

# MIMO Gaussian Channels With Arbitrary Inputs: Optimal Precoding and Power Allocation

Fernando Pérez-Cruz, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Miguel R. D. Rodrigues, *Member, IEEE*, and Sergio Verdú, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—In this paper, we investigate the linear precoding and power allocation policies that maximize the mutual information for general multiple-input–multiple-output (MIMO) Gaussian channels with arbitrary input distributions, by capitalizing on the relationship between mutual information and minimum mean-square error (MMSE). The optimal linear precoder satisfies a fixed-point equation as a function of the channel and the input constellation. For non-Gaussian inputs, a nondiagonal precoding matrix in general increases the information transmission rate, even for parallel noninteracting channels. Whenever precoding is precluded, the optimal power allocation policy also satisfies a fixed-point equation; we put forth a generalization of the mercury/waterfilling algorithm, previously proposed for parallel noninterfering channels, in which the mercury level accounts not only for the non-Gaussian input distributions, but also for the interference among inputs.

**Index Terms**—Gaussian noise channels, minimum mean-square error (MMSE), multiple-input–multiple-output (MIMO) systems, mutual information, optimum power allocation, precoding, waterfilling.

Manuscript received October 03, 2008; revised August 14, 2009. Current version published March 10, 2010. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under Grants NCR-0074277 and CCR-0312879 and collaborative participation in the Communications and Networks Consortium sponsored by the U.S. Army Research Laboratory under the Collaborative Technology Alliance Program, Cooperative Agreement DAAD19-01-2-0011. This work was also supported in part by the Spanish Government (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia TEC2006-13514-C02-01/TCM, TEC2009-14504-C02-01, Consolider-Ingenio 2010 CSD2008-00010). The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Government purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation thereon. The work of F. Pérez-Cruz was supported by Marie Curie Fellowship 040883-AI-COM. The work of M. R. D. Rodrigues was supported by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia through the research project PTDC/EEA-TEL/100854/2008, by Instituto de Telecomunicações through the research project IT/LA/430/2008, by Fundação Luso-Americana through the research project FLAD/2-05/08, and by Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian. The material in this paper was presented in part at the IEEE International Conference on Communications, Beijing, China, May 2008 and at the 45th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Computing and Control, Monticello, IL, September 2007.

F. Pérez-Cruz is with the Electrical Engineering Department, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544 USA and also with the Department of Signal Theory and Communications, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, 28911 Leganes (Madrid), Spain (e-mail: fernando@tsc.uc3m.es).

M. R. D. Rodrigues is with Instituto de Telecomunicações and the Department of Computer Science, University of Porto, Porto 4169-007, Portugal (e-mail: mrodrigues@dcc.fc.up.pt).

S. Verdú is with the Electrical Engineering Department, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544 USA (e-mail: verdu@princeton.edu).

Communicated by L. Zheng, Associate Editor for Communications.

Color versions of Figures 2, 3, and 5–8 in this paper are available online at <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TIT.2009.2039045

## I. INTRODUCTION

LINEAR precoding for mutually interfering channels that maximizes mutual information yields the maximal achievable rates in conjunction with reliable error control codes. For parallel noninteracting channels corrupted with independent Gaussian noise, the mutual information is maximized, under a total power constraint, by independent Gaussian inputs with power selected according to the waterfilling allocation. Maximization of mutual information has also been considered for general multiple-input–multiple-output (MIMO) channels, where the channels are mutually interfering and the noise covariance is arbitrary. Mutual information is maximized by imposing a covariance structure on the Gaussian input vector that satisfies two conditions. First, transmitting along the right eigenvectors of the channel, the vector channel reduces to a set of parallel noninterfering subchannels. Second, the power allocation follows the waterfilling policy based on the signal-to-noise ratio in each noninteracting subchannel.

Practical constraints dictate the use of discrete constellations, such as phase shift keying (PSK) and quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM), which depart significantly from the optimal Gaussian distributions. Thus, it is of interest to revisit the linear precoding problem under the constraint that each input follows a specified discrete constellation. In [7], the optimal power allocation for parallel noninteracting channels with arbitrary inputs is obtained exploiting the relation between the mutual information and the minimum mean-square error (MMSE) found in [4]. The results in [7] demonstrate that capacity-achieving strategies for Gaussian inputs may be quite suboptimal for discrete input constellations. One might expect that since the channels are noninterfering, to maximize mutual information, it is sufficient to take into account the non-Gaussianness of the input constellations by means of the mercury/waterfilling power allocation. However, linear precoding techniques that introduce correlation among the channel inputs may achieve higher information transmission rates.

The optimization of a linear precoder and equalizer for MIMO channels has been typically addressed using an MMSE criterion [6], [14], [17], [18], with the optimal solution being the diagonalization of the channel matrix. In [9], a unifying approach using different criteria, such as the MMSE, the signal to interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) and the bit error rate (BER), leads to identical results.

In this paper, we propose to optimize a linear precoder to maximize the input–output mutual information for general (not necessarily diagonal) rectangular deterministic channel

matrices. A necessary condition for the solution is expressed as a fixed-point equation in terms of the relation between the MMSE and mutual information [4], [10]. In contrast to the situation for Gaussian inputs [19], the optimal linear precoder for arbitrary inputs does not diagonalize the channel and, in particular, it does not reduce to a diagonal matrix for parallel noninterfering channels.

In those cases in which no linear processing of the inputs is allowed, it is necessary to restrict the precoder to be a (power allocation) diagonal matrix. The optimum power allocation matrix satisfies a fixed-point equation and we provide a graphical interpretation for the optimum solution. In the mercury/water-filling algorithm [7], the base level is modified by the addition of mercury to account for the non-Gaussian input constellation. In our generalization, the mercury level accounts for two factors: the non-Gaussianness of the input distribution and the interference (caused by the other inputs).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We derive the optimal precoding policy in Section II-A. We study the low and high signal-to-noise ratio (snr) regimes, respectively, in Sections II-B and II-C. We illustrate the reported results with representative examples in Section II-D. We derive the optimal power allocation policy in Section III-A. Section III-B particularizes the solution for Gaussian inputs and Section III-C provides a graphical interpretation. We devote Section III-D to optimum power allocation in the low- and high-snr regimes and show some illustrative examples in Section III-E.

## II. OPTIMUM PRECODER

### A. General Result

Consider the deterministic complex-valued vector channel<sup>1</sup>:

$$\mathbf{y} = \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w} \quad (1)$$

where the  $n$ -dimensional vector  $\mathbf{y}$  and the  $m$ -dimensional vector  $\mathbf{x}$  represent, respectively, the received vector and the independent zero-mean unit-variance transmitted information vector. The distributions of the components of  $\mathbf{x}$  are fixed, not necessarily Gaussian nor identical. The  $n \times m$  complex-valued matrix  $\mathbf{H}$  corresponds to the deterministic channel gains (known to both encoder and decoder) and  $\mathbf{w}$  is the  $n$ -dimensional complex Gaussian noise with independent zero-mean unit-variance components.<sup>2</sup> The optimization of the mutual information is carried out over all  $m \times m$  precoding matrices  $\mathbf{P}$  that do not increase the transmitted power. The precoding

<sup>1</sup>*Notation:* Boldface uppercase letters denote matrices, boldface lowercase letters denote column vectors, and italics denote scalars. The superscript  $(\cdot)^\top$  and  $(\cdot)^\dagger$  denote transpose and Hermitian operations.  $(\cdot)^*$  denotes optimum,  $\text{Tr}\{\cdot\}$  denotes the trace of a matrix, and  $\Re\{\cdot\}$  denotes real part of a complex number.  $(\mathbf{X})_{ij}$  and  $x_{ij}$  denotes the  $i$ th element of the  $j$ th column of the matrix  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_j$  denotes the  $j$ th column of  $\mathbf{X}$ , and  $x_i$  denotes the  $i$ th element of  $\mathbf{x}$ . The Frobenius norm of a matrix is denoted by  $\|\mathbf{X}\| = \sqrt{\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\dagger\}}$ , which reduces to the  $L^2$ -norm  $\|\mathbf{x}\|$  in the special case of a vector. The Kronecker delta function is  $\delta_{ij}$  and  $\mathbf{1}$  is a column vector of ones with the appropriate dimensions.

