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Performance Analysis of Large Multi-User MIMO Systems with Space-Constrained 2D Antenna Arrays
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Abstract—Massive Multiple-Input-Multiple-Output (MIMO) systems deploying a large number of antennas at the base station (BS) have been shown to produce high spectral and energy efficiency (EE) under the assumptions of increasing BS physical space and critical antenna spacing. We examine the deployment of massive MIMO systems and resulting EE with a more realistic scenario considering a 2D rectangular array with increasing antenna elements within a fixed physical space. Mutual coupling and correlation among the BS antennas are incorporated by deriving a practical mutual coupling matrix which considers coupling among all antenna elements within a BS. We also provide a realistic analysis of the energy consumption using a model, which takes into account the circuit power consumptions as a function of the number of BS antennas and then present a performance analysis of two practical low complexity detectors/receivers keeping EE into consideration. The simulation results obtained show that EE does not monotonically increase with the number of BS antennas. On the contrary, it is a decreasing concave or quasi-concave function of the number of BS antennas depending on the detection technique used at the receiver. We also show that with decreasing spacing between the antennas, mutual coupling increases, contributing towards reduction in EE. Our analysis thus shows that EE does not increase infinitely in a massive MIMO system when the increasing number of antennas are to be accommodated within a fixed physical space and the total power consumed is considered to be a function of the antennas. Accordingly, closed-form expressions for the optimum number of antennas to attain maximum EE for zero forcing (ZF) are obtained.

Index Terms—Antenna correlation, antenna coupling, energy efficiency, massive MIMO, spectral efficiency.

I. INTRODUCTION

To meet the ever-increasing demands for the next generation of wireless communication, massive Multiple-Input-Multiple-Output (MIMO) systems are introduced based on the fact that the BS is equipped with a much larger number of antennas than the number of users served [1], [2] which enable us to design simple signal processing algorithms [2] that can attain very high spectral efficiency [3]. Such systems are now being implemented in various wireless communication technologies such as LTE-Advanced [4] and 802.11n [5] to name a few. However, due to the limited availability of wireless spectrum, massive MIMO can be truly exploited only by significantly increasing the number of antennas deployed per unit area [6]. A usual practice when deploying antenna elements is to space them by a distance equal to wavelength of the transmitted frequency or more [1], [7]. One of the constraints towards this end is the limited availability of physical area for deployment of large number of antennas at the base station. Massively densified antenna deployment is a way out but it leads to two effects, namely spatial correlation and antenna mutual coupling. The proximity of the antenna elements as signal sources and electrical components causes antenna correlation and coupling respectively [8].

The nulls and the maximum of the radiation pattern of the antennas are shifted owing to the mutual coupling among them [9]. Mutual coupling effects among antenna elements in 1D linear arrays have widely been studied in [10]-[15]. While [10] and [11] focus on the performance of adaptive arrays when exerted to mutual coupling, [8] and [17] examine the performance of massive MIMO systems with antenna elements affected by mutual coupling owing to constrained physical space. Mutual coupling due to constrained antenna spacing has been stated to deteriorate the performance of MIMO systems by influencing the correlation of the antennas in [18], [19]. Effects of mutual coupling on the radiation patterns of phased arrays were investigated in [20]. Effects of transmit correlation and mutual coupling on linear precoders were analyzed considering large scale MIMO transmitters in [8]. While a considerable amount of work has already been done with regards to antenna coupling in MIMO, its effects are still quite unknown when a massive MIMO scenario with hundreds of antennas at the BS are considered. Also to be noted is that most prior work on effects of antenna coupling on MIMO is based on linear arrays [11]-[13]. Since the need of the hour is to accommodate as many number of antennas as possible, we present a more realistic 2D rectangular antenna array configuration with antennas increasing up to 250. If antenna elements are rigged considering a spacing less than half the wavelength of transmission, a considerable number of antennas will be coupled affecting both the spectral efficiency (SE) and
energy efficiency (EE) of the system. While mutual coupling models for 2D antenna arrays have been ever-present in the field of communications, most existing works on large-scale MIMO systems predict over-optimistic performance assuming arrays with unbounded physical space, the more relevant work in [8] considers only linear arrays and a simplified mutual coupling model. In this work, we consider a more realistic 2D planar array bounded by a fixed physical space with an area of about $1m^2$ and analytically account for the full mutual coupling model of the array.

