $a_3 = \frac{\rho_2}{\alpha_1} \| h_{SR} \|^2 / \| h_{RD} \|^2$, $a_4 = \frac{d^2}{\rho_1} \| h_{SR} \|^2$, and $\alpha_2 = a_3 \alpha_4$.

### D. MRC/MRT Scheme

Substituting $w_{\text{MRC}}$ and $w_{\text{MRT}}$ into (7), the instantaneous throughput of the MRC/MRT scheme can be expressed as
\[
R_{\text{MRC}}(\alpha) = (1-\alpha) \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{b_3}{\rho_3} \| h_{SR} \|^2 \| h_{RD} \|^2 \right),
\]
where $R_{\text{MRC}}(\alpha)$ is given by
\[
\frac{\rho_2}{\alpha_1} \| h_{SR} \|^2 / \| h_{RD} \|^2, b_4 = \frac{\rho_2}{\alpha_1} \| h_{SR}^R H_R h_{RD}^t \|^2, b_5 = \frac{\rho_2}{\alpha_1} \| h_{RD} \|^2. \text{ Hence, (36) can be written as}
\]
\[
R_{\text{MRC}}(\alpha) = (1-\alpha) \log_2 \left( 1 + b_3 \right) \times \min \left( \frac{1}{\frac{\rho_2}{\alpha_1} \| h_{SR} \|^2}, \frac{\eta\alpha}{1-\alpha} \right)
\]
As such, the optimal time-split $\alpha$ is the solution of the following problem:
\[
\alpha_{\text{MRC}}^* = \arg\max_{0<\alpha<1} R_{\text{MRC}}(\alpha). \quad (38)
\]

We now consider the delay-constrained scenario, where the source transmits at a constant rate $R_e$ bits/sec/Hz. Due to the time variation of the fading channel, outage events where the instantaneous channel capacity is below the source transmission rate may occur. Hence, the average throughput can be computed as [19]
\[
R_D(\alpha) = (1 - P_{\text{out}})R_e(1-\alpha), \quad (42)
\]
where $P_{\text{out}}$ is the outage probability, which is defined as the probability that the instantaneous SINR falls below a predefined threshold, $\gamma_{th}$. Mathematically, it can be written as
\[
P_{\text{out}} = P_r(\gamma_{FD} < \gamma_{th}) = F_{\gamma}(\gamma_{th}), \quad (43)
\]
Algorithm 1 The proposed optimum scheme for the instantaneous throughput maximization.

Step 1: Initialize $\alpha$.

Choose $\alpha$ from its grid (Line search Method -LS) or generate an initial point for $\alpha$ (Alternating optimization method-AO) where $\alpha \in [0, 1)$.

Step 2: Obtain the transmit beamformer $w_{t,o}$ using (15).

if (15) requires solving the feasibility problem $\mathcal{P}$ of (16) then

if $W_t$ is rank-one then

Take $w_{t,o}$ as the eigenvector corresponding to non-zero eigenvalue of $W_t$.

else

Take $w_{t,o}$ as given in Case b of the Appendix I (see (82))

end if

end if

Step 4:

If AO method then

while not converged do

Obtain $\omega_{\text{opt}}$ from (28) using $w_{t,o}$ obtained in Step 2.

Update $\alpha$ as $\alpha = \omega_{\text{opt}}$ and go to Step 2.

end while

Save $w_{t,o}$, $\alpha$, and the objective function.

else if LS method then

Save $w_{t,o}$, $\alpha$, and the objective function.

Take another $\alpha$ from its grid, and repeat Step 1.

end if

Step 3: Choose the $w_{t,o}$ and $\alpha$ that give maximum objective value.

where $\gamma_{\text{th}} = 2^{R_c} - 1$. Therefore in order to find the delay-constrained throughput, the remaining key task is to characterize the exact outage probability of the system. In the sequel, we investigate the outage probability of the considered TZF, RZF, and MRC/MRT schemes. In addition, simple high SNR approximations are presented, which provide a concise characterization of the diversity order, and enable a performance comparison of these three schemes. Derivation of the outage probability of the optimum scheme is difficult. Hence we have resorted to simulations for evaluating the delay-constrained throughput of the optimum scheme in Section VI.

A. TZF Scheme

Substituting the $w_{t}^{\text{TZF}}$ and $w_{t}^{\text{MRC}}$ into (7), the end-to-end SNR $\gamma_{\text{TZF}}$ can be expressed as

$$F_{\gamma_{\text{TZF}}} (z) \approx \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_R+1)} & + \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_T-1)\Gamma(M_R)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k!(M_R+M_T-k+1)} \left( \frac{\sigma_w^2}{\sigma_n^2} \right)^k \left( \frac{d_1^2}{\rho_1} \right)^{M_T-k} \left( \frac{d_2^2}{\rho_2} \right)^{M_R} \frac{\Gamma(M_T-k+1)}{\Gamma(M_R)} \left( \frac{d_1}{\rho_1} \right)^{M_T-k+1} \\
\Gamma(M_R-M_T+1) & \left( \frac{d_1^2}{\rho_1} \right)^{M_T-1} \left( \frac{d_2^2}{\rho_2} \right)^{M_R} \end{array} \right\},$$

where $\gamma_{\text{th}} = 2^{R_c} - 1$. Therefore in order to find the delay-constrained throughput, the remaining key task is to characterize the exact outage probability of the system.