<sup>2</sup>It is also possible to consider nonidentity noise covariance matrices, since we could add a whitening filter at the receiver that only affects the definition of the channel matrix.

problem can be cast as a constrained nonlinear optimization problem

$$\max_{\mathbf{P}} I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \quad (2)$$

subject to

$$\text{Tr}\left\{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\dagger\mathbf{P}^\dagger]\right\} = \text{Tr}\{\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\dagger\} \leq 1. \quad (3)$$

*Theorem 1:* Let the input distribution be  $P_{\mathbf{x}}$ . The optimum precoding matrix  $\mathbf{P}^*$  that solves (2) subject to (3) satisfies

$$\mathbf{P}^* = \nu^{-1} \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \quad (4)$$

with

$$\nu = \|\mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E}\| \quad (5)$$

and

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}])(\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}])^\dagger\right] \quad (6)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\dagger\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}]\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}]^\dagger\right] \quad (7)$$

is known as the MMSE matrix [5], where

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}] = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{x} p_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) P_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x}'} p_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}') P_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}')} \quad (8)$$

$$p_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\pi^n} e^{-\|\mathbf{y} - \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{x}\|^2}. \quad (9)$$

Henceforth, we denote the MMSE achieved by the optimum precoding matrix  $\mathbf{P}^*$  by

$$\text{mmse}(\text{snr}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* (\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}])\|^2\right]. \quad (10)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix I.  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 1 relies on the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) conditions [3] and the relation between the mutual information and the MMSE [4], [10]. The KKT conditions are satisfied by any critical point (minimum, maximum, or saddle point). There is a unique  $\mathbf{P}^*$  that satisfies the KKT conditions when the problem is strictly concave, corresponding to the global maximum. In general, the optimal precoding in (2) and (3) is non-concave. It becomes concave in some specific cases, e.g., for Gaussian input distributions with arbitrary channel matrices [2]. Thus, it is important to realize that Theorem 1 gives a necessary condition for the optimum precoder, but in general, it does not identify uniquely the optimum precoding matrix.

For discrete constellations, the computation of the MMSE matrix (6) entails averaging over all possible transmitted vectors. Since the number of transmitted vectors grows exponentially with the input dimension  $m$ , for large dimensions, we typically estimate the MMSE matrix  $\mathbf{E}$  in (6) using Monte Carlo methods. A way to obtain an approximation of the solution to (4) is the iteration

$$\mathbf{P}_{k+1} = \alpha_k \left( \mathbf{P}_k + \mu \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{E}_k \right) \quad (11)$$

where  $\mu$  is a small constant, the MMSE matrix  $\mathbf{E}_k$  depends on  $\mathbf{P}_k$  through (6)–(9), and  $\alpha_k$  ensures that the norm of (11) is

normalized to 1. This procedure ascends in the direction of the gradient and is fairly robust to noise in the estimation of  $\mathbf{E}_k$ . A similar approach was used in [10] to illustrate the gradient of the mutual information with respect to  $\mathbf{P}$ . To lessen the chance of getting trapped in local maxima, we may run (11) with several different  $\mathbf{P}_0$ , and select the stationary point precoding matrix offering the largest mutual information.

### B. Low-snr Regime

We now consider the optimal precoding policy for MIMO Gaussian channels with arbitrary input distributions in the regime of low snr. We consider the low-snr expansion to the MMSE, and, by virtue of the relationship between mutual information and MMSE, the low-snr expansion to the mutual information. The form of the optimal precoder follows from the low-snr expansions.

We restrict the analysis to the case of zero-mean uncorrelated proper complex inputs, where  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\dagger] = \mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T] = \mathbf{0}$ . We note that as  $\text{snr} \rightarrow 0$  the conditional probability density function  $p_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$  can be expressed as

$$p_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\pi^n} e^{-\|\mathbf{y} - \sqrt{\text{snr}}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x}\|^2} \quad (12)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi^n} e^{-\|\mathbf{y}\|^2} e^{2\sqrt{\text{snr}}\Re\{\mathbf{y}^\dagger\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x}\} - \text{snr}\|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x}\|^2} \quad (13)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi^n} e^{-\|\mathbf{y}\|^2} \left( 1 + 2\sqrt{\text{snr}}\Re\{\mathbf{y}^\dagger\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x}\} + \mathcal{O}(\text{snr}) \right). \quad (14)$$

Using (14), it is possible to express the low-snr expansion of the MMSE matrix (6) as

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})^\dagger (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}) \cdot \text{snr} + \mathcal{O}(\text{snr}^2). \quad (15)$$

Consequently, the low-snr expansion of the MMSE is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mmse}(\text{snr}) &= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}])^\dagger (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}])] \\ &= \text{tr}\{\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})^\dagger\} \\ &= \text{tr}\{(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})^\dagger\} - \text{tr}\{((\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})^\dagger)^2\} \\ &\quad \cdot \text{snr} + \mathcal{O}(\text{snr}^2) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

whereas the low-snr expansion of the mutual information is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\text{snr}) &= \text{tr}\{(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})^\dagger\} \cdot \text{snr} \\ &\quad - \text{tr}\{((\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})^\dagger)^2\} \cdot \frac{\text{snr}^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\text{snr}^3). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Note that it is important to retain the first two terms in the low-snr expansion of the MMSE, or, equivalently, the first- and the second-order terms in the low-snr expansion of the mutual information. In fact,  $\ddot{\mathcal{I}}(0) = \frac{d^2\mathcal{I}(\text{snr})}{d\text{snr}^2}\big|_{\text{snr}=0}$  is a key low-power performance measure since the bandwidth required to sustain a given rate with a given (low) power is proportional to  $-\ddot{\mathcal{I}}(0)$  [16].

According to (17), for first-order optimality,  $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\dagger$  ought to maximize (subject to  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\dagger) = 1$ )

$$\text{tr}\{(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P})^\dagger\} = \text{tr}\{\mathbf{\Lambda}_H \mathbf{V}_H^\dagger \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\dagger \mathbf{V}_H \mathbf{\Lambda}_H\} \quad (18)$$

where we have used the singular value decomposition of the channel matrix  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{U}_H \mathbf{\Lambda}_H \mathbf{V}_H^\dagger$ , with  $\mathbf{U}_H$  and  $\mathbf{V}_H$  unitary  $n \times n$  and  $m \times m$  matrices, respectively, and  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_H$  is a diagonal matrix with  $(\mathbf{\Lambda}_H)_{ii}$  equal to the  $i$ th singular value of  $\mathbf{H}$ . Therefore, the nonunique first-order optimal  $\mathbf{P}$  is equal to  $\mathbf{V}_H$  times a diagonal matrix whose diagonal coefficients are zero except at coefficients corresponding to the (generally nonunique) maximum singular value of  $\mathbf{H}$ . In addition, optimizing (17) (see also [16]) second-order optimality requires that there are as many nonzero coefficients as the multiplicity of the largest singular value, and that they are all equal.

It is instructive to observe that the optimal precoder performs two operations. First, it aligns the transmit directions with the right singular vectors of the channel. This decomposes the vector channel into a set of independent scalar subchannels. Second, it assigns power on an equal basis to the strongest scalar subchannels. As expected in the regime of low snr the optimal precoding policy for proper complex inputs is entirely equivalent to the optimal one for complex Gaussian inputs [16].

### C. High-snr Regime for Discrete Inputs

We now consider the optimal precoding policy for MIMO Gaussian channels with arbitrary discrete input distributions in the high-snr regime. We prove upper and lower bounds to the MMSE, and consequently, upper and lower bounds to the mutual information by exploiting the relationship between mutual information and MMSE [4], [10]. Then, we use the upper and lower bounds to derive the form of the optimal policy. These results rest upon [7, Th. 3], where the MMSE for single-input–single-output Gaussian channels with BPSK input distribution is expanded for large snr. We generalize the bound in [7, Th. 4], to general (nondiagonal, rectangular) channel matrices.

Consider a single-input–single-output channel model

$$y = \sqrt{\text{snr}} x + w \quad (19)$$

where the input  $x \in \{\pm 1\}$  is an equiprobable random variable and the noise  $w$  is a complex random variable Gaussian with zero mean and unit variance. The MMSE obeys the integral equation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mmse}(\text{snr}) &= \mathbb{E}[|x - \mathbb{E}[x|y]|^2] \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tanh(2\sqrt{\text{snr}}\xi) e^{-(\xi - \sqrt{\text{snr}})^2} d\xi. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

(21)

*Theorem 2 (Large Series Expansion for Binary Phase Shift Keying (BPSK) From [7]):* The  $\text{mmse}(\text{snr})$  in (21) admits the large-snr expansion

$$\text{mmse}(\text{snr}) = \frac{e^{-\text{snr}}}{2\sqrt{\text{snr}}} \left( \sqrt{\pi} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta_i}{(4\text{snr})^i} \right) \quad (22)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_i &= \frac{(-1)^i}{\sqrt{\pi} 8^i} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + 1/4)^{-2i-1} - (k + 3/4)^{-2i-1} \right) \\ &\quad \times \prod_{q=1}^i (2q - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

*Corollary 1:* Consider the channel model

$$\mathbf{y} = \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{h} x + \mathbf{w} \quad (24)$$

where the input  $x \in \{\pm 1\}$  is an equiprobable random variable and  $\mathbf{w}$  is the complex Gaussian noise with independent zero-mean and unit-variance components. The  $\text{mmse}(\text{snr})$  admits the representation (for those snr large enough for the series to converge)

$$\text{mmse}(\text{snr}) = \mathbb{E} [ \|\mathbf{h}(x - \mathbb{E}[x|\mathbf{y}])\|^2 ] \quad (25)$$

$$= \|\mathbf{h}\|^2 \mathbb{E} [(x - \mathbb{E}[x|\mathbf{y}])^2] \quad (26)$$

$$= \|\mathbf{h}\| \frac{e^{-\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 \text{snr}}}{2\sqrt{\text{snr}}} \left( \sqrt{\pi} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta_i}{(4\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 \text{snr})^i} \right) \quad (27)$$

with  $\zeta_i$  as defined in (23).

