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SUMMARY In this paper, we present a transmission scheme for a multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) quasi-static fading channel with imperfect channel state information at the transmitter (CSIT). In this scheme, we develop a precoder structure to exploit the available CSIT and apply spatial coupling for further performance enhancement. We derive an analytical evaluation method based on extrinsic information transfer (EXIT) functions, which provides convenience for our precoder design. Furthermore, we observe an area property indicating that, for a spatially coupled system, the iterative receiver can perform error-free decoding even if the original uncoupled system has multiple fixed points in its EXIT chart. This observation implies that spatial coupling is useful to alleviate the uncertainty in CSIT which causes difficulty in designing LDPC code based on the EXIT curve matching technique. Numerical results are presented, showing an excellent performance of the proposed scheme in MIMO fading channels with imperfect CSIT.
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1. Introduction

The extrinsic information transfer (EXIT) chart analysis technique [1]–[5] has been widely used for the design of low-density parity-check (LDPC) codes and turbo codes with iterative decoding [6]–[8]. With this technique, near capacity performance can be approached by matching the EXIT curves of two local processors (decoders) of an iterative receiver in an additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel [3], [5].

For a multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) system with perfect channel state information at the transmitter (CSIT), the channel can be transformed into a set of parallel subchannels using singular value decomposition (SVD). The MIMO capacity can then be achieved by independent coding for each sub-channel, following the water-filling principle [9]. The design problem in this case is similar to that for an AWGN channel.

For a quasi-static MIMO channel without CSIT, however, the optimal design for the transmitter remains a challenging problem. In this case, it is difficult to apply the EXIT curve matching technique. (See Fig. 5 for this issue.) This problem becomes more complicated when the available CSIT is imperfect, containing both useful information as well as errors. In this case, to the best of our knowledge, even the outage capacity of the system is still unknown and the optimal transmitter design problem remains open [10].

Detection complexity is another issue, especially for MIMO systems with a large number of antennas. Among different options, linear minimum mean-square error (LMMSE) [11] detection has suboptimal performance but relatively low complexity. Techniques that can improve the performance of MIMO systems with LMMSE detection are thus highly desirable.

In this paper, we will first consider the transmission issues for MIMO systems without CSIT. We focus on a linear precoding technique that can facilitate LMMSE detection. We develop an analytical EXIT curve method to evaluate the performance of MIMO systems with LDPC coding and linear precoding. We apply the spatial coupling approach [12]–[14] to treat the EXIT curve mismatching problem. We show that, with spatial coupling, an iterative decoder can converge to the correct detection even when the two EXIT curves have multiple fixed points. This leads to a noticeable performance improvement.

We will then extend our discussions to MIMO systems with partial (imperfect) CSIT. We propose a heuristic precoding scheme that works efficiently with partial CSIT. Spatial coupling is again used to deal with the EXIT curve mismatching problem. Numerical results demonstrate that the proposed scheme can achieve impressive gain (relative to the case of no CSIT). This provides an attractive solution to practical MIMO systems.

2. System Model

Consider a flat-fading MIMO system with $M_R$ receive antennas and $M_T$ transmit antennas. Denote by $H(n)$ the $M_R \times M_T$ channel matrix and $y(n)$ the transmitted sequence of length $M_T$ at time slot $n$. The received sequence of length $M_R$ is given by

$$ r(n) = H(n)y(n) + z(n) $$

(1)

where $z(n)$ denotes a complex AWGN sequence of length $M_R$ with zero mean and covariance matrix $N_0I$.

For convenience of the discussion, we consider the following extended system model over $N$ time slots

$$ r = Hy + z $$

(2)

where $y(n)$ is the transmitted sequence, and $r(n)$ the received sequence.
where $H$ is an $NM_R \times NM_T$ block diagonal matrix with $N$ diagonal submatrices, i.e.,
\[ H = \text{diag}(H(1), \ldots, H(N)) \] (3)
and $y$ is a length-$NM_T$ transmitted sequence
\[ y = \begin{bmatrix} y^T(1), \ldots, y^T(N) \end{bmatrix}^T. \] (4)
The other sequences $r$ and $z$ are defined similarly.