B. RZF Scheme

Invoking (7), and using $w_{t}^{\text{TZF}}$ and $w_{t}^{\text{MRT}}$, the end-to-end SNR $\gamma_{\text{RZF}}$ can be expressed as

$$\gamma_{\text{RZF}} = \min \left( \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \h_s^T \D_h \h_s \frac{\rho_2}{d_1^2 d_2^2} ||\h_s||^2 ||\h_{RD}||^2 \right)$$

$$= \min \left( \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \h_s^T \diag (0, 1, \cdots, 1) \h_s \frac{\rho_2}{d_1^2 d_2^2} ||\h_s||^2 ||\h_{RD}||^2 \right)$$

$$= \min \left( \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} ||\h_s||^2 \frac{\rho_2}{d_1^2 d_2^2} ||\h_s||^2 ||\h_{RD}||^2 \right),$$

where $\h_s = \Phi \h_{SR}$ with $\Phi$ is a unitary matrix, and $\h_{SR}$ is a $(M_R-1) \times 1$ vector, consisting of the $M_R-1$
last element of $\mathbf{h}_{SR}$. In (47), the first equality follows from the fact that $\mathbf{D}$ is idempotent and the second equality is due to the eigen decomposition. Let us denote $Z_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{d_1^2} (\|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}_1\|^2)$ where $\mathbf{h}_1$ is the first element of the $\mathbf{h}_{SR}$ and $X_1 = \frac{\|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\|^2}{\|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}_1\|^2}$. Therefore, the end-to-end SINR can be re-expressed as

$$
\gamma_{\text{RZF}} = Z_1 \min \left( \rho_1 X_1, \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2 \right). \quad (48)
$$

It is well known that $Z_1$ follows central chi-square distribution with $2M_R$ degrees-of-freedom, denoted as $Z_1 \sim \chi^2_{2M_R}$ and that $X_1$ follows a beta distribution with shape parameters $M_R - 1$ and 1, denoted as $X_1 \sim \text{Beta}(M_R - 1, 1)$, with [38]

$$
F_{X_1}(x) = x^{M_R-1}, \quad 0 < x < 1.
$$

Moreover, let $Y_2 = \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_2^2} \|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2$; we have $F_{Y_2}(y) = P \left( M_R, \frac{d_2^2}{\kappa \rho_2} y \right)$, where $P(a, x) = \gamma(a, x) / \Gamma(a)$. With $F_{X_1}(x)$ and $F_{Y_2}(y)$ in hand, $F_{\gamma_{\text{RZF}}}(z)$ can be expressed as

$$
F_{\gamma_{\text{RZF}}}(z) = 1 - Q \left( M_R, \frac{d_1^2 z}{\rho_1} \right) + \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_R)} \left( \int_{\frac{d_1^2 z}{\rho_1}}^{\infty} P \left( M_R, \frac{d_2^2 z}{\kappa \rho_2} \right) x^{M_R-1} e^{-x} dx \right) + \left( \frac{d_1^2 z}{\rho_1} \right)^{M_R-1} \int_{\frac{d_1^2 z}{\rho_1}}^{\infty} Q \left( M_R, \frac{d_2^2 z}{\kappa \rho_2} x \right) e^{-x} dx. \quad (50)
$$

Although (50) does not admit a closed-form solution, it can be efficiently evaluated numerically. Now, we look into the high SNR regime, and investigate the diversity order.

Proposition 6: In the high SNR regime, i.e., $\rho_1, \rho_2 \to \infty$, the outage probability of the RZF scheme can be approximated as

$$
F_{\gamma_{\text{RZF}}}(z) \approx \begin{cases}
\frac{1}{\Gamma(M_R)} \left( \frac{d_1^2 z}{\rho_1} \right)^{M_R-1}, & M_R < M_T + 1, \\
\frac{1}{\Gamma(M_R)} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_R+1)} \left( \frac{d_2^2 z}{\kappa \rho_2} M_T \right)^{M_T} \right) \left( \frac{d_1^2 z}{\rho_1} \right)^{M_T}, & M_R = M_T + 1, \\
\frac{\Gamma(M_R-M_T)}{\Gamma(M_R)} \left( \frac{d_2^2 z}{\kappa \rho_2} M_T \right)^{M_T} \left( \frac{d_1^2 z}{\kappa \rho_2} \right)^{M_T}, & M_R > M_T + 1.
\end{cases} \quad (51)
$$

Proof: See Appendix C.

Proposition 6 indicates that the RZF scheme achieves a diversity order of $\min(M_R - 1, M_T)$. This result is also intuitively satisfying since one degree-of-freedom should be allocated for LI cancellation at the receive side of $R$.

C. MRC/MRT Scheme

The outage probability analysis of the MRC/MRT scheme for arbitrary $M_T$ and $M_R$ appears to be cumbersome. Therefore, we now consider two special cases as follows: Case-1) $M_T = 1$, $M_R \geq 1$ and Case-2) $M_T \geq 1$, $M_R = 1$.