*Proof:* Replace  $\sqrt{\text{snr}}$  by  $\sqrt{\text{snr}}\|\mathbf{h}\|$  in (22).  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 2 is based on the expansion of  $Q(\cdot)$  in [15, eq. (3.53)]. Typically only one or two terms are considered for this expansion. Furthermore, the first two terms of the large series expansion of  $Q(\cdot)$  provide, respectively, an upper and lower bound for this function [13]. Therefore, we can construct an upper and lower bound for the MMSE using the first two terms of its expansion in (27).

*Corollary 2:* We can bound the MMSE for the channel model in (24) by

$$\|\mathbf{h}\| \frac{e^{-\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 \text{snr}}}{2\sqrt{\text{snr}}} \left( \sqrt{\pi} - \frac{4.37}{4\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 \text{snr}} \right) \leq \text{mmse}(\text{snr}) \quad (28)$$

$$\leq \|\mathbf{h}\| \frac{e^{-\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 \text{snr}}}{2\sqrt{\text{snr}}} \sqrt{\pi}. \quad (29)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix II.  $\square$

In the following theorem, we upper and lower bound the MMSE for the MIMO channel model in (1).

*Theorem 3:* For the channel model in (1), assuming equiprobable signaling for each input

$$\frac{d_{\min}^2}{2M} \frac{e^{-d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}/4}}{d_{\min} \sqrt{\text{snr}}} \left( \sqrt{\pi} - \frac{4.37}{d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}} \right) \leq \text{mmse}(\text{snr}) \quad (30)$$

$$\leq (M-1) d_{\max}^2 \frac{e^{-d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}/4}}{d_{\min} \sqrt{\text{snr}} \pi} \quad (31)$$

where  $\text{mmse}(\text{snr})$  is given in (10), and  $M$  is the product of the constellations cardinality,  $d_{\min}$  is the minimum distance between the  $M$  possible realizations of the input vector (which we refer to as *constellation vectors*)

$$d_{\min} = \min_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{x} \neq \bar{\mathbf{x}}}} \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\| \quad (32)$$

and  $d_{\max}$  is the maximum distance

$$d_{\max} = \max_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x}} \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\|. \quad (33)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix III.  $\square$

We can use (30) and (31) and the relation between the MMSE and the mutual information to bound the mutual information for large snr and discrete input distributions.

*Theorem 4:* The mutual information between  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  for the channel model in (1) can be bounded by

$$\log M - \frac{2(M-1)d_{\max}^2}{d_{\min}^3 \sqrt{\text{snr}} \pi} e^{-d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}/4} \leq I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \quad (34)$$

$$\leq \log M - d_{\min}^2 \frac{e^{-d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}/4}}{M d_{\min}^3 \sqrt{\text{snr}}} \left( \sqrt{\pi} - \frac{4.37 + 2\sqrt{\pi}}{d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}} \right). \quad (35)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix IV.  $\square$

Theorems 3 and 4 show that for a MIMO channel model with discrete inputs, the precoding matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  that maximizes the information transmission rate converges as the snr  $\rightarrow \infty$  to the matrix that maximizes the minimum distance between the constellation vectors. This matrix also ensures the asymptotic minimization of the MMSE and the symbol error rate (SER). This result is a direct generalization of a result in [7] for noninterfering channels. This is an appealing result as it tells us that for discrete inputs in high-snr regime, minimizing the symbol error rate is equivalent to both minimizing the mean-square error and maximizing the mutual information, thereby linking three standard criteria typically used for power allocation in the all-important case of discrete input distributions.

We can illustrate with a simple example why linear precoders achieve larger information transmission rates than diagonal power allocation matrices even for diagonal channel matrices as the snr tends to infinity. Let us assume a simple real-valued communication system with a noninterfering channel matrix

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (36)$$

in which both inputs are BPSK distributions. We first set  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}$  and the minimum distance in the received constellation is 2. The optimal power allocation matrix corresponding to the mercury/waterfilling [7] solution is

$$\mathbf{P}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{3}/2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (37)$$

and the minimum distance increases to  $\sqrt{6}$ . We can further compute the optimal linear precoder, using the procedure described at the end Section II-A

$$\mathbf{P}^* = \begin{bmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (38)$$

and obtain the largest minimum distance of  $\sqrt{8}$ . In Fig. 1, we have plotted the constellations for the optimal precoder and power allocation matrices to highlight the difference between the received constellations. The difference between the transmission rates for precoding and power allocation strategies is quite substantial, as illustrated in Section II-D.




Fig. 1. “o” represents the received constellation for the diagonal power allocation solution  $\mathbf{P}_0$  and “\*” represents the output constellation achieved with the optimum linear precoder  $\mathbf{P}^*$ . The dashed lines represent the minimum distance in each constellation.

#### D. Applications

In this section, we show the benefit of using a full precoding matrix instead of a diagonal power allocation matrix for maximizing the mutual information in a MIMO communication channel with Gaussian noise when the inputs are QPSK.

In the first example we deal with a  $5 \times 5$  diagonal channel matrix and compare the information transmission rate obtained using the optimal mercury/waterfilling power allocation proposed in [7], corresponding to a diagonal real-valued matrix  $\mathbf{P}$ , to the optimal nondiagonal precoding matrix.

In the second example, we use a full  $4 \times 4$  channel matrix typically encountered in each subchannel of digital subscriber line (DSL) systems [1]. However, rather than performing diagonalization of the channel matrix followed by waterfilling power allocation over the subchannels, as proposed in [1], we directly optimize the precoding matrix [11], significantly increasing the input-output mutual information.

1) *Diagonal Channel Matrix:* We assume QPSK inputs and

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} 2e^{-j2.51} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1.5e^{j1.60} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-j0.79} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.8e^{-j3.05} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.6e^{-j1.67} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (39)$$

For this diagonal channel model, Fig. 2 compares the performance of the optimal power-allocation policy corresponding to a diagonal real-valued  $\mathbf{P}$  [7] (denoted in Fig. 2 as MWF) and the optimal nondiagonal precoding matrix, together with the waterfilling solution for Gaussian inputs, which serves as an upper bound to the mutual information. It can be seen in Fig. 2 that




Fig. 2. Mutual Information rates for the  $5 \times 5$  matrix in (39).

the mutual information achieved by the full precoding matrix is substantially higher than that achieved by the diagonal power allocation matrix, yielding gains higher than 2 dB. Fig. 2 also shows the performance of the precoder that maximizes the minimum distance and, thus, is asymptotically optimal for large snr, given by (40) shown at the bottom of the page.

Note that the maximum–minimum distance precoder achieves higher information transmission rates than the optimal diagonal power allocation for  $\text{snr} > 2.9$  dB. As the snr increases, the optimal diagonal power-allocation matrix tends to

$$\mathbf{P}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.20 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.27 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.41 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.51 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.68 \end{bmatrix} \quad (41)$$

while the full precoding matrix tends to (40).

Asymptotically the optimal power-allocation matrix and the nondiagonal precoder behave differently. On the one hand, the mercury-waterfilling policy performs power equalization as noted in [7]. On the other hand, the nondiagonal precoder assigns equal power for all inputs,<sup>3</sup> while more power is assigned to the stronger channels.<sup>4</sup>

2) *Full Channel Matrix: The DSL Scenario:* In this second example, we illustrate for a nondiagonal channel matrix  $\mathbf{H}$  that a full precoder provides substantially higher information transmission rates than standard channel diagonalization followed by mercury/waterfilling power allocation. We consider a situation encountered in gigabit DSL systems with four copper-wire pairs

<sup>3</sup>The norms of the columns of  $\mathbf{P}_{\max_{d_{\min}}}$  are almost identical.

<sup>4</sup>The norm of the rows of  $\mathbf{P}_{\max_{d_{\min}}}$  decreases with the channel gain.

$$\mathbf{P}_{\max_{d_{\min}}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.28e^{j2.5} & 0.26e^{j1.8} & 0.27e^{-j0.1} & 0.16e^{j1.5} & 0.23e^{j1.8} \\ 0.09e^{j1.9} & 0.21e^{j0.9} & 0.16e^{-j3.1} & 0.34e^{-j2.5} & 0.25e^{j2.7} \\ 0.26e^{j0.7} & 0.09e^{-j2.6} & 0.15e^{j1.6} & 0.17e^{j0.1} & 0.27e^{j3.0} \\ 0.07e^{j0.6} & 0.23e^{j1.4} & 0.21e^{j1.8} & 0.02e^{-j0.1} & 0.17e^{-j0.7} \\ 0.18e^{j0.8} & 0.17e^{-j2.9} & 0.15e^{-j0.5} & 0.21e^{-j1.0} & 0.12e^{-j1.0} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (40)$$




Fig. 3. Mutual Information rates for the  $4 \times 4$  matrix in (42).

typically available in the last distribution area [1]. In particular, we use the following channel matrix:

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{j2.80} & 0.5e^{-j0.97} & 0.01e^{-j1.02} & 10^{-3}e^{-j1.06} \\ 0.5e^{-j0.43} & e^{-j2.98} & 0.1e^{j0.12} & 0.01e^{-j3.12} \\ 0.01e^{j2.93} & 0.1e^{j1.27} & e^{-j2.00} & 0.5e^{-j1.83} \\ 10^{-3}e^{j2.63} & 0.01e^{-j2.06} & 0.5e^{j2.38} & e^{j2.69} \end{bmatrix} \quad (42)$$

in which the diagonal coefficients have unit gain.