Any new system developed in the field of communication would demand energy saving as one of its primary design criteria. The advent of technology hasn’t actually reduced the energy consumption of the BS and user equipments (UE); instead energy consumption and power radiation has become a major health and economic hazard over the years [5]. [28] discusses the electrical power consumptions of the power amplifiers, the cooling systems and the associated circuits installed at the BS. While large antenna arrays have been stated to reduce uplink (UL) and downlink (DL) transmit powers due to coherent combining and an increased antenna aperture in [29], [3] claims such systems operate with a total output RF power of magnitude which is two times less than the current technology. Thus, with the emergence of massive MIMO, we can claim to have taken a giant leap towards reducing the consumption of energy in the field of communication. But how massive is the leap and where will it lead us towards conservation of energy? We will try to analyse this question with respect to EE that can be considered to be a very proficient design goal when it comes to developing energy efficient communication systems.

EE of a communication link is usually defined as the total energy required for transmission in order to achieve a specific SE [21], [1]. The significance of the total power consumption in MIMO systems has been emphasized in [22] with respect to EE. MIMO systems have been stated to offer improved EE on account of array gains and diversity effects [33]. A common practice in determining EE is to consider the total transmitted energy to be a constant quantity [1] which aids in reducing the complexity of calculations. Hence, the definition of EE can be quite delusive at times especially when a massive MIMO scenario is considered with the number of antennas increasing asymptotically leading towards unbounded EE which is quite improbable for practical scenarios. The effect of number of BS antennas on EE has been discussed in [5] and [23], while [24] discusses about designing optimal EE for the uplink massive MIMO systems considering both RF and circuit power consumptions. In [30] power optimization techniques were analyzed using Game theory approaches while considering both circuit and transmission powers. A trade-off between the EE and SE was also given in [30].

The focus of this paper is to consider realistic setups of massive MIMO and analyze how large MIMO systems bounded by fixed physical spaces fare to the demands of increasing EE while contributing towards high spectral efficiencies. We re-examine the question- “How many antennas do we need?” [2] by means of EE under a) realistic antenna deployments in fixed physical spaces and b) thorough and pragmatic power consumption models. We reflect on both the uplink and downlink of a multi-user MIMO system which models antenna correlation and coupling at the BS. We calculate the SE and transmitted power for both uplink and downlink and also the EE of this system with the help of a power consumption model similar to [24], incorporating parameters like power consumed by amplifiers and other digital circuits. Our analysis is based on the effect of increasing the number of BS antennas and reducing the antenna spacing on the EE of the system while taking into consideration two practical linear receivers/precoders in maximum ratio combining/transmission (MRC/MRT) and zero forcing (ZF). To obtain a fair comparison, we analyze the EE of massive MIMO systems considering the fixed power consumption for the cases of two current communication technologies- WIFI and LTE. While analytical expression for EE is obtained for ZF only, simulation results are provided for both MRC and ZF. The results provide adequate insights into how future massive MIMO Base stations can be setup within constrained physical spaces.

Notation: All matrices and vectors will be represented in bold uppercase and lowercase symbols respectively while $(.)^T$ and $(.)^H$ are used to denote the transpose and Hermitian transpose of a matrix respectively. $E$ is used to denote the expectation operator. All other symbols will be explicitly mentioned wherever used.

II. System Model

We consider the uplink and downlink of a single cell multi-user MIMO arrangement with one BS equipped with a uniform rectangular 2D antenna array located in a fixed physical space of area $\Delta$. Each row and column of the antenna array consists of $n$ and $m$ dipole antennas respectively with each element separated from the other by a distance $d$ within a row or a
column. \( M = n \times m \) is the total number of antennas receiving signals from \( K \) single-antenna users with \( M \gg K \). The users are assumed to transmit their data in the same time-frequency resource with \( \lambda \) being the carrier wavelength. We also assume that \( d < \lambda/2 \) so that antenna coupling significantly impacts the performance of the system. Furthermore the length and breadth of the rectangular array are \( \alpha \lambda \) and \( \beta \lambda \) \((\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N})\) respectively which leads to the following expressions

\[
\Delta = \alpha \beta \lambda^2, \\
d = \frac{\alpha \lambda}{m - 1} = \frac{\beta \lambda}{n - 1}.
\]

(1)

(2)

Hereinafter, any analysis performed with respect to the \( n \times m \) rectangular array will take into consideration the following assumptions-

a) The antenna elements are placed at uniform intervals.

b) All the elements are identical to each other. In our case we consider dipoles of equal length.

c) All the elements have equal amplitude excitation.

d) The directions of arrivals (DOAs) or directions of departures (DODs) are randomly and independently distributed in angle spread \( \phi \) as a \((D, \phi)\) channel \((D \) is explained later).