Case-1): In this case $\frac{\|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\| \|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2}{\|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\|^2 \|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2}$ is given by

$$
X_2 \triangleq \left| \mathbf{w}_c^\top \mathbf{h}_{RR} \right|^2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{h}_{SR}^\top \mathbf{h}_1\|^2}{\|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\|^2} \|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2. \quad (52)
$$

For notational convenience, we define $c_1 = \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \rho_1^2$, $c_2 = \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_2^2} \rho_1^2$, $c_3 = \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_2^2} \rho_1^2$. Then, the end-to-end SINR can be re-expressed as

$$
\gamma_{\text{MRC}} = \min \left( \frac{c_1 \|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\|^2}{c_2 \|\mathbf{h}_{SR}^\top \mathbf{h}_1\|^2 \|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2 + 1, c_3 \|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\|^2 \|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2 \right). \quad (53)
$$

Let us denote $X = c_1 / (c_2 X_2 + \frac{1}{\rho_1})$ where $X_2 = \|\mathbf{h}_{SR}^\top \mathbf{h}_1\|^2 \|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2$ and $Y = c_3 X_2 Y_4$, with $Y_3 = \|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\|^2$ and $Y_4 = \|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2$. Accordingly, the cdf of $\gamma_{\text{MRC}}$ in (53) can be expressed as

$$
F_{\gamma_{\text{MRC}}}(z) = \Pr(\min(X, Y) < z), = 1 - \Pr(X > z, Y > z). \quad (54)
$$

Conditioned on $Y_3$, the RVs $X$ and $Y$ are independent and hence we have

$$
\Pr(X > z, Y > z) = \int_{\frac{1}{\rho_1}}^{\infty} \left( 1 - F_{X|Y_3}(z) \right) f_{Y_3}(y) dy = \int_{\frac{1}{\rho_1}}^{\infty} F_{X_2}(\frac{1}{c_2} \left( \frac{c_1}{z} - \frac{1}{y} \right)) \left( 1 - F_{Y_4} \left( \frac{z}{c_3 y} \right) \right) f_{Y_3}(y) dy. \quad (55)
$$

In order to evaluate (55) we require the cdf of the RV $X_2$. Note that $\|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2 \sim \chi^2_{2M_R}$, $Z_2 \triangleq \|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\|^2$ is distributed as $Z_2 \sim \text{Beta}(1, M_R - 1)$, and the cdf of $X_2$ can be readily evaluated as

$$
F_{X_2}(t) = \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty G_{23}^1 \left( t \left| 1, M_R, 0 \right. \right) dz, \quad (56)
$$

where $G_{23}^1 \left( t \left| 1, M_R, 0 \right. \right) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_R-1)} \int_0^t \gamma^{-M_R-1} \sech(M_R, z t) dz, \quad (b)

To the best of the authors’ knowledge, the integral in (57) does not admit a closed-form solution. However, (57) can be evaluated numerically. We now look into the high SNR regime to gain more insights. To this end, neglecting the noise term of the first term inside in minimum function in (53), we write

$$
\gamma_{\text{low}} > \gamma_{\text{MRC}} = \min \left( \frac{1}{\kappa X_2} \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \|\mathbf{h}_{SR}\|^2 \|\mathbf{h}_{RD}\|^2 \right). \quad (58)
$$

We now present the following proposition.

Proposition 7: In the high SNR regime, i.e., $\rho_1, \rho_2 \to \infty$, with $M_T = 1$ the outage probability of the MRC/MRT
scheme can be approximated as
\[ F_{\gamma_{\text{MRC}}}^\infty(z) = 1 - \frac{2}{\Gamma(M_R)} G_{23}^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1, M_R \mid 1, M_R, 0 \end{pmatrix} \]
\[ \times \left( \frac{d_1^2}{\rho_2 \kappa^2} \right)^{M_R} K_{M_R} \left( 2, \frac{d_1^2}{\rho_2 \kappa^2} \right) . \]

Proof: See Appendix D.

Moreover, by applying a Bessel function approximation for small arguments [30, Eq. (9.6.9)], in (59) we can write
\[ F_{\gamma_{\text{MRC}}}^\infty(z) = 1 - G_{23}^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1, M_R \mid 1, M_R, 0 \end{pmatrix} . \]

Note that (60) presents the outage probability floor and indicates that the MRC/MRT scheme with \( M \) schemes can be approximated as
\[ \hat{F}_h \approx \frac{|h_{\text{RR}}|^2}{\|h_{\text{RR}}\|^2} \]

Proposition 8: In the high SNR regime, i.e., \( \rho_1, \rho_2 \to \infty \), the outage probability of the MRC/MRT scheme can be approximated as
\[ F_{\gamma_{\text{MRC}}}^\infty(z) \approx 1 - \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{d_1^2}{\rho_1 \kappa^2}} \right) \left( e^{-\frac{d_1^2}{\rho_1 \kappa^2}} - \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_R + 1)} \right) \]
\[ \times \left( \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_2 \kappa^2} \right)^{M_R + k} \left( \frac{d_1^2}{\rho_1 \kappa^2} \right) . \]