In Fig. 3, we show the mutual information for the optimal precoding as well as for the optimal power allocation policy using the mercury/waterfilling algorithm [7] performed after diagonalization of the channel matrix (denoted as MWF). As in the previous example, the full precoder significantly increases the information transmission rate with respect to the optimal power allocation strategy.

### III. OPTIMUM POWER ALLOCATION

#### A. General Result

The mercury/waterfilling algorithm in [7] sets the optimal power for parallel interference-free channels [diagonal  $\mathbf{H}$  and  $\mathbf{P}$  in (1)] with arbitrary inputs. It involves two phases: a mercury-pouring phase followed by a water-pouring one. The mercury-pouring phase amends the base level to account for the mismatch between the actual input and the optimal Gaussian distribution, while the water-pouring phase represents the power allocation. Lozano *et al.* [7] capitalized on the relationship between the mutual information and the MMSE [4] to obtain this power-allocation policy, thereby circumventing the lack of mutual information expressions for arbitrary input distributions.

In this section, we determine the optimal power-allocation policy for MIMO interfering channels with arbitrary input distributions, thereby generalizing the mercury/waterfilling solution. We generalize the setting in [7] to any rectangular channel matrix  $\mathbf{H}$ , limiting ourselves to optimization over a diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{P}$ . As pointed out in [7], there are communication systems in which precoding policies are precluded, preventing the channel from being diagonalized (or subject to any linear transformation at the encoder). In this section, we extend the waterfilling algorithm for MIMO interfering channels and, in this more general setup, we show that the mercury level accounts

for both the mismatch between the actual input and an optimal Gaussian distribution, as well as the interference between inputs [12].

The power-allocation problem can be cast as a linearly constrained nonlinear optimization problem

$$\max_{\mathbf{p}} I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \quad (43)$$

subject to

$$(p)_{ij} = \sqrt{p_j} \delta_{ij} \quad (44)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^m p_j \leq 1 \quad (45)$$

$$p_j \geq 0 \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, m \quad (46)$$

where  $\mathbf{p} = [p_1, \dots, p_m]^T$ .

*Theorem 5:* The optimal power allocation  $\mathbf{p}^*$  that solves (43) subject to (44)–(46) satisfies

$$p_j^* = \gamma^{-1} \left( \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \right)_{jj} \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, m \quad (47)$$

where

$$\gamma = \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \right\}. \quad (48)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix V.  $\square$

If  $\mathbf{H}$  is diagonal, so is  $\mathbf{E}$ , and (47) can be simplified to

$$p_j^* = \gamma^{-1} p_j^* |h_{jj}|^2 \mathbb{E} [ |x_j - \mathbb{E}[x_j|y_j]|^2 ] \quad (49)$$

$$= \gamma^{-1} p_j^* |h_{jj}|^2 \text{mmse}_j(\text{snr} |h_{jj}|^2 p_j^*). \quad (50)$$

Recalling that the mean-square error in (50) cannot be greater than 1, we can express the optimal power allocation as follows:

$$p_j^* = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\text{snr} |h_{jj}|^2} \text{mmse}_j^{-1} \left( \frac{\gamma}{|h_{jj}|^2} \right), & \gamma \leq |h_{jj}|^2 \\ 0, & \gamma > |h_{jj}|^2. \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

As expected, the optimal power allocation in (51) reduces to [7, Th. 2] in the special case of parallel noninterfering channels.

The proof of Theorem 5, as that of Theorem 1, relies on the KKT conditions [3] and the relation between the mutual information and the MMSE [4], [10]. There is a unique  $\mathbf{p}^*$  that satisfies the KKT conditions when the problem is strictly concave, corresponding to the global maximum. In general, the power allocation as stated in (43)–(46) is nonconcave. It becomes concave in some specific cases, e.g., for Gaussian input distributions [2] or diagonal channel matrices with arbitrary input distributions [7]; it is also concave for low snr. Thus, like Theorem 1, it is important to realize that Theorem 5 only gives a necessary condition for the optimum power allocation. To compute the optimal power-allocation matrix, we proceed as we did in Section II-A to compute the optimal precoder.

Solution (47) does not provide much insight about how the power is allocated. We provide an interpretation for the optimal power-allocation policy, generalizing the mercury/waterfilling algorithm put forward in [7] for noninterfering channels.

*Definition 1:* The *water level* is  $\beta = (\text{snr}\gamma)^{-1}$ , the inverse of the Lagrange multiplier associated with the inequality constraint in (45).

*Definition 2:* The base level associated with the  $j$ th input is given by

$$b_j = \frac{1}{\left. \frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} \right|_{\substack{p_j=1 \\ x_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)}}} - 1 \quad (52)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\text{snr} \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2} \quad (53)$$

where  $\mathbf{h}_j$  is the  $j$ th column of  $\mathbf{H}$ .

These definitions correspond to the water and base levels for waterfilling [2] and mercury/waterfilling [7] for noninterfering channels. Note that the base level definition ensures that the difference between the water and the base levels is 1, if the  $j$ th input uses a Gaussian distribution and is assigned all the available power.

*Definition 3:* The mercury level associated with the  $j$ th input is given by

$$m_j = \frac{1}{\left. \frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} \right|_{\mathbf{P}=\mathbf{P}^*}} - p_j^*. \quad (54)$$

For  $p_j^* > 0$

$$\left. \frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} \right|_{\mathbf{P}=\mathbf{P}^*} = \frac{\text{snr}}{\sqrt{p_j^*}} \left( \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \right)_{jj} = \beta^{-1} \quad (55)$$

therefore

$$p_j^* = (\beta - m_j)^+ \quad (56)$$

where  $(\cdot)^+ = \max(\cdot, 0)$ . If  $p_j^* = 0$ , we do not need to define the mercury level as the  $j$ th input is not assigned any power. However, even in that case we choose to define a mercury level to ensure it is a continuous function of the snr. For  $p_j^* = 0$ , the derivative of the mutual information is not given by (55), because it is an indeterminate form  $(0/0)$ . The value of the mercury level for  $p_j^* = 0$  is computed in Appendix VI and it is shown to be above the water and base levels.

### B. Gaussian Inputs

The special case of Gaussian inputs is interesting in those problems where the suboptimality comes from constraints that prevent the input components from being correlated. In that case, we have the following results.

*Theorem 6:* For Gaussian independent inputs with any channel matrix  $\mathbf{H}$ :

$$\frac{\partial(m_j - b_j)}{\partial p_i} \geq 0 \quad (57)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial(m_j - b_j)}{\partial \text{snr}} \leq 0. \quad (58)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix VII.  $\square$

*Theorem 7:* For Gaussian independent inputs and if  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\dagger$  is invertible

$$\lim_{\text{snr} \rightarrow \infty} p_i = \frac{1}{m}. \quad (59)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix VIII.  $\square$




Fig. 4. Illustration of the mercury/waterfilling power allocation for a seven-input MIMO channel. The power for each input is the difference between the water and mercury level. The base, mercury, and water are depicted in black, dark gray, and light gray, respectively. The mercury in channels 3 and 4 is only due to the interferences caused by the other inputs, because their allocated power is zero.

Theorem 7 indicates that as the snr increases the power is equally shared between all the subchannels, as in the noninterfering case, as long as  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\dagger$  is full rank.

### C. Graphical Interpretation

In the mercury/waterfilling interpretation for noninterfering channels in [7], the mercury level for the  $j$ th channel directly depends on  $\text{snr}|h_{jj}|^2$ , through the inverse MMSE, and the water level.<sup>5</sup> The water level is numerically calculated ensuring that  $\{p_j^*\}_{j=1}^m$  add up to 1. For nondiagonal  $\mathbf{H}$  matrices, we solve the optimization problem in (43)–(46), jointly obtaining the power allocation (primal variables) and the water level (Lagrange multiplier).

Fig. 4 depicts the generalized mercury/waterfilling reinterpretation for mutually interfering MIMO channels. The mercury level for  $p_j^* = 0$  is the main difference between the mercury/waterfilling for mutually interfering MIMO channels and the one in [7] for noninterfering channels. In interference-free mercury waterfilling [7], mercury is never added to a base level that is above the water level. In contrast, for interfering channels the mercury level can be nonzero, even if the base level is above the water level, or if the base level is below the water level, but the mercury level is above the water level and thus,  $p_j^* = 0$ . This added mercury accounts for the interference suffered by the  $j$ th input.