Perfect synchronization in time and frequency is considered between the BS and users, which operate in a time division duplex (TDD) protocol. The uplink and downlink channels are assumed to be reciprocal within a coherence block. Moreover, the uplink and downlink transmissions follow a ratio \( \Upsilon^{UL} : \Upsilon^{DL} \) where \( \Upsilon^{UL} \) and \( \Upsilon^{DL} \) are fixed transmission ratios for uplink and downlink respectively [7] with \( \Upsilon^{UL} + \Upsilon^{DL} = 1 \). Let \( T \) be the length of the coherence time interval and \( \Upsilon^{UL}, \Upsilon^{DL} \) are the number of symbols used for uplink and downlink pilots respectively. Uplink training utilizes \( K\Upsilon^{UL} \) of the coherence time interval while downlink training occupies \( K\Upsilon^{DL} \). The BS utilizes the uplink training to estimate the downlink channel.

Let \( W \) represent a semi-correlated frequency-flat channel matrix between the BS and the \( K \) users which is modeled as \( W = H F^\frac{1}{2} \) for uplink with \( H \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Sigma^{UL}_M \otimes I_K) \) representing the uplink channel and \( W = F^\frac{1}{2} H \) for downlink with \( H \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, I_K \otimes \Sigma^{DL}_M) \) representing the downlink channel, where \( \Sigma^{UL}_M = \Sigma^{DL}_M = \Sigma_M \) is the BS correlation matrix, \( \otimes \) denotes the Kronecker product operator and \( F \) is a \( K \times K \) diagonal matrix, where \( F_{kk} = \beta_k \sqrt{\beta_k} \) models the geometric attenuation and shadow fading which is assumed to be independent over \( M \) and constant over several coherence time intervals. This holds true owing to the assumption that \( d < \lambda/\lambda \), where \( \lambda/\lambda \) is the minimum distance between an arbitrary user and the BS and \( \beta_k \) changes very slowly with time.

A. Channel Model with Correlation and Coupling

We examine a single-cell setup with an M-antenna BS and \( K \) single-antenna users. The uplink and downlink channels are modeled as one-sided correlated Rayleigh flat fading channel with no line of sight. We assume the fading to be correlated only at the BS [25]. After incorporating the mutual coupling of the receiving antennas, we model \( H \) for uplink as [8]

\[
H = [h_1, \ldots, h_k, \ldots, h_K],
\]

(3)

where \( h_k \) is the \( M \times 1 \) uplink channel vector of the \( k \)-th user; given as

\[
h_k = \Gamma A^{UL}_k g_k
\]

(4)

and for downlink as

\[
H = [h^T_1, \ldots, h^T_k, \ldots, h^T_K]^T,
\]

(5)

where \( h_k \) is the \( 1 \times M \) downlink channel vector of the \( k \)-th user; given as

\[
h_k = g_k A^{DL}_k \Gamma
\]

(6)

where \( \Gamma \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times M} \) denotes mutual coupling, \( A^{UL}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times D} \) denotes the receive steering matrix during uplink containing \( D \) steering vectors of the receive antenna array with \( D \) denoting the number of direction of arrivals (DOAs) while \( A^{DL}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{D \times M} \) denotes the transmit steering matrix during downlink containing \( D \) steering vectors of the receive antenna array with \( D \) denoting the number of direction of departures (DODs) and the vector \( g_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, I_D) \) whose dimensions for uplink and downlink are \( D \times 1 \) and \( 1 \times D \) respectively. For the sake of simplicity, the number of DOAs and DODs are considered to be equal. Furthermore, for the uplink transmission, \( [HH^H] \sim \mathcal{CW}_K(M, \Sigma_M) \) where \( \mathcal{CW}_q(r, S) \) denotes a complex Wishart distribution with degrees of freedom \( r \), dimension \( q \) and covariance \( S \). Similarly for downlink transmission, \( [HH^H] \sim \mathcal{CW}_K(M, \Sigma_M) \).