Proof: Note that in the high SNR regime, i.e., \( \rho_1, \rho_2 \to \infty \), the cdf \( F_{\gamma_{\text{MRC}}}^\infty(z) \) can be approximated as
\[ F_{\gamma_{\text{MRC}}}^\infty(z) \approx 1 - \int_{\rho_1}^{\infty} \Gamma \left( M, \frac{z}{\kappa \sigma} \right) e^{-x} dx . \]

In most cases, \( k = 0 \) is sufficient for accurate results leading to the following compact expression
\[ F_{\gamma_{\text{MRC}}}^\infty(z) \approx 1 - \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{d_1^2}{\rho_1 \kappa^2}} \right) \left( e^{-\frac{d_1^2}{\rho_1 \kappa^2}} - \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_R + 1)} \right) \]
\[ \times \left( \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_2 \kappa^2} \right)^{M_R + k} \left( \frac{d_1^2}{\rho_1 \kappa^2} \right) , \]

while in other cases it can be truncated using few terms up to 10.

At this point, it is important to determine the value of \( \alpha \) that maximizes the throughput. We note that delay-constrained throughput should converge to the ceiling value of \( R_c(1-\alpha) \) when \( \rho_{\text{out}} \to 0 \). For each beamforming scheme we observe that \( P_{\text{out}} \) is a complicated function of \( \alpha \) and it decreases as the value of \( \alpha \) is increased. However, this will lead to the increase of the term \( (1-\alpha) \) at the same time.

Therefore, an optimal value of \( \alpha \) that maximizes the delay-constrained throughput exists and it can be found by solving the following optimization problem [27, Eq. (18)]
\[ \alpha^* = \arg \max_{0 < \alpha < 1} R(\alpha) . \]

Given (46), (50), (57) and (63), unfortunately the optimization problem in (67) does not admit closed-form solutions. However, the optimal \( \alpha^* \) can be solved numerically.

### VI. Numerical Results and Discussion

We now present numerical results based on analytical expressions developed and investigate the impact of key system parameters on the performance. The simulations adopt parameters of the 3GPP LTE for small cell deployments [39]. The maximum transmit power of the source node is set to 26 dBm. The energy conversion efficiency is set to be \( \eta = 0.5 \).

#### A. Instantaneous Throughput

We consider the influence of optimal time-split \( \alpha \) and LI effect on the instantaneous throughput of different beamforming schemes. Fig. 2 shows the instantaneous throughput versus \( \alpha \) of the beamforming schemes for a single time frame and channel realizations. There are two groups of curves: the OPA (dashed line) and EPA (solid line) curves. OPA and EPA refer to the cases where source allocates different and equal power levels for energy harvesting phase and the information transmission phase respectively. The results for OPA have been obtained using a two dimensional grid search strategy over \( \alpha \) and the splitting factor that controls the source power for the energy harvesting phase and the information transmission phase. It is clear that the OPA scheme achieves a higher throughput than the EPA scheme over the entire range of the time-split. We can see that the values of the optimal \( \alpha \) calculated by (28), (33), (35), and (36) coincide with the corresponding ones obtained via simulation. Also, as expected, the optimum scheme outperforms all other schemes on all time-split values. In addition, simulation results, not

---

3We note that the typical values for practical parameters used in EH systems will depend on both the system application and specific technology used for implementation of RF energy harvesting circuits.
shown in the figure to avoid clutter, reveal that the values of the optimal $\alpha$ decrease as either the number of relays' receive antennas or the sources’ transmit power increases. This is because in these cases the relay node can harvest the same amount of energy in a shorter time. Therefore, more time must be allocated to the information transmission phase in order to improve the system throughput.

**B. Outage Probability**

Fig. 3 shows the outage probability for the ZF based beamforming schemes with different antenna configurations and for a specific $\alpha = 0.5$ and $d_1 = d_2 = 10$ m. The asymptotic results based on (47) and (51) are also presented. Since the relay is capable of canceling LI, we see that the outage probability of the TZF and RZF beamforming schemes decays proportionally to the diversity orders reported in Proposition 5 and 6, respectively. Comparing the TZF and RZF schemes with the same diversity orders and different receive antenna numbers (i.e., TZF, with $M_R = 1$ and $M_T = 3$, and RZF with $M_R = 3$ and $M_T = 1$) we see that the additional receive antenna could harvest more energy to increase the second-hop SNR and to facilitate information transfer. Moreover, for the case where $M_R = M_T$, RZF achieves a higher array gain. This observation demonstrates that while under some configurations ($M_T = 1$) or ($M_R = 1$) only one form (receive or transmit) of beamforming design can be implemented, when both designs can be applied, the system designer has to carefully decide on the configuration as well as the beamforming design.