In the MIMO setup with arbitrary input constellations, we can distinguish three types of mechanisms that curtail the reliable information rate achievable by an individual input:

- the additive white Gaussian noise;
- the non-Gaussian nature of the input;
- the presence of interference from other inputs.

In the conventional waterfilling solution, b) and c) are absent, and the base level that accounts for the individual signal-to-noise ratio of that channel is sufficient to capture the difficulty to convey information through that input.

<sup>5</sup>The water level depends on every  $\text{SNR}|h_{ii}|^2$ , thus indirectly the mercury level depends on all channel responses.

In the mercury/waterfilling solution of [7], c) is absent, and the mercury accounts for the suboptimality of the input. The mercury level depends on the available power, on the signal-to-noise ratios seen by the other inputs as well as on all the input distributions.

If a), b), and c) are present, the mercury level also accounts for the interference suffered from those inputs that receive positive power. It is instructive to consider first the special case when all the inputs are Gaussian, and thus only mechanisms a) and c) are present. In that case, the mercury level serves simply to augment the base level with the additive Gaussian noise received from the other inputs. Thus, as in [7], the mercury level depends on the total available power. Furthermore, if the power is sufficiently low that only one input is allocated power, there is no need to add mercury to that input. However, there is indeed mercury added to the other inputs, as their barrier for nonzero power allocation is now increased due to the presence of the interference from the sole input that has been assigned power. As we increase power, at some point the water level exceeds the mercury level of one or several inputs, and thus, a small nonzero mercury level is added to the original input that received all the power. As indicated by Theorem 6, the mercury level of every input is monotonically nondecreasing with the total available power.

Returning to the general case where a), b), and c) are present, the mercury level does not decompose in separate components due to b) and c) since the deleterious effect of an interfering input depends on its distribution. However, as the power increases, discrete-constellation interferers have an asymptotically vanishing effect on the available rate, and therefore, in the high snr, the solution behaves as if c) were not present.

#### D. Low- and High-snr Regime

We now consider the optimal power-allocation policy for MIMO Gaussian channels with arbitrary input distributions in the regime of low snr. The study of the high-snr regime is identical to Section II-C, exchanging the precoder by a power allocation matrix.

The low-snr analysis of the optimal power allocation policy follows closely the low-snr analysis of the optimal precoding policy. However, it is important to note that the power allocation matrix is constrained to be a diagonal matrix rather than a general matrix.

For first-order optimality, the optimal diagonal power allocation matrix  $\mathbf{PP}^\dagger$  has to maximize

$$\begin{aligned} I(\text{snr}) &= \text{tr}\{(\mathbf{HP})(\mathbf{HP})^\dagger\} \cdot \text{snr} + \mathcal{O}(\text{snr}^2) \\ &= \sum_i \|\mathbf{h}_i\|^2 (\mathbf{PP}^\dagger)_{ii} \cdot \text{snr} + \mathcal{O}(\text{snr}^2) \\ &= \sum_i \|\mathbf{h}_i\|^2 p_i \cdot \text{snr} + \mathcal{O}(\text{snr}^2) \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

subject to the power constraint  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{PP}^\dagger) = \sum_i p_i = 1$ , with  $p_i \geq 0, \forall i$ . This shows that power is allocated only to the inputs associated with the columns of the channel matrix  $\mathbf{H}$  with the highest norm.

For both first- and second-order optimality, the optimal diagonal power allocation matrix  $\mathbf{PP}^\dagger$  has to maximize

$$\begin{aligned} I(\text{snr}) &= \text{tr}\{(\mathbf{HP})(\mathbf{HP})^\dagger\} \cdot \text{snr} - \text{tr}\{(\mathbf{HP})(\mathbf{HP})^\dagger(\mathbf{HP})(\mathbf{HP})^\dagger\} \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{\text{snr}^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\text{snr}^3) \\ &= \sum_i \|\mathbf{h}_i\|^2 (\mathbf{PP}^\dagger)_{ii} \cdot \text{snr} \\ &\quad - \sum_i \sum_j \mathbf{h}_i^\dagger \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{h}_i (\mathbf{PP}^\dagger)_{ii} (\mathbf{PP}^\dagger)_{jj} \cdot \frac{\text{snr}^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\text{snr}^3) \\ &= \sum_i \|\mathbf{h}_i\|^2 p_i \cdot \text{snr} - \sum_i \sum_j \mathbf{h}_i^\dagger \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{h}_i p_i p_j \cdot \frac{\text{snr}^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\text{snr}^3) \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

subject to the power constraint  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{PP}^\dagger) = \sum_i p_i = 1$ , with  $p_i \geq 0, \forall i$ . This shows that if there is a unique column of the channel matrix with the highest norm, then power is allocated solely to the input associated with that column of the channel matrix. In contrast, if there are multiple columns of the channel matrix with the highest norm, then power is divided equally between the inputs associated with those columns of the channel matrix.

#### E. Examples

We now cast further insight into the mercury/waterfilling interpretation for MIMO channels by analyzing four cases of interest: i) diagonal channel matrix with Gaussian inputs; ii) diagonal channel matrix with BPSK inputs; iii) nondiagonal channel matrix with Gaussian inputs; and iv) nondiagonal channel matrix with BPSK inputs. Cases i) and ii) are used for comparison purposes and allow us to recover the standard waterfilling or the mercury/waterfilling interpretations. Case iii) sheds insights into the operation of the general mercury/waterfilling interpretation for interfering channels. Unlike the conventional graphical illustrations of waterfilling and mercury/waterfilling which illustrate the power allocation for a given power, here we illustrate the effects of varying the power (in decibels) on the resulting solution. As in Fig. 4, in Figs. 5–8, the water is represented by the light gray shaded area and the mercury by the dark gray shaded area. The allocated power is equal to the height of the light gray shaded area.

- i) Gaussian inputs and diagonal channel matrix: In Fig. 5, we show the base (= mercury) and water levels for the diagonal channel matrix

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1.09} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{0.34} \end{bmatrix} \quad (62)$$

with Gaussian inputs as a function of the snr. We can verify the standard waterfilling interpretation, in which all the power is assigned to the strongest input (largest  $|h_{jj}|$ ) for low snr, and it is evenly split between the inputs for high snr.

- ii) Non-Gaussian inputs and diagonal channel matrix: In Fig. 6, we show the base, mercury and water levels for




Fig. 5. Power allocation for (a) input 1 and (b) input 2 for Gaussian inputs and diagonal channel matrix in (62).




Fig. 6. Power allocation for (a) input 1 and (b) input 2 for BPSK inputs and diagonal channel matrix in (62).

the diagonal channel (62) with BPSK inputs. For the input with highest channel value (first input) we always add mercury to the base level. This mercury compensates for the mismatch between the input distribution and the optimal Gaussian distribution. Note that the mercury increases with the snr and vanishes as the snr tends to zero. For the input with the lowest gain (second input), we only add mercury to the base level once this input is allocated some power. In fact, for zero power, we could consider the input distribution to be Gaussian, and we should not add mercury to the base level. As shown in [7], for discrete input distributions, the mercury grows exponentially with snr and so does the water level. For high snr, the mercury level (mismatched between Gaussian and the input distribution) determines the power allocation, because the base level is negligible for every input.

iii) Gaussian inputs and nondiagonal channel matrix: In Fig. 7, we show the base, mercury and water levels for the interfering channel matrix

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.3 \\ 0.3 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix} \quad (63)$$

with Gaussian inputs. For low-snr values, the strongest input (input 1) gets all the power, and therefore, it is not interfered by the second input, and consequently, there is no added mercury. The weakest input (input 2) is not assigned any power until the snr increase is able to compensate not only the noise but also the interference by the first input. For high-snr values, the second input is assigned some power, as it is able to overcome both the noise and the interference. The mercury level for the first input starts rising once the second input is assigned some power, due to the interference it causes on the second input. This is barely noticeable in Fig. 7, because the mercury tends to zero when the snr tends to infinity for a full-rank  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T$ , as predicted by Theorem 7. Note that the power is equally divided between inputs as  $\text{snr} \rightarrow \infty$ .

iv) Non-Gaussian inputs and nondiagonal channel matrix: In Fig. 8, we show the base, mercury and water levels for the interfering channel (63) with BPSK inputs. For low snr, the first input is assigned all the power. The mercury level for input 1 depends only on the distribution mismatch, since there is no interference from the second input. For low snr, the base, mercury, and water levels of




Fig. 7. Power allocation for (a) input 1 and (b) input 2 for Gaussian inputs and nondiagonal channel matrix in (63).




Fig. 8. Power allocation for (a) input 1 and (b) input 2 for BPSK inputs and nondiagonal channel matrix in (63).

the first input are identical to the levels of input 1 in case ii). The mercury level for input 2 is only due to interferences, since input 2 is not assigned any power it cannot be penalized for its distribution. This mercury level is not identical to the mercury level in case iii) (Gaussian input with the same nondiagonal channel matrix), because the interference comes from a different input distribution. For high snr, the mercury level is mainly due to the input distribution mismatch, because for discrete input distributions, the interferences have an asymptotically negligible effect. Note that the mercury level is not equal to case ii) because the mercury level depends not only on the norm of the columns of  $\mathbf{H}$ .