To make the discussion simpler, we assume that the channel is time-invariant over $N$ time slots, i.e., $H(n) = H'$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$. The extension to the time-varying fading case is straightforward.

To characterize the CSIT, we consider the following channel mean information (CMI) model \cite{10}, \cite{15}
\[ H = \sqrt{\alpha} \overline{H} + \sqrt{1-\alpha} H_W \] (5)
where $\overline{H}$ and $H_W$ are $NM_R \times NM_T$ block diagonal matrices, representing the known and unknown parts of $H$ at the transmitter. The entries of the diagonal submatrices of $H_W$ are modeled as independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) complex Gaussian random variables with zero mean and unit variance. The CSIT quality is measured by $\alpha$ ($0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$): $\alpha = 0$ for no CSIT and $\alpha = 1$ for perfect CSIT.

For simplicity, we first discuss the no CSIT case ($\alpha = 0$) in Sects. 3, 4, and 5, and then discuss the precoder design in the partial CSIT case ($\alpha > 0$) in Sect. 6.

3. Transmitter and Receiver Structure

3.1 Linear Precoding without CSIT

Figure 1(a) illustrates the transmitter structure and the channel, where $y$ is generated by a linear precoder as
\[ y = Px. \] (6)
Here $P$ denotes an $NM_T \times NM_T$ precoding matrix and $x$ is a symbol sequence of length $NM_T$ generated by an LDPC encoder. The power of each symbol is assumed to be normalized.

Without CSIT (i.e., $\alpha = 0$), we adopt the following linear precoder structure developed in \cite{16}
\[ P = \Pi F \] (7)
where $\Pi$ and $F$ are, respectively, an $NM_T \times NM_T$ random permutation matrix and an $NM_T \times NM_T$ Hadamard matrix. This precoder structure provides diversity advantage \cite{16}.

Denote by $A = HP$ the equivalent $NM_R \times NM_T$ channel matrix. From (2) and (6), we have
\[ r = Ax + z. \] (8)

Figure 1(b) illustrates a factor graph representation \cite{17}, \cite{18} of the block diagram in Fig. 1(a), where each circle represents a variable node and each square represents a check node.

3.3 LMMSE Detection

For convenience, we assume binary phase shift keying (BPSK) \cite{19} for the coded symbols in $x$. The discussion can be extended to other modulation methods \cite{20}.

Assume that the LLR message $\xi^V_L = (\xi^V_L)^T$ of length
We can generate the LMMSE detection outputs as shown in Fig. 1(c). (We will return to this issue in 3.5.)

The LMMSE detection outputs can be modeled as the observation Gaussian random variable with zero mean and variance $\Omega_m$. The extrinsic LLR of $x_m$ is given by (see Appendix)

$$\xi_{m}^{LV} = 2 \left( \Omega_{m,m}^{-1} \hat{x}_m - \bar{\xi}_m \right)$$

where $\bar{\xi}_m$ is the $m$-th diagonal entry of the mean-square error (MSE) matrix [11]

$$\Omega = \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{I}^H R^{-1} A.$$  (13)

We write the LMMSE detection outputs as $\xi^{LV} = \{\xi^{LV}_m\}$, which are passed to the VND as shown in Fig. 1(c).

### 3.4 Modeling the LMMSE Detection Outputs

The LMMSE detection outputs can be modeled as the observations from an equivalent AWGN channel. It is shown that when the precoder matrix $F$ in (7) is properly chosen, $\xi^{LV}_m$ can be expressed as [c.f., (5), (17) and (18) in [21]]

$$\xi^{LV}_m = \mu x_m + \epsilon_m$$  (14)

where $\mu$ is a constant with respect to $m$, and $\epsilon_m$ is an independent Gaussian random variable with zero mean and variance $\sigma^2$.