Fig. 4 compares the outage probability of the optimum, TZF, RZF, and MRC/MRT schemes with different antenna configurations and for $\alpha = 0.5$ and $d_1 = d_2 = 10$ m. The residual LI strength at the relay is set to be $-50$ dBm. Asymptotic results in (59) and (66) are also provided for the MRC/MRT scheme. The outage performance of the MRC/MRT scheme is almost identical to the optimum scheme at low SNRs, while the ZF-based schemes can achieve almost the same performance of the optimum scheme in the high SNR regime. When the transmit power increases and $\alpha$ remains fixed, an excessive amount of energy will be collected at the relay, which is detrimental for the MRC/MRT scheme since it results in a strong LI effect. Therefore, the outage probability of the MRC/MRT scheme shows an outage floor at high SNRs. However, to some level a proper choice of $\alpha$ can improve the outage performance of the MRC/MRT scheme. Fig. 3 and 4 illustrate that the outage probability of the system depends on the amount of energy harvested through the receive antenna numbers at the relay, source-relay link distance, and the energy conversion efficiency of the deployed energy harvester at the relay. Moreover, it is significantly influenced by the transmit/receive beamforming design at the relay.

**C. Delay-Constrained Throughput**

Fig. 5 shows the impact of optimal $\alpha$ on the delay-constrained throughput. As expected, the optimum scheme exhibits the best throughput among all beamforming schemes. The superior performance of the optimum scheme is more pronounced especially between 0.4 and 0.8 values of $\alpha$. The highest throughput with optimized $\alpha$ for the
optimum, RZF, MRC/MRT and TZF schemes are given by 0.557, 0.549, 0.453 and 0.404, respectively. Moreover, we see that each one of the TZF, RZF and MRC/MRT schemes can surpass other beamforming schemes depending on the value of $\alpha$. This observation reveals the existence of various design choices when performance-complexity tradeoff is considered.

Fig. 6 shows the effect of the LI strength on the delay-constrained throughput when optimum $\alpha$ is used. The total number of antennas is $M_R + M_T = 4$. The ZF-based schemes do not suffer from LI, therefore the delay-constrained transmission throughput remains constant. On the contrary, as expected, the delay-constrained transmission throughput of the MRC/MRT scheme decreases as $\sigma_{R,R}^2$ and consequently the LI strength increases. When the LI strength is low the ZF-based schemes become inferior as compared to the MRC/MRT scheme. In this region the combination ($M_R = 2$, $M_T = 2$) with MRC/MRT scheme exhibits a near optimum performance. Results, not shown for the configuration ($M_R = 3$, $M_T = 1$), showed inferior performance as compared to the configuration ($M_R = 2$, $M_T = 2$) in all schemes while they showed a superior performance as compared to the configuration ($M_R = 1$, $M_T = 3$). Therefore, performance enhancements can be achieved through equal transmit and receive antenna deployment.

As a final cautionary note we would like to express that the above main findings and insights can be further examined by applying specific RF circuitry and power amplifier model. For example, low efficiency of a RF amplifier used for digital communications can be accounted in a detailed analysis. An implication of such use would be that, often the relay will be unable to operate and the price paid would be a high outage probability due to communication blackout periods. Nevertheless, our results provide useful theoretical performance bounds for the studied system and motivates practical interest from the perspective of wireless-powered full-duplex system implementation.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we studied the instantaneous and delay-constrained throughput of a wireless-powered FD MIMO relay system. We designed optimum linear processing at the relay as well as investigated several suboptimum schemes. The optimal time-split for instantaneous throughput maximization of all schemes was derived. We also presented exact and asymptotic closed-form expressions for the outage probability useful to characterize the delay-constrained throughput. We found that the MRC/MRT scheme can offer a higher instantaneous/delay-constrained throughput as compared to the RZF and TZF schemes, when the LI is significantly canceled, and vice versa. The MRC/MRT scheme can provide a better outage performance at low-to-medium SNRs, while the ZF precoders outperform the former at high SNRs.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

Proof: We show that (18) leads to optimum rank-one solution or such solution can be recovered from the optimum solution that has rank higher than one. First note that instead of solving (16) for a given $t$, (18) can be solved for a given $y = \tilde{y}$. Such optimization problem is expressed as

$$\max_{W_t, t} t$$

s.t. $\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \tilde{y} \leq \|h_{SR}\|^2 \tilde{y} - \frac{\kappa_{\rho_1}}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 h_{SR}^\dagger H_{RR} W_t H_{RR}^\dagger h_{SR}$

$$\tilde{y} = \text{tr} \left( W_t \left( I + \frac{\kappa_{\rho_1}}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 H_{RR}^\dagger H_{RR} \right) \right)$$

$$t \leq \frac{\kappa_{\rho_2}}{d_2^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 h_{RD}^\dagger W_t h_{RD}^\dagger$$

$$\text{tr} \left( W_t \right) = 1, W_t \succeq 0$$

(68)

where $\tilde{y} \in [y_{up}, y_{up}]$. Here, $y_{up}$ is the maximum value of $\tilde{y}$ which is the maximum eigenvalue corresponding to $R = I + \frac{\kappa_{\rho_1}}{d_1^2} \|h_{SR}\|^2 H_{RR}^\dagger H_{RR}$. The optimum $W_t$ is the solution that maximizes $t$ for all $y \in [y_{up}, y_{up}]$ for which (68) is feasible.

Fig. 5. Delay-constrained throughput of different FD schemes ($M_T = M_R = 3$, $P_S = 10$ dBm, $d_1 = 20$, $d_2 = 10$, $\tau = 3$, $\eta = 0.5$, and $R_c = 2$).