For high snr, the cases with Gaussian inputs share equally the available power as the base and mercury levels vanishes, because  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\dagger$  is full rank. For cases ii) and iv), the mercury level only depends on the input distributions, as the interferences are negligible, but the mercury levels and allocated powers are different in each case, because the channel matrices are different and the mercury level depends on the channel response to every input.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Regardless of whether the channel matrix is diagonal, we have shown that when the inputs are not Gaussian, information transmission rates are maximized when a full precoder is used instead of a power allocation strategy coupled to channel diagonalization. The optimal precoder matrix is expressed using the relation between the MMSE and the mutual information and it is computed by solving a fixed-point equation.

As in [7], we devoted particular attention to the low- and high-snr regimes for discrete input constellations. In the low-snr regime, the optimal linear precoder diagonalizes the channel matrix, because the non-Gaussianness of the input distribution has little effect on the maximum information transmission rate. We have also shown that for asymptotically high snr the optimal precoder matrix for discrete inputs achieves maximal minimum distance and minimal mean-square error, linking three common criteria for designing digital communication systems.

Whenever precoding is precluded, we optimize a power allocation matrix, and we generalize the mercury/waterfilling algorithm in [7] to interfering MIMO channels. We also put forth

a graphical interpretation, in which the mercury accounts not only for the suboptimal constellation, but also for the interferences between the subchannels. For power allocation, the low- and high-snr regimes, respectively, follow [7] and the high-snr regime results for the precoder in Section II-C, but using a power allocation matrix.

#### APPENDIX I PROOF OF THEOREM 1

The possible solutions to (2) subject to (3) are characterized by the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker theorem (e.g., [3]), which gives necessary conditions for the matrix  $\mathbf{P}^*$  to be a critical point, known as the KKT or first-order conditions. To compute the KKT conditions, we first build the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{P}, \lambda) = -I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) - \lambda \left(1 - \text{Tr}\{\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\dagger\}\right) \quad (64)$$

in which the Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda$ , accounting for the inequality constraint, has to be nonnegative.

The first-order conditions are given by

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{P}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{P}, \lambda) = -\nabla_{\mathbf{P}} I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) + \lambda \mathbf{P} = 0 \quad (65)$$

$$\lambda \left(1 - \text{Tr}\{\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\dagger\}\right) = 0 \quad (66)$$

$$\lambda \geq 0. \quad (67)$$

If  $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\dagger\} = 1$ ,  $\lambda$  is nonzero, and the solution  $\mathbf{P}^*$  to (65) satisfies

$$\mathbf{P}^* = \lambda^{-1} \nabla_{\mathbf{P}} I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \quad (68)$$

$$= \lambda^{-1} \text{snr} \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \quad (69)$$

$$= \nu^{-1} \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \quad (70)$$

where (69) follows from the gradient of the mutual information with respect to  $\mathbf{P}$  found in [10]; and in (70), we eliminate  $\lambda$  by introducing

$$\nu = \frac{\lambda}{\text{snr}} = \left\| \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \right\|. \quad (71)$$

For any  $\mathbf{P}$  with  $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\dagger\} < 1$ , we can define another precoder  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\dagger\}}} \mathbf{P}$ , which achieves higher mutual information than  $\mathbf{P}$ , because

$$\frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\text{snr}} > 0. \quad (72)$$

Therefore, we only need to consider precoding matrices that fulfill (3) with equality.

#### APPENDIX II PROOF OF COROLLARY 2

The MMSE for the channel model in (24) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mmse}(\text{snr}) &= 4 \|\mathbf{h}\|^2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i e^{(i^2+i)4\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 \text{snr}} Q\left((2i+1)\|\mathbf{h}\|\sqrt{2\text{snr}}\right) \\ & \quad (73) \end{aligned}$$

which can be obtained from [7, eq. (79)], replacing  $d$  by  $2\|\mathbf{h}\|$ .

The bounds in (28) and (29) are obtained using the well-known bounds (e.g., [13])

$$\frac{e^{-\xi^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\xi} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\xi^2}\right) \leq Q(\xi) \leq \frac{e^{-\xi^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\xi}. \quad (74)$$

#### APPENDIX III PROOF OF THEOREM 3

The proof of Theorem 3 follows the proof in [7, Th. 4] with some minor modifications. We label each of the different  $M$  constellation vectors by  $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M\}$ , in such a way that

$$d_{\min} = \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{(i+1)_M})\| \quad (75)$$

for at least one  $i$  and  $(i)_M = i - M \lfloor (i-1)/M \rfloor$  is the modulo  $M$  operation.

To prove the lower bound, we construct a genie that supplies the estimator with a pair of constellation vectors: if the transmitted constellation vector is  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , then with probability  $1/2$  the genie gives the pair  $\{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{(i+1)_M}\}$  and with probability  $1/2$  gives the pair  $\{\mathbf{x}_{(i-1)_M}, \mathbf{x}_i\}$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mmse}(\text{snr}) &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}])\|^2 | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i \right] \\ & \quad (76) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{i=1}^M \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}, \{\mathbf{x}_{(i-1)_M}, \mathbf{x}_i\}))\|^2 | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}, \{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{(i+1)_M}\}))\|^2 | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i \right] \right) \\ & \quad (77) \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \frac{d_{\min}^2}{2M} \frac{e^{-d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}/4}}{d_{\min} \sqrt{\text{snr}}} \left( \sqrt{\pi} - \frac{4.37}{d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}} \right) \quad (78)$$

where

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}, \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}) = \frac{\mathbf{a} e^{-\|\mathbf{y} - \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{a}\|^2} + \mathbf{b} e^{-\|\mathbf{y} - \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{b}\|^2}}{e^{-\|\mathbf{y} - \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{a}\|^2} + e^{-\|\mathbf{y} - \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{b}\|^2}}. \quad (79)$$

The inequality in (78) follows from  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(\mathbf{y}, \text{snr}, \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\})$  being the mean-square estimate for the channel model in Corollary 1 with  $\mathbf{h} = (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}))/2$ , the lower bound in Corollary 2, and taking the largest term in the sum. This completes the proof of the lower bound in (30).

We now prove the upper bound in (31), and as in [7], we replace the optimal MSE estimator by the maximum-likelihood estimator

$$\mathbf{x}_{ML}(\mathbf{y}) = \underset{\mathbf{x}}{\text{argmin}} \|\mathbf{y} - \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{x}\|^2 \quad (80)$$

thereby

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mmse}(\text{snr}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}])\|^2 \right] \\ & \quad (81) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{ML}(\mathbf{y}))\|^2 \right] \quad (82)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^M \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{HP}(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)\|^2 | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{V}_j] \\
 &\quad \times \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{V}_j | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i] \quad (83)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^M \|\mathbf{HP}(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)\|^2 \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{V}_j | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i] \quad (84)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}_j$  is the Voronoi region for  $\mathbf{HP}\mathbf{x}_j$  in the received constellation. We have assumed as in (77) that all the constellation vectors are equally likely.

We can now complete the proof for the upper bound in (31)

$$\text{mmse}(\text{snr}) \leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^M \|\mathbf{HP}(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)\|^2 \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{V}_j | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i] \quad (85)$$

$$\leq \frac{d_{\max}^2}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{V}_i | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i] \quad (86)$$

$$\leq \frac{d_{\max}^2}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M (M-1) Q\left(d_{i,\min} \sqrt{\frac{\text{snr}}{2}}\right) \quad (87)$$

$$\leq d_{\max}^2 (M-1) Q\left(d_{\min} \sqrt{\frac{\text{snr}}{2}}\right) \quad (88)$$

$$\leq d_{\max}^2 (M-1) \frac{e^{-d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}/4}}{d_{\min} \sqrt{\text{snr}\pi}}. \quad (89)$$

We obtain the inequality in (86) replacing  $\mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{HP}(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)\|^2 | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{V}_j]$  by  $d_{\max}^2$  [the maximum distance in the received between the constellation vectors (33)]. The inequality in (87) is obtained, computing the union bound [13] for the probability that  $\mathbf{y}$  does not lie in the Voronoi region of  $\mathbf{HP}\mathbf{x}_i$

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{V}_i | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i] \leq \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^M \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{V}_{ij} | \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i] \quad (90)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^M Q\left(d_{ij} \sqrt{\frac{\text{snr}}{2}}\right) \quad (91)$$

$$\leq (M-1) Q\left(d_{i,\min} \sqrt{\frac{\text{snr}}{2}}\right) \quad (92)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}_{ij}$  is the Voronoi region for  $\mathbf{HP}\mathbf{x}_i$ , when we assume that only  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and  $\mathbf{x}_j$  have been transmitted

$$d_{ij} = \|\mathbf{HP}(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i)\| \quad (93)$$

and  $d_{i,\min} = \min_j d_{ij}$ .