Define the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) for (14) as $\rho^{LV} \equiv \mu^2 / \sigma^2$. We have [c.f., (16c) in [16]]

$$\rho^{LV} = \phi(\bar{\xi}) \equiv \left( \frac{1}{N M_T} \text{trace} \left( \frac{1}{2} I + \frac{A^H A}{N_0} \right)^{-1} \right) - \frac{1}{\bar{\xi}}.$$  (15)

### 3.5 VND/CND Operations and Overall Iterative Process

Based on (14), we can regard the LMMSE detection outputs as the observations from an equivalent AWGN channel. The messages $\xi^{VC}$ and $\xi^{CV}$ between the CND and VND are generated based on the standard message passing algorithm [4, 5]. The details are omitted here. Furthermore, the message $\xi^{VL} = \{\xi^{VL}_m\}$ is generated by the VND as

$$\xi^{VL}_m = \sum_n \xi^{CV}_n$$  (16)

where the subscript $n$ represents the edge index and the sum is over all edges connected to the variable node $m$. The message $\xi^{VL}$ is then used to refine the LMMSE detection outputs in the next iteration (see (9)).

With the above schedule, the messages $\xi^{LV}$, $\xi^{VC}$, $\xi^{CV}$, and $\xi^{VL}$ are updated in sequence during each iteration. The iterative detection continues until convergence. This schedule is also adopted in [14].

### 4. Performance Analysis based on EXIT Charts

#### 4.1 Modeling LLR with i.i.d. Gaussian Assumption

Following [2, 4], we assume that the LLRs in each message in Fig. 1(c) are i.i.d. Gaussian random variables, satisfying the consistency condition [2]. By doing this, a message can be characterized by the individual statistics of each entry. Let $\xi$ be an LLR in a message and $x$ the corresponding BPSK signal. Under the above assumption, $\xi$ can be modeled as [c.f., (9), (10) in [2]]

$$\xi = (\sigma^2 / 2) x + \sigma \epsilon$$  (17)

where $\epsilon$ is an independent Gaussian random variable with zero mean and unit variance. The mutual information between $x$ and $\xi$ is given by [2]

$$I(\sigma^2) = 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\left((\tau - \sigma^2 / 2)^2 / 2\sigma^2\right)} d\tau.$$  (18)

With (18), we can compute the mutual information for every message in Fig. 1(c) under the i.i.d. Gaussian assumption. This is shown in Fig. 2, where the superscripts are used to indicate the corresponding relationship between the mutual information and the messages. For example, $I^{LV}$ corresponds to $\xi^{LV}$.

Following [2] and [4], we adopt the so-called EXIT functions to characterize the behavior of these local detectors, as discussed in the next three subsections.

#### 4.2 Characterization of the LMMSE Detector

Let $I^{LV} = \chi(I^{VL})$ be the EXIT function of the LMMSE detector. It can be derived as follows.

From (15), we have

$$I^{LV} = J(\rho^{LV}) = J(2 \sqrt{\rho^{LV}}) = J(2 \sqrt{\phi(\bar{\xi})})$$  (19)

where the first equality follows from (18) and second equality follows from (17) in [21].

Combining (9) and (10), and letting $N \to \infty$, we have
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\[ V = 1 - \frac{1}{N M T} \sum_{n=1}^{N M T} \tanh^2 \left( \frac{\chi_{n}^{VL}}{2} \right) \]  
(20a)

\[ \rightarrow 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-t^2/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left( \frac{\sigma_{VL}}{4} + \frac{\sigma_{VL}}{2} t \right) dt \]  
(20b)

\[ \equiv T(\sigma_{VL}) \]  
(20c)

where (20b) follows from the model in (17), and \( \sigma_{VL} \) in (20c) is given by (using \( J(\cdot) \) in (18))

\[ \sigma_{VL} = J^{-1}(I_{VL}) \]  
(21)

Combining (19), (20) and (21), for \( N \to \infty \), we have

\[ I_{VL} = \chi(I_{VL}) \equiv J \left( 2 \sqrt{\phi(T(\sigma_{VL}))} \right). \]  
(22)

The analytic form of the EXIT function in (22) provides conventions for our precoder design as to be discussed in 6.3.