Fig. 6. Delay-constrained throughput versus the LI strength for proposed beamforming schemes with optimal $\alpha$ ($P_S = 20$ dBm, $d_1 = 20$, and $d_2 = 10$).
The optimum $W_t$ thus obtained will be the same as that obtained by solving (16). The Lagrangian multiplier function for (68) is expressed as
\[
\mathcal{L} \left( W_t, t; \{ \lambda_i \}_{i=1}^4 \right) = -t + \lambda_1 \left( \frac{d}{\rho_1} t \bar{y} - \| h_{SR} \|^2 h_{\parallel} \right) + \lambda_2 \left( \text{tr} ( W_t R ) - \bar{y} \right) + \lambda_3 \left( t - \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 h_{RD} \right) + \lambda_4 \left( \text{tr} ( W_t - 1 ) \right) - \text{tr} ( Y W_t ), \tag{69}
\]
where $Y \geq 0$ is the matrix dual variable associated with the constraint $w_i \geq 0$. Since (68) is convex and Slater condition holds true, the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions are necessary and sufficient for optimality. The KKT conditions for (68) are
\[
\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W_t} = 0 \rightarrow Y = \lambda_1 \frac{\kappa \rho_1}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 H_{RR} h_{SR} h_{\parallel} \quad \text{and} \quad H_{RR} \quad \tag{70}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial t} = 0 \rightarrow \lambda_2 R + \lambda_4 I + \lambda_3 \left( t - \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 h_{\parallel} h_{RD} \right) = 0 \tag{71}
\]
\[
\lambda_1 \left( \frac{d}{\rho_1} t \bar{y} - \| h_{SR} \|^2 h_{\parallel} \right) + \lambda_2 \left( \text{tr} ( W_t R ) - \bar{y} \right) + \lambda_3 \left( t - \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 h_{RD} \right) = 0 \quad \tag{72}
\]
\[
\lambda_3 \left( t - \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 h_{RD} \right) = 0 \tag{73}
\]
\[
\text{tr} ( Y W_t ) - 1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tr} ( Y W_t ) = 0 \rightarrow Y W_t = 0. \tag{76}
\]

The complementary slackness condition (76) means that at KKT optimality, the optimum $W_t$ lies in the null-space of $Y$. This means that the rank of $W_t$ is the nullity of $Y$. In the following, we analyze the cases in which the optimum $W_t$ is rank-one (Cases a and c) and not rank-one but the rank-one optimum solution can be recovered from optimum $W_t$ (Case b).

- **Case a**: $\lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_3 \neq 0$ - When $\lambda_1 = 0$, the inequality constraint corresponding to (72) is not satisfied with equality, whereas the inequality constraint corresponding to (73) is satisfied with equality since $\lambda_3 = 0$ leads to $\lambda_3 = 1$ (see (71)). In this case, $Y$ reduces to
\[
Y = (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4) I + \lambda_3 \frac{\kappa \rho_1}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 H_{RR} - \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 h_{\parallel} h_{RD}. \tag{77}
\]
It is clear that both $\lambda_2$ and $\lambda_3$ cannot be equal to zero at optimality. Otherwise, $Y$ turns to a negative semi-definite matrix contradicting the fact that $Y \geq 0$. In all other possible values of $\lambda_2$ and $\lambda_3$, it is seen that $Z \triangleq (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4) I + \lambda_3 \frac{\kappa \rho_1}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 H_{RR} - \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 h_{\parallel} h_{RD}$ is a full-rank matrix. Now, we can show that the nullity of $Y$ cannot be greater than one by contradiction. Assume that $\{ u_{y,q}, q = 1, 2 \} \in N_s(Y)$ where $N_s(Y)$ denotes the null-space of $Y$ and let $a a^\dagger = \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 h_{\parallel} h_{RD}$. Then,
\[
Y u_{y,q} = Z u_{y,q} - a a^\dagger u_{y,q} \quad \rightarrow u_{y,q} = Z^{-1} a a^\dagger u_{y,q}, \quad \forall q. \tag{78}
\]
which shows that $u_{y,q}$ is an eigenvector of $Z^{-1} a a^\dagger$ corresponding to eigenvalue 1. Since rank($Z^{-1} a a^\dagger$) = 1, it turns out that $q$ cannot take a value greater than 1. This shows that the dimension of null space of $Y$ is 1, and therefore, the rank of $W_t$ is one.

- **Case b**: $\lambda_1 \neq 0, \lambda_3 = 0$ - When optimum $\lambda_3 = 0$, the inequality constraint associated with (72) will be satisfied with equality, whereas that associated with (73) will not be satisfied with equality. Note that $\lambda_3 = 0$ leads to $\lambda_1 = \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2}$. In this case, $Y$ reduces to
\[
Y = \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \frac{\kappa \rho_1}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 H_{RR} h_{SR} h_{\parallel} h_{RR} + (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4) I + \lambda_3 \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 H_{RR} h_{\parallel} \tag{79}
\]
Note that a feasible $Y$ is the one which has at least a nullity of 1, since the optimum $W_t$ lies in the null-space of $Y$. Therefore, at optimality both $\lambda_2$ and $\lambda_4$ should be zero, otherwise $Y$ in (79) turns to a full-rank matrix which is not feasible. Consequently, $Y$ reduces to
\[
Y = \frac{\rho_1}{d_1^2} \frac{\kappa \rho_1}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 H_{RR} h_{SR} h_{\parallel} h_{RR} \quad \text{which is a rank-one matrix. Therefore, the optimum $W_t$ may not be rank-one. However, we show that optimum rank-one matrix can be recovered from optimum $W_t$ without loss of optimality.}