We sum  $M$  times the largest term in the sum to reach the inequality in (88) and the inequality in (89) uses the upper bound in (74) for the  $Q(\cdot)$  function.

This theorem generalizes [7, Th. 4] to nondiagonal rectangular channel matrices and it follows the same ideas to prove the upper and lower bounds with two minor modifications. For the upper bound (31), we use the union bound for  $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{V}_i | \mathbf{x} =$

$\mathbf{x}_i]$ . The union bound allows to get a tighter bound for large snr, as it incorporates an extra  $1/\sqrt{\text{snr}}$  in the bound. For the lower bound in (78), we use the lower bound in (28), instead of the first-order approximation to  $Q(\cdot)$  as they do in [7], and a different definition for the genie.

#### APPENDIX IV PROOF OF THEOREM 4

From the relation between the mutual information and the MMSE in [4] for the channel model in (1), we know that we can express the mutual information as

$$I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) = \int_0^{\text{snr}} \text{mmse}(\xi) d\xi \quad (94)$$

$$= \log M - \int_{\text{snr}}^{\infty} \text{mmse}(\xi) d\xi. \quad (95)$$

We use (95) to bound the mutual information, because the bounds that we have presented for the MMSE are tight for large snr.

We can upper bound the MMSE as

$$\text{mmse}(\text{snr}) \leq (M-1) d_{\max}^2 \frac{e^{-d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}/4}}{d_{\min} \sqrt{\text{snr}\pi}} \left(1 + \frac{2}{d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}}\right). \quad (96)$$

The inequality in (96) follows from (89). We get the lower bound of the mutual information in (34) when we integrate (96) from snr to  $\infty$ .

We can lower bound the MMSE as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{mmse}(\text{snr}) \\
 &\geq \frac{d_{\min}^2}{2M} \frac{e^{-d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}/4}}{d_{\min} \sqrt{\text{snr}}} \left( \sqrt{\pi} - \frac{4.37}{d_{\min}^2 \text{snr}} - \frac{6(4.37 + 2\sqrt{\pi})}{d_{\min}^4 \text{snr}^2} \right). \quad (97)
 \end{aligned}$$

The inequality in (97) follows from (78). We get the upper bound of the mutual information in (35) from integrating (97) from snr to  $\infty$ .

#### APPENDIX V PROOF OF THEOREM 5

The Lagrangian for the optimization problem in (43)–(46) is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}, \lambda, \boldsymbol{\eta}) = -I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) - \lambda \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m p_j\right) - \sum_{j=1}^m \eta_j p_j \quad (98)$$

in which the Lagrange multipliers  $\lambda$  and  $\eta_j$  for the inequality constraints have to be nonnegative.

The KKT conditions are given by

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}, \lambda, \boldsymbol{\eta})}{\partial p_j} = -\frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} + \lambda - \eta_j = 0 \quad (99)$$

$$\lambda \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^m p_j\right) = 0 \quad (100)$$

$$p_j \eta_j = 0 \quad (101)$$

$$\lambda, \eta_j \geq 0. \quad (102)$$

The derivative of  $I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})$  with respect to  $p_j$  is given by

$$\frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} = \frac{\text{snr}}{\sqrt{p_j}} \left( \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{E} \right)_{jj} \quad (103)$$

which can be computed from [10, eq. (21)] and the chain rule.

For  $p_j^* > 0$

$$\lambda = \left. \frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} \right|_{\mathbf{P}=\mathbf{P}^*} \quad (104)$$

$$= \frac{\text{snr}}{\sqrt{p_j^*}} \left( \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \right)_{jj} \geq 0 \quad (105)$$

because  $\eta_j = 0$  for nonzero  $p_j^*$ . Strict inequality holds in (105) because  $\mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E}$  is positive semidefinite, thus  $\sum_j p_j^* = 1$ . For  $p_j^* = 0$

$$\left( \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \right)_{jj} = 0 \quad (106)$$

The optimal solution can be expressed as

$$p_j^* = \frac{\text{snr}}{\lambda} \sqrt{p_j^*} \left( \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \right)_{jj} \quad (107)$$

$$= \gamma^{-1} \left( \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E} \right)_{jj} \quad (108)$$

where we have combined (105) and (106) to obtain a single equation for all  $p_j^*$  and  $\gamma = \frac{\lambda}{\text{snr}} = \text{Tr}\{\mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{E}\}$  to ensure that  $\sum_j p_j^* = 1$ .

#### APPENDIX VI

##### MERCURY LEVEL FOR $p_j^* = 0$

Using (54) and for  $p_j^* = 0$ , we can rewrite the mercury level as follows:

$$m_j^{-1} = \left. \frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} \right|_{\mathbf{P}=\mathbf{P}^*} \quad (109)$$

$$= \text{snr} \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 - \text{snr} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{h}_i \sqrt{p_i^*} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}[x_j|\mathbf{y}]}{\sqrt{p_j^*}} \right)^\dagger \mathbb{E}[x_i|\mathbf{y}] \right]. \quad (110)$$

For  $p_j^* = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[x_j|\mathbf{y}] = 0$  and (110) is indeterminate. To derive the mercury level, we compute the limit of (110) as  $p_j^* \rightarrow 0$

$$\lim_{p_j^* \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}[x_j|\mathbf{y}]}{\sqrt{p_j^*}} = \lim_{p_j^* \rightarrow 0} \int \frac{x_j}{\sqrt{p_j^*}} \frac{p_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) p_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}{p_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{x} \quad (111)$$

$$= 2 \frac{\sqrt{\text{snr}}}{\pi^n} \int e^{-\|\mathbf{a}\|^2} \Re\{\mathbf{a}^\dagger \mathbf{h}_j x_j\} x_j \frac{p_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}{p_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y})} d\mathbf{x} \quad (112)$$

where

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{y} - \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{x} + \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{h}_j \sqrt{p_j^*} x_j \quad (113)$$

because of the cancellation in (113), note that  $\mathbf{a}$  does not depend on either  $x_j$  or  $p_j^*$ .

To obtain the limit in (112), we approximate

$$p_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\pi^n} e^{-\|\mathbf{y} - \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{x}\|^2} \quad (114)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi^n} e^{-\|\mathbf{a} - \sqrt{\text{snr}} \mathbf{h}_j \sqrt{p_j^*} x_j\|^2} \quad (115)$$

$$= \frac{e^{-\|\mathbf{a}\|^2}}{\pi^n} \left( 1 + 2\sqrt{\text{snr}} p_j^* \Re\{\mathbf{a}^\dagger \mathbf{h}_j x_j\} \right) + \mathcal{O}(p_j^*) \quad (116)$$

and to obtain the last equality in (112), we should notice that  $\mathcal{O}(p_j^*)/\sqrt{p_j^*} \rightarrow 0$  for  $p_j^* \rightarrow 0$  and that for any matrix  $\mathbf{P}$

$$\frac{1}{\pi^n} \int e^{-\|\mathbf{a}\|^2} x_j \frac{p_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})}{p_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y})} d\mathbf{x} = 0 \quad (117)$$

because the  $j$ th marginal of  $p_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$  is symmetric and  $\mathbf{a}$  does not depend on  $x_j$ .

We can show that the mercury level is above the water level if  $p_j^* = 0$ , using the first-order conditions in Appendix V. For  $p_j^* = 0$ , (99) becomes

$$\eta_j = \lambda - \left. \frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} \right|_{\mathbf{P}=\mathbf{P}^*} \geq 0 \quad (118)$$

thus

$$m_j \geq \beta. \quad (119)$$

Finally, we can prove that the mercury level is above the base level for  $p_j^* = 0$  using (110). The random variables  $h_j \mathbb{E}[x_j|\mathbf{y}]$  and  $h_i \mathbb{E}[x_i|\mathbf{y}]$  are positively correlated, and therefore

$$m_j^{-1} \leq \text{snr} \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 = b_j^{-1}. \quad (120)$$

#### APPENDIX VII

##### PROOF OF THEOREM 6

We first prove that the derivative of  $m_j - b_j$  with respect to  $\text{snr}$  is nonpositive for Gaussian inputs. For Gaussian inputs, the derivative of the mutual information with respect to  $p_j$  can be computed analytically

$$\frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} = \text{snr} \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^2 \mathbf{H}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \mathbf{h}_j. \quad (121)$$

Hence, we can rearrange  $m_j - b_j$  as follows:

$$m_j - b_j = \frac{1}{\text{snr} \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^2 \mathbf{H}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \mathbf{h}_j} - p_j^* - \frac{1}{\text{snr} \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2} \quad (122)$$

$$= \frac{\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 - \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^2 \mathbf{H}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \mathbf{h}_j}{\text{snr} \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^2 \mathbf{H}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \mathbf{h}_j} - p_j^* \quad (123)$$

$$= \frac{\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^* \right)^{-1} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{h}_j}{\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^2 \mathbf{H}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \mathbf{h}_j} - p_j^* \quad (124)$$

$$= \frac{\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j}{\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 \left( \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 - \text{snr} \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \right)} - p_j^* \quad (125)$$

where we have used the matrix inversion lemma to obtain the last two equalities and have defined

$$\mathbf{M}_1 = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^* \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr}\mathbf{P}^*\mathbf{H}^\dagger\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^* \right)^{-1} \mathbf{P}^*\mathbf{H}^\dagger. \quad (126)$$