4.3 Characterization of the VND and CND

The EXIT functions for the VND and CND are denoted by (see Fig. 2)

\[ I_{VC} = \lambda(f^{VC}, I_{LV}) \text{, } I_{VL} = \eta(f^{VC}) \text{, and } f^{VC} = g(I_{VC}). \]  
(23)

These EXIT functions are determined by the degree distributions of an LDPC code [4]. For a \((d_i, d_j)\) regular LDPC code, we have

\[ \lambda(f^{VC}, I_{LV}) \equiv J \left( \sqrt{(d_i-1)J^{-1}(f^{VC})^2} + [J^{-1}(f^{LV})]^2 \right) \]  
(24)

\[ \eta(f^{VC}) \equiv J \left( \sqrt{d_iJ^{-1}(f^{VC})} \right) \]  
(25)

\[ g(I_{VC}) = 1 - J \left( (d_i - 1)^{-1}J^{-1}(1 - I_{VC}) \right). \]  
(26)

4.4 EXIT Chart Analysis

The flow-graph in Fig. 3(a) summarizes the EXIT functions in (22), (24), (25) and (26). We can combine the VND and LMMSE detector in Fig. 3(a) into an overall functional block, as marked by “G-VND” (standing for generalized VND) in Fig. 3(b). The latter involves two EXIT functions, namely \( g(\cdot) \) in (26) and

\[ f^{(VC)} = \lambda \left( f^{VC}, \chi \left( \eta(f^{VC}) \right) \right). \]  
(27)

Based on Fig. 3(b), we can predict the performance of the iterative receiver as follows. Denote by the subscript “\( q \)” the iteration number. We initialize \( I_{0}^{VC} = 0 \), which implies no a priori information from the CND to the G-VND at the beginning of the iterative detection process. The mutual information during the iterative process can be tracked as

\[ I_{q}^{VC} = f(I_{q-1}^{VC}), \text{ and } f^{VC} = g(I_{q}^{VC}) \text{ } q = 1, \ldots, Q. \]  
(28)

At the end of the iterative process, \( I_{Q}^{VC} \) and \( f^{VC} \) are used to predict the bit error rate (BER) and frame error rate (FER) performance [2], [16], [21].

The behavior of the iterative process in (28) can be demonstrated by an EXIT chart as shown in Fig. 4. It is wanted that the iterative process converges to \( f^{VC} = 1 \) and \( I^{VC} = 1 \), (i.e., point C in Fig. 4), which represents error free detection. However, there can be multiple fixed points in an EXIT chart, such as the example with three fixed points labeled by “A”, “B” and “C” in Fig. 4. In this case, the iterative process will converge to the first fixed point, i.e., point A in Fig. 4. This indicates potential detection error. We will return to this issue later in 5.3.

We can increase the transmit power to avoid the situation of multiple fixed points. However, this incurs loss in power efficiency.

4.5 Mismatch between EXIT Curves

It has been shown that near capacity performance can be achieved if the following matching condition is fulfilled [3], [20], [22]

\[ f(I^{VC}) = g^{-1}(f^{VC}) \quad 0 \leq f^{VC} \leq 1 \]  
(29)

where \( g^{-1}(\cdot) \) is the inverse function of \( g(\cdot) \).
In (29), \( g(\cdot) \) is determined by the check node degree distribution of an LDPC code (see (26)) but \( f(\cdot) \) is determined by the variable node degree distribution of an LDPC code as well as the channel (see (15), (23), (24), (25) and (27)).

In the case of full CSIT, we can design the precoder according to the matching condition in (29) as to be discussed in 6.1. Alternatively, we can also tune the degree distributions of the LDPC codes [3], [5], [20]. Both methods lead to excellent performance.