B. Channel Correlation at the Transmitter

We consider the antenna array at the BS to be uniformly rectangular as shown in Fig. 1. As stated before, the spacing between two adjacent antennas within a row or a column is considered to be \( d \). Thus without loss of generality, the steering matrix with respect to the \( i \)-th direction of arrival can then be expressed as [16]

\[
A_i = a_c(\phi_i, \theta) a_r(\phi_i, \theta)^T,
\]

(7)

where \( a_c(\theta, \phi) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times 1} \) is the column array steering vector given as

\[
a_c(\phi_i, \theta) = \left[1, e^{j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} d \cos \phi_i \sin \theta}, \ldots, e^{j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} d(n-1) \cos \phi_i \sin \theta}\right]^T
\]

(8)

and \( a_r(\phi, \theta) \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times 1} \) is the row array steering vector given as

\[
a_r(\phi_i, \theta) = \left[1, e^{j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} d \sin \phi_i \sin \theta}, \ldots, e^{j \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} d(m-1) \sin \phi_i \sin \theta}\right]^T.
\]

(9)
Using the vector valued operator vec\{·\}, which maps a \(m \times n\) matrix to a \(mn \times 1\) column vector by stacking the columns of the matrix, the array steering matrix may be transformed to a 2-D array steering vector as
\[
a(\phi_i, \theta) = \text{vec}(A_i). \tag{10}\]
The \(M \times D\) steering matrix of the rectangular array for uplink can now be given as
\[
A^{UL} = [a(\phi_1, \theta), \ldots, a(\phi_i, \theta), \ldots, a(\phi_D, \theta)], \tag{11}\]
where \(a(\phi_i, \theta) \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times 1}\) for \(i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, D\). Similarly for downlink the \(D \times M\) steering matrix is given as
\[
A^{DL} = [a(\phi_1, \theta)^T, \ldots, a(\phi_i, \theta)^T, \ldots, a(\phi_D, \theta)^T]^T. \tag{12}\]
Hereinafter, for notational simplicity, we represent the uplink and downlink steering matrix with the same notation \(A\). However, the property of the matrix will be clearly mentioned, wherever used. Throughout this paper we consider \(d\) to be equidistant and the \(D\) DOAs and DODs are randomly and independently distributed in an angle spread determined by the azimuth \(\phi_i \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}], i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, D\) and the same elevation \(\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]\). Different degrees of transmit correlation are obtained by varying \(\phi\) of the semi-correlated \((D, \phi)\) channel.

C. Mutual Coupling at the Transmitter

When multiple antennas radiating simultaneously are located in the proximity of each other within a fixed physical space, the electric field of one antenna impacts the distribution of current of the adjacent antennas, which leads to the radiation pattern and input impedance of each antenna being disturbed [18]. This phenomenon is known as antenna coupling.

Our system model is characterized by mutual coupling among linear dipole antennas of length \(l\) which are arranged in a planar configuration with uniform square grids and rectangular boundary as shown in Fig. 1 and described earlier. The mutual coupling matrix, \(\Gamma\) is defined as [9]
\[
\Gamma = (Z_L + Z_A)(Z + Z_L I)^{-1}, \tag{13}\]
where \(Z_L, Z_A\) and \(Z\) denote load impedance, antenna impedance and mutual impedance matrix respectively. \(Z\) can be constructed as a \(M \times M\) matrix, which is given in (14) on top of the following page, where \(Z_{(i,k),(j,l)}\) denotes the mutual impedance between antenna located at the \(i\)th row and \(k\)th column and the antenna located at the \(j\)th row and \(l\)th column of the rectangular array with \(i, j \in 1, 2, \ldots, n\) and \(k, l \in 1, 2, \ldots, m\).

The correlation matrix at the BS for uplink can be given as
\[
\Sigma_M^{UL} = E\{HH^H\} = \Gamma \Gamma^H \text{A} \text{A}^H \Gamma^H = K\alpha \text{A} \text{A}^H \Gamma^H. \tag{15}\]
Similarly, the correlation matrix at the BS for downlink is given as
\[
\Sigma_M^{DL} = K\Gamma^H \text{A} \text{A}^H \Gamma. \tag{16}\]
Since \(\Sigma_M^{UL} = \Sigma_M^{DL} = \Sigma_M\), we will ignore the superscripts \(UL\) and \(DL\) henceforth.

Example 1. Assume that the antennas at the BS are rigged in a uniform planar array with square grids and rectangular boundary as shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. Applying simple algebraic operations on the Cartesian co-ordinates of the rectangular array can now be given as
\[
d_{(i,j),(k,l)} = d \sqrt{(i - j)^2 + (k - l)^2}, \tag{17}\]
where \(i, j, k, l\) are described as before.