The derivative of  $m_j - b_j$  is given by

$$\frac{\partial(m_j - b_j)}{\partial \text{snr}} = \frac{\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \frac{\partial \mathbf{M}_1}{\partial \text{snr}} \mathbf{h}_j \left( \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 - \text{snr}\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \right)}{\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 \left( \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 - \text{snr}\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \right)^2} \quad (127)$$

$$+ \frac{\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \left[ \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j + \text{snr}\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \frac{\partial \mathbf{M}_1}{\partial \text{snr}} \mathbf{h}_j \right]}{\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 \left( \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 - \text{snr}\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \right)^2} \quad (128)$$

$$= \frac{\left( \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \right)^2 - \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1^2 \mathbf{h}_j}{\left( \|\mathbf{h}_j\| \left( \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 - \text{snr}\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \right) \right)^2} \quad (129)$$

where the derivative of  $\mathbf{M}_1$  with respect to snr is given by

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{M}_1}{\partial \text{snr}} = -\mathbf{M}_1^2. \quad (130)$$

We can see that

$$\left( \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \right)^2 = \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \quad (131)$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \right\} \quad (132)$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \right\} \quad (133)$$

$$\leq \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \right\} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1 \right\} \quad (134)$$

$$= \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2 \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \mathbf{M}_1^2 \mathbf{h}_j \quad (135)$$

where we have used that for positive-semidefinite matrices:  $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\} \leq \text{Tr}\{\mathbf{A}\}\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{B}\}$  [8].

We have just proven with (135) that the numerator of (129) is nonpositive while the denominator is always positive, because it is the square of a real number. Hence, the derivative of  $m_j - b_j$  with respect to the snr is nonpositive for any MIMO Gaussian channel with Gaussian inputs.

We use the first equality in (125) to compute its derivative with respect to  $p_i$

$$\frac{\partial(m_j - b_j)}{\partial p_i} = - \frac{\text{snr}\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \frac{\partial \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^*{}^2\mathbf{H}^\dagger \right)^{-1}}{\partial p_i} \mathbf{h}_j}{\left( \text{snr}\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^*{}^2\mathbf{H}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \mathbf{h}_j \right)^2} - \delta_{ij} \quad (136)$$

$$= \frac{\left\| \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^*{}^2\mathbf{H}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \mathbf{h}_i \right\|^2}{\left( \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \left( \mathbf{I} + \text{snr}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^*{}^2\mathbf{H}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \mathbf{h}_j \right)^2} - \delta_{ij}. \quad (137)$$

This derivative is nonnegative for  $i \neq j$  and zero for  $i = j$ .

## APPENDIX VIII PROOF OF THEOREM 7

The derivative of the mutual information with respect to  $p_j$  for Gaussian inputs is given by

$$\frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} = \mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \left( \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^2\mathbf{H}^\dagger + \frac{\mathbf{I}}{\text{snr}} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{h}_j. \quad (138)$$

If all the channels are assigned the same power ( $p_j = 1/m, \forall p_j$ ) and  $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\dagger$  has full-rank, we have

$$\lim_{\text{snr} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})}{\partial p_j} = m\mathbf{h}_j^\dagger \left( \mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \mathbf{h}_j = m \quad \forall j. \quad (139)$$

This means that the water level  $\beta$  tends to  $1/m$  and the mercury level tends to zero. Therefore, equal power allocation for asymptotically large snr fulfills the conditions of Theorem 5 and the objective function is asymptotically concave for Gaussian inputs.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Cioffi, S. Jagannathan, M. Mohseni, and G. Ginis, "CuPON: The copper alternative to PON 100 Gb/s DSL networks," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 132–139, Jun. 2007.
- [2] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. New York: Wiley, 2006.
- [3] R. Fletcher, *Practical Methods of Optimization*, 2nd ed. New York: Wiley, 1987.
- [4] D. Guo, S. Shamai, and S. Verdú, "Mutual information and minimum mean-square error in Gaussian channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 1261–1282, Apr. 2005.
- [5] S. M. Kay, *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing: Estimation Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1993.
- [6] K. H. Lee and D. P. Petersen, "Optimal linear coding for vector channels," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 1283–1290, Dec. 1976.
- [7] A. Lozano, A. M. Tulino, and S. Verdú, "Optimum power allocation for parallel Gaussian channels with arbitrary input distributions," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 3033–3051, Jul. 2006.
- [8] A. W. Marshall and I. Olkin, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications*. New York: Academic, 1979.
- [9] D. P. Palomar, J. M. Cioffi, and M. A. Lagunas, "Joint Tx-Rx beamforming design for multicarrier MIMO channels: A unified framework for convex optimization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 51, no. 9, pp. 2381–2401, Sep. 2003.
- [10] D. P. Palomar and S. Verdú, "Gradient of mutual information in linear vector Gaussian channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 141–154, Jan. 2006.
- [11] F. Pérez-Cruz, M. Rodrigues, and S. Verdú, "Optimal precoding for digital subscriber lines," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Commun.*, Beijing, China, May 2008, pp. 1200–1204.
- [12] F. Pérez-Cruz, M. R. D. Rodrigues, and S. Verdú, "Generalized mercury/waterfilling for multiple-input multiple-output channels," in *Proc. 45th Allerton Conf. Commun. Control Comput.*, Allerton Park, IL, Sep. 2007.
- [13] J. G. Proakis and M. Salehi, *Communication Systems Engineering*, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 2002.
- [14] A. Scaglione, P. Stoica, S. Barbarossa, G. B. Giannakis, and H. Sampath, "Optimal designs for space-time linear precoders and decoders," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1051–1064, May 2002.
- [15] S. Verdú, *Multuser Detection*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.
- [16] S. Verdú, "Spectral efficiency in the wideband regime," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 1319–1343, Jun. 2002.
- [17] J. Yang and S. Roy, "Joint transmitter-receiver optimization for multiple-input multiple-output systems with decision feedback," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 1334–1347, Sep. 1994.
- [18] J. Yang and S. Roy, "On joint transmitter and receiver optimization for multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) transmission systems," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 42, no. 12, pp. 3221–3231, Dec. 1994.
- [19] W. Yu, W. Rhee, S. Boyd, and J. M. Cioffi, "Iterative waterfilling for Gaussian vector multiple-access channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 145–152, Jan. 2004.

**Fernando Pérez-Cruz** (S'97–M'01–SM'06) was born in Sevilla, Spain, in 1973. He received the M.Sc./B.Sc. degree in telecommunication engineering from the University of Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain, in 1996 and the Ph.D. degree in telecommunication engineering from the Technical University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain, in 2000.

He is an Associate Professor at the Department of Signal Theory and Communication, University Carlos III, Madrid, Spain. He is currently on sabbatical at Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, under the sponsorship of an outgoing Marie Curie Fellowship. He has held positions and visited Gatsby Unit, London, U.K., Max Planck Institute for Biological Cybernetics, Tuebingen, Germany, BioWulf Technologies, New York, and the Technical University of Madrid and Alcala University, Madrid, Spain. His current research interest lies in machine learning algorithmic and theoretical developments and its application to signal processing and information theory. He has authored over 70 contributions to international journals and conferences.

**Miguel R. D. Rodrigues** (S'98–A'02–M'03) was born in Porto, Portugal, in 1975. He received the Licenciatura degree in electrical engineering from the Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto, Portugal, in 1998 and the Ph.D. degree in electronic and electrical engineering from University College London, U.K., in 2002.

He has held postdoctoral research appointments at Cambridge University, U.K., and at Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, between 2003 and 2007. He joined the Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Sciences, University of Porto, in 2007. His research interests include information theory and communications.

**Sergio Verdú** (S'80–M'84–SM'88–F'93) received the Telecommunications Engineering degree from the Universitat Politècnica de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, in 1980 and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, in 1984.

Since 1984, he has been a member of the faculty at Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, where he is the Eugene Higgins Professor of Electrical Engineering.

Dr. Verdú is the recipient of the 2007 Claude E. Shannon Award and the 2008 IEEE Richard W. Hamming Medal. He is a member of the National Academy of Engineering and was awarded a Doctorate Honoris Causa from the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya in 2005. He is a recipient of several paper awards from the IEEE: the 1992 Donald Fink Paper Award, the 1998 Information Theory Outstanding Paper Award, an Information Theory Golden Jubilee Paper Award, the 2002 Leonard Abraham Prize Award, and the 2006 Joint Communications/Information Theory Paper Award. He received the 2000 Frederick E. Terman Award from the American Society for Engineering Education for his book *Multuser Detection*, (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998). He served as President of the IEEE Information Theory Society in 1997 and as an Associate Editor for Shannon Theory of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON INFORMATION THEORY.