Suppose the optimum $W_t$ has a rank $r$ where $W_t = \sum_{q=1}^r \sigma_q u_q u_q^\dagger$. $\sigma_q$ and $u_q, (q = 1, \cdots, r)$ are, respectively, the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the matrix $W_t$. Furthermore, due to the equality constraint (75), $\sum_{q=1}^r \sigma_q = 1$. Substituting eigenvalue decomposition of $W_t$ into the condition (76), we find that
\[
\sum_{q=1}^r \sigma_q u_q y u_q = 0 \rightarrow u_q^\dagger \left[ H_{RR} h_{SR} h_{\parallel} h_{RR} - \frac{\kappa \rho_1}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 \right] u_q = 0, \forall q \tag{80}
\]
where the last step is due to the fact that $Y \succeq 0$. Moreover, following is due to (80)
\[
\frac{d^2 t}{\rho_1^2} t = \| h_{SR} \|^2 - \frac{\kappa \rho_1}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 h_{\parallel} \quad \tag{81}
\]
On the other hand, using the eigenvalue decomposition of $W_t$, the inequality constraint associated with (73) and equality constraint (74), respectively, yield
\[
t < \frac{\kappa \rho_2}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 \sum_{q=1}^r \sigma_q u_q u_q^\dagger h_{RD} u_q \quad \tag{82}
\]
\[
1 + \frac{\kappa \rho_1}{d_1^2} \| h_{SR} \|^2 \sum_{q=1}^r \sigma_q u_q u_q^\dagger h_{RR} u_q = \bar{y}. \tag{83}
\]
It can be observed from (81) that the optimum value of $t$ does not depend on $\bar{y}$ in the underlying case. An arbitrary $\bar{y}$ where $\bar{y} > 1$ (see (83)) remains optimum. Now we can show that by choosing a particular $u_q$
from a set \( \{u_j\}_{j=1}^r \) and a specific value of \( \sigma_q \), (82) is not violated. Consider that \( \bar{q} = \max_q \|h_{SR}u_j\|_R \). Then, the maximum of (82) is achieved by choosing \( u_j \) with \( \sigma_q = 1 \). This choice does not affect the optimum objective value which remains (81). As such, the optimum rank-one matrix recovered from \( W_1 \) turns to \( \sigma_q u_1 \).

- Case c: \( \lambda_1 \neq 0, \lambda_3 \neq 0 \) - In this case, both the inequality constraints (72) and (73) will be satisfied with equality. As such, \( Y \) is given by (70). As long as at least one of \( \lambda_2 \) and \( \lambda_4 \) is non-zero, \( \lambda_1 \frac{\sigma_q}{\sigma_{q}} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RR}h_{SR}h_{SR}h_{RR}\| + \lambda_2 R + \lambda_4 I \) is a full-rank matrix. On the other hand, \( \lambda_3 \frac{\sigma_q}{\sigma_{q}} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RR}h_{RD}h_{RD}\) is a rank-one matrix. Consequently, as in Case a, the optimum \( W_1 \) can be shown to be a rank-one matrix. Therefore, it is sufficient to show that both \( \lambda_2 \) and \( \lambda_4 \) cannot be zero at the optimality. Towards this end, we use the method of contradiction. Assume that \( \lambda_2 = 0 \) and \( \lambda_4 = 0 \). Then, \( Y \) reduces to

\[
Y = \lambda_1 \frac{\sigma_q}{\sigma_{q}} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RR}h_{SR}h_{SR}h_{RR}\| - \lambda_3 \frac{\sigma_q}{\sigma_{q}} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RR}h_{RD}h_{RD}\.
\] (84)

Note that \( Y \) should be positive-semidefinite. Since \( Y \) in (84) is the difference between two rank-one matrices, it can be readily shown from Weyl’s inequalities for eigenvalues of sum of Hermitian matrices that \( Y \) cannot remain positive-semidefinite except in the case with \( \lambda_3 \frac{\sigma_q}{\sigma_{q}} \|h_{SR}\|^2 \|h_{RR}h_{RD}h_{RD}\) are non-zero for non-zero \( h_{SR} \) and \( h_{RD} \). This contradicts the assumption \( \lambda_3 \neq 0 \), which consequently contradicts the assumption that both \( \lambda_2 \) and \( \lambda_4 \) are zero. This completes the proof of the proposition.