Without perfect CSIT, the matching condition in (29) cannot be satisfied by optimizing the degree distributions of the LDPC code or the precoder structure. This is because, as mentioned above, \( f(\cdot) \) is a function of the channel matrix \( H \), as illustrated in Fig. 5. Here, the EXIT curves are generated using a (3, 6) LDPC code and 10 random realizations of a \( 2 \times 2 \) MIMO Rayleigh fading channel. For different channel realizations, \( f(\cdot) \) varies noticeably while \( g(\cdot) \) remains fixed as discussed above. This clearly demonstrates the main difficulty in meeting the matching condition in (29): without accurate CSIT, \( f(\cdot) \) is uncertain at the transmitter. This mismatching problem may lead to noticeable performance loss.

5. Spatial Coupling

5.1 Spatial Coupling Principle

In this section, we adopt the spatial coupling approach proposed in [13] to mitigate the mismatching problem as mentioned in 4.5.

The basic principle of spatial coupling is illustrated in Fig. 6. Due to space limitation, our discussion below is very brief. For details, please refer to [13].

In Fig. 6(a), we create \( L \) parallel copies of the system in Fig. 1(c). Each copy is referred to as a “position”. At each position, the edges between the check nodes and the variable nodes are randomly and uniformly divided into \( w \) edge subsets (\( w < L \)) indexed by \( k \), \( k = 0, \ldots, w - 1 \). In Fig. 6(a), \( w = 3 \) and each edge subset is represented by a line between the white double circle and the white double square. Note that the variable nodes are only connected to the check nodes at the same position in Fig. 6(a).

In Fig. 6(b), we perform spatial coupling as follows. The variable nodes at each position \( i \) are reconnected to the check nodes at \( w \) positions (from \( i \) to \( i + w - 1 \)) through \( w \) edge groups, respectively. Extra check nodes are created at \( w - 1 \) positions for spatial coupling termination. This results in the factor graph of a spatially coupled LDPC (SC-LDPC) code.

Assume that a \((d_l, d_r)\) regular LDPC code is used at each position. The resultant spatially coupled LDPC code is referred to as a \((d_l, d_r, L, w)\) SC-LDPC code [13].

It has been demonstrated that SC-LDPC codes can achieve excellent performance in nonfading channels. See [12]–[14] and references therein. In what follows, we will show that SC-LDPC codes can be used in fading MIMO channels to handle the EXIT curve mismatching problem discussed in 4.5.

The message passing detection algorithm for the SC-LDPC coded MIMO system can be carried out using the factor graph in Fig. 6(b) in a straightforward way.

5.2 EXIT Chart Analysis for a Spatially Coupled System

The EXIT chart analysis technique can be extended to the spatially coupled system in Fig. 6(b). Let us focus on posi-
tion \(i\) in Fig. 6(b). Here the mutual informations are indexed by the position number, i.e., \(I^{CV}(i)\) and \(I^{VC}(i)\).

The nodes in Fig. 6(b) can still be characterized by \(g(\cdot)\) and \(f(\cdot)\) in (26) and (27). The key point is that each incoming message is a uniform mixture of LLRs from different positions with different mutual information values (see Fig. 6). We can thus use the average mutual information to characterize the incoming messages. For the G-VND and CND at position \(i\), the input average mutual informations are given by

\[
\frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} I^{CV}(i+k), \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} I^{VC}(i-k).
\]  

(30)

Following [13], we impose boundary constraints \(I^{VC}(i) = 1\) for \(i < 0\) or \(i \geq L\). Based on (26), (27) and (30), we have

\[
I^{VC}(i) = f \left(\frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} I^{CV}(i+k)\right),
\]

(31)

\[
I^{CV}(i) = g \left(\frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} I^{VC}(i-k)\right).
\]

(32)

Again, denote by \(q\) the iteration number. We initialize \(I^{CV}_q(i) = 0\), for \(0 \leq i < L + w - 1\). For \(1 \leq q \leq Q\), we track the mutual informations during the iterative process as

\[
\begin{align*}
I^{CV}_q(i) &= f \left(\frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} I^{CV}_q(i+k)\right) \quad 1 \leq i < L \\
I^{VC}_q(i) &= 1 \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq i \leq L \\
I^{CV}_q(i) &= g \left(\frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} I^{VC}_q(i-k)\right) \quad 1 \leq i < L + w - 1
\end{align*}
\]

(33)

The results of the above recursion can be used to predict system performance.