**APPENDIX B**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5**

Applying the series expansion of \( \gamma(a, x) \) and \( \Gamma(a, x) \) [29, Eq. (8.354.1) and (8.354.2)] we have

\[
F_{\gamma_{cR}}(z) = 1 - \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_{R})} \int_{z}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_{R} - 1)} \right) \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \frac{x^{M_{R} - k - 1}}{\kappa^2} \, dx + \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_{R} - 1) \Gamma(M_{R})} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!(k + M_{R} - 1)} \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \frac{x^{M_{R} - k - 1}}{\kappa^2} \, I(k),
\] (85)

where \( I(k) = \int_{z}^{\infty} x^{M_{R} - M_{R} - k} e^{-x} \, dx \), that has closed form solution given by

\[
I(k) = \begin{cases} \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right)^{M_{R} - M_{R} - k + 1} E_{M_{R} - M_{R} - k} \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right), & M_{R} > M_{R} - k \smallskip \\
\left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right)^{M_{R} - M_{R} - k + 1} \alpha_{M_{R} - M_{R} - k} \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right), & M_{R} \leq M_{R} - k \end{cases}
\] (86)

where \( \alpha_m(x) = \int_{0}^{\infty} x^m e^{-x} \, dx \) [30, Eq. (5.1.5)]. By substituting (86) into (85), and then applying [30, Eq. (5.1.8)] and [30, Eq. (5.1.12)], we get (87) at the top of the next page where \( \psi(1) = -0.57721 \) and \( \psi(n) = \psi(1) + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{m} \), for \( n > 1 \) [29, Eq. (9.73)]. In the high SNR regime, i.e., \( \rho_1, \rho_2 \to \infty \), omitting higher order items of the series expansion in (87), the desired result follows after some simple algebraic manipulations.

**APPENDIX C**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6**

Using the series expansion of \( \gamma(a, x) \) and \( \Gamma(a, x) \), we get

\[
F_{\gamma_{cR}}(z) = 1 - \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_{R})} \int_{z}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_{R} - 1)} \right) \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \frac{x^{M_{R} - k - 1}}{\kappa^2} \, dx + \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_{R} - 1) \Gamma(M_{R})} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!(k + M_{R} - 1)} \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \frac{x^{M_{R} - k - 1}}{\kappa^2} \, I(k) + \frac{1}{\Gamma(M_{R})} \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right)^{M_{R} - 1} \frac{x^{M_{R} - k - 1}}{\kappa^2} \, I\left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right),
\] (88)

where \( I(k) = \int_{z}^{\infty} x^{M_{R} - M_{R} - k - 1} e^{-x} \, dx \) is evaluated as

\[
I(k) = \begin{cases} \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right)^{M_{R} - M_{R} - k} E_{M_{R} - M_{R} - k + 1} \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right), & M_{R} > M_{R} - k - 1 \smallskip \\
\left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right)^{M_{R} - M_{R} - k} \alpha_{M_{R} - M_{R} - k - 1} \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right), & M_{R} \leq M_{R} - k - 1 \end{cases}
\] (89)

and \( I_2(k) = \int_{0}^{\infty} x^{M_{R} - k - 1} e^{-x} \, dx \) is solved as

\[
I_2(k) = \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right)^{-M_{R} - k - 1} E_{M_{R} - k} \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right).
\] (90)

Substituting (89) and (90) into (88), and expanding the result with the help of [30, Eq. (5.1.8)] and [Eq. (5.1.12)], and then only selecting the sufficient and ignoring the higher order terms, we arrive at (51).

**APPENDIX D**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 7**

Let \( Z_3 = \| h_{SR} \|^2 \| h_{RD} \|^2 \), and observing that \( X_2 \) and \( Z_3 \) are independent, we have

\[
F_{\lambda_{\text{coherent}}} (z) = 1 - F_{X_2} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_{RD}^2} \frac{1}{z} \right) \left( 1 - F_{Z_3} \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right) \right),
\] (91)

where \( F_{X_2}(\cdot) \) is given in (56) and the cdf of \( Z_3 \) can be derived as

\[
F_{Z_3}(z) = \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{Pr \left( \| h_{SR} \|^2 < \frac{z}{x} \right) f_{\| h_{SR} \|^2}(x) dx,}{1 - \frac{2}{\Gamma(M_{R})} \frac{z^{M_{R}}}{\kappa^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!(k + M_{R} - 1)} \left( \frac{d^2z}{dx^2} \right)^{M_{R} - k} K_{M_{R} - k} (2 \sqrt{z}),}
\] (92)

where we used [29, Eq. (3.471.9)] to derive (92). Finally, substituting (56) and (92) into (91) yields the desired result.
\[
F_{\text{MIMO}}(z) = 1 - \frac{1}{\Gamma(MR)} \left( \frac{d^2 z}{d^2 M_R} \right) + \frac{1}{\Gamma(MR) - 1} \left( \frac{d^2 z}{d^2 M_R} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{( -1)^k}{k! (k + M_R)} \left( \frac{\sigma^2 D}{\sigma_R^2} \right)^{M_R + k - 1} 
\]

\[
\times \left( \left( \frac{d^2 z}{d^2 M_R} \right)^{M_R - M_R + k - 1} - \ln \left( \frac{d^2 z}{d^2 M_R} \right) + \psi(M_R - M_R + k) \right) 
\]

\[
\left( \frac{d^2 z}{d^2 M_R} \right)^{M_R - M_R + k - 1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!(k + M_R)} \left( \frac{\sigma^2 D}{\sigma_R^2} \right)^{M_R + k - 1} 
\]

\[
MT > M_R - k
\]
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