5.3 Area Property

Assume that there are multiple fixed points in an EXIT chart for an LDPC coded system without spatial coupling. The iterative process in (28) then converges to the first fixed point, which is not desirable as we discussed before.

With spatial coupling, interestingly, we observed that the iterative process in (33) may converge to the correct decision, i.e., \(I^{CV}_q(i) \rightarrow 1\) and \(I^{VC}_q(i) \rightarrow 1\), even the EXIT chart for the system in each position before spatial coupling has multiple fixed points. We have conducted a large amount of experiments. We observed that for \(L \gg w \gg 1\), \(I^{CV}_q(i) \rightarrow 1\) and \(I^{VC}_q(i) \rightarrow 1\) if \(S_{AB} < S_{BC}\), where \(S_{AB}\) and \(S_{BC}\) are the areas of the two regions as shown in Fig. 4. We conjecture that this property is true for general cases. We are now working on a rigorous proof of this conjecture.

Based on the above conjecture, we have a simple method to predict the performance of a spatially coupled system. Given a channel realization, assuming that there are only three fixed points as shown in Fig. 4, we can shift \(f(\cdot)\) by tuning transmission power \(P_T\). Thus \(S_{AB}\) and \(S_{BC}\) can be expressed as functions of \(P_T\), i.e., \(S_{AB}(P_T)\) and \(S_{BC}(P_T)\).

6. Precoder Design with Perfect and Partial CSIT

6.1 Perfect CSIT Case

The discussions so far have been on systems without CSIT. We now consider more general cases with CSIT. We first assume that CSIT is perfect (\(\alpha = 1\)) so \(H\) is accurately known at the transmitter. Following [16], we can modify the precoder in (7) to the following form

\[
P = VW^{1/2}\Pi F
\]

(36)

where \(V\) is the beamforming matrix obtained using the SVD of \(H = UDV^H\), \(W\) is a diagonal matrix representing power allocation, \(\Pi\) and \(F\) are the same as those in (7). In principle, the diagonal entries of \(W\) have a water-filling effect [16]. Roughly speaking, the use of \(W\) allocates more energy to channel directions with high gains and vise versa. An optimization procedure for \(W\) can be found in [16].
6.2 Partial CSIT Case

We now consider CSIT uncertainty ($\alpha < 1$). For $\alpha = 0$, the precoder structure in (7) is adopted. To facilitate our discussion below, we rewrite (7) as

$$P = V \cdot I \cdot \Pi F$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)

where $V$ can be an arbitrary unitary matrix. It is easy to see that $V$ and $I$ in (37) will not affect the performance.

For $0 < \alpha < 1$, we do not have the optimal solution in this case, so we consider the following heuristic option. Let the SVD of $H$ be $H = UDV^H$. We first pretend that the CSIT is perfect and $H = \overline{H}$ (i.e., we ignore the uncertain part $H_W$). Then the method outlined in 6.1 can be used to design a precoder structure below

$$P = \overline{V} \cdot \overline{W}^{1/2} \cdot \Pi F$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)

where two upper hyphens “” are added on $V$ and $W$ to emphasize that they are obtained using the SVD of $\overline{H}$ rather than $H$. Note that $H_W$ is ignored in this design so the precoder structure in (38) may not be reliable.

On the other hand, we can also assume no CSIT and ignore the available information $\overline{H}$. Then, again, we have the precoder in (37).

We combined the two precoders in (37) and (38) as

$$P = \overline{V}(\beta_1 I + \beta_2 \overline{W})^{1/2} \cdot \Pi F$$  \hspace{1cm} (39)

where $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$ are two nonnegative weight coefficients to be optimized. Intuitively, $\overline{W}$ in (39) has the water-filling effect as mentioned in 6.1, since $\overline{H}$ can still provide information (though imperfect) about the channel condition. Also, the term $I$ in (39) represents a diversity effect against CSIT uncertainty.

We obtain the weight coefficients in (39) using a two-dimensional search. The EXIT chart analysis outlined in Sect. 4 provides a fast means for this purpose.

Provided that the CSIT is imperfect, the condition in (29) cannot be guaranteed in general, thus the mismatching problem demonstrated in Fig. 5 still exists for the precoder in (39). Again, spatial coupling can be applied to treat the problem, as shown in the next subsection.

6.3 Numerical Results

We now present simulation results to demonstrate the performance of the precoder in (39). The simulation settings are as follows. The MIMO channel is quasi-static Rayleigh fading with $M_R = M_T = 4$. The signaling method is QPSK with Gray mapping [19]. An underlying (3, 6) regular LDPC code is used with and without spatial coupling. The coding length is $2^{17}$ for both cases.

The simulated FER performance is shown in Fig. 8. In the case of no CSIT ($\alpha = 0$), there is a gain of about 2 dB between the systems with and without spatial coupling. This gain is verified by EXIT chart analysis based on the area property discussed in 5.3. We can observe that there is still about 0.7 dB gap between the system with spatial coupling and the outage performance. We believe that this gap can be reduced by carefully designing the degree distributions of the SC-LDPC code.

In the case of perfect CSIT ($\alpha = 1$), the precoder in (39) can provide an extra gain (compared with the no CSIT case) of about 5.5 dB (at FER = $10^{-3}$) for the system without spatial coupling and about 4.5 dB for the system with spatial coupling. We can further observe that in the perfect CSIT case, the spatial coupling gain is about 1 dB, which is less than that in the no CSIT case. Furthermore, there is a gap of about 2 dB between the system with spatial coupling and the capacity. We are seeking for a solution for further improvement.

In the case of partial CSIT ($\alpha = 0.9$), the precoder in (39) performs between the two extreme cases of no CSIT and perfect CSIT. Again, in this case, spatial coupling provides noticeable gain.

7. Conclusions

We developed a combined scheme involving LDPC coding, linear precoding and spatial coupling. We derived an analytical method to evaluate the performance based on EXIT functions. We also observed an area property for a spatially coupled system, indicating that error-free decoding can be achieved even the underlying uncoupled system has multiple fixed points in its EXIT chart. This property is very useful to alleviate the uncertainty in partial CSIT which leads to difficulty designing LDPC codes based on the EXIT curve matching technique. Numerical results show that the proposed scheme can achieve excellent performance in MIMO channels with partial CSIT.
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### Appendix

In this appendix, we derive (12). Denote by $a_m$ the $m$-th column vector of $A$. The extrinsic LLR $\ell_m^{\text{LV}}$ is given by (c.f. (4b) in [21])

$$\ell_m^{\text{LV}} = 2a_m^H R^{-1}(r - A\hat{x}) + a_m^H R^{-1}a_m\hat{x}_m - 2\frac{a_m^H R^{-1}a_m}{1 - \bar{\gamma}a_m^H R^{-1}a_m}$$

From (11) and (13), we have

$$\hat{x}_m = \frac{\bar{\gamma}a_m^H R^{-1}(r - A\hat{x})}{(1 - \bar{\gamma}a_m^H R^{-1}a_m)} = \frac{\bar{\gamma}a_m^H R^{-1}(r - A\hat{x})}{\bar{\gamma}a_m^H R^{-1}a_m}$$

Substituting (A-2) and (A-3) into (A-1c), we obtain (12).