\(d_{(i,j),(k,l)}\) plays a significant role in determining the mutual impedance, \(Z_{(i,k),(j,l)}\) which based on current maximum at the input antenna terminal is given by the EMF method as [4]
\[
Z_{(i,k),(j,l)} = R_{(i,k),(j,l)} + jX_{(i,k),(j,l)}, \tag{18}\]
where, \(R_{(i,k),(j,l)}\) and \(X_{(i,k),(j,l)}\) are self-mutual-resistance and self-mutual-reactance between antenna located at the \(i\)th row and \(k\)th column and the antenna located at the \(j\)th row and \(l\)th column respectively and given as [9]
\[
R_{(i,k),(j,l)} = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi \epsilon_0} [2C_{in}(u_0) - C_{in}(u_1) - C_{in}(u_2)], \tag{19}\]
and
\[
X_{(i,k),(j,l)} = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi \epsilon_0} [2S_{in}(u_0) - S_{in}(u_1) - S_{in}(u_2)], \tag{20}\]
where \(\mu_0\) and \(\epsilon_0\) denote the magnetic and electric constants, \(u_0 = 2\pi d_{(i,j),(k,l)}, u_1 = 2\pi \left( l + \sqrt{d_{(i,k),(j,l)}^2 + l^2} \right)\) and \(u_2 = 2\pi \left( l + \sqrt{d_{(i,j),(k,l)}^2 + l^2} \right)\), \(C_{in}(\cdot)\) and \(S_{in}(\cdot)\) are cosine and sine integral functions respectively and defined as
\[
C_{in}(a) = \gamma + \ln(a) + \int_0^a \frac{\cos t - 1}{t} dt, \tag{21}\]
and
\[
S_{in}(a) = \int_0^a \frac{\sin t}{t} dt, \tag{22}\]
where \(\gamma\) is the Euler-Mascheroni constant and \(l\) is the length.
of the dipole antenna.

The electrical and magnetic parameters of the antennas are considered to be equal for every antenna. Hence, considering equal spacing among the antennas along row and column of the rectangular array, the following properties for the mutual impedance matrix $Z$ can be obtained:

a) $Z$ is a symmetric. Let $Z_{uv}$ be the element in the $u$th row and $v$th column of $Z$. Then

$$Z_{uv} = Z_{vu}. \quad (23)$$

b) $Z$ is a Toeplitz matrix. Thus

$$Z_{uv} = Z_{(u+1)(v+1)}. \quad (24)$$

c) $Z$ has $2M - 1$ degrees of freedom.

Remark 1. Let $Z_{pq} = Z_{(i,k)(j,l)}$, where $p, q \in 1, 2, \ldots, M$. If $p = q$, then $\Gamma_{pq} = Z_A$, where $Z_A$ denotes antenna or self impedance.

### III. Spectral Efficiency and Transmitted Power

#### A. Uplink

During uplink transmission, the $K$ users transmit their data in the same time-frequency resource. Thus the $M \times 1$ received vector at the BS can be given as

$$y = WP^{UL}x + z, \quad (25)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times 1}$ is the symbol transmitted by the $K$ users. $P^{UL}$ is a $K \times K$ diagonal matrix with the vector $P^{UL} = \begin{bmatrix} p_1^{UL} & \cdots & p_K^{UL} \end{bmatrix}$ constituting the diagonal where $p_i^{UL}$ is the average transmitted power of each user and $p_i^{UL} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, K$ and $z$ is a vector of additive white Gaussian noise with zero mean. Without loss of generality the variance of $z$ is considered to be 1 to reduce complexity.

For the detection of $x$, the BS uses a $M \times K$ linear detector, $V$ on $y$ [5]. The signal and noise plus interference components of the processed received signal for the $k$th user after detection can thus be given as [5]

$$r_k = p_k^{UL}v_k^Hw_kx_k + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{K} p_i^{UL}v_i^Hw_i x_i + v_k^Hn, \quad (26)$$

where $r_k$ and $x_k$ are the $k$th elements of vectors $r$ and $x$ respectively while $p_k^{UL}$ is the power transmitted by the $k$th user. We consider two low complexity detection schemes, namely MRC and ZF at the BS. Hence,

$$V = \begin{cases} W, & \text{for MRC} \\ W(W^HW)^{-1}, & \text{for ZF} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

Assuming the channel to be ergodic, the ratio of the signal power of the $k$th user to the noise-plus-interference term (SINR) can be given as

$$\gamma^{UL}_k = \frac{p_k^{UL}|v_k^Hw_k|^2}{\sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{K} p_i^{UL}|v_k^Hw_i|^2 + ||v_k||^2}. \quad (28)$$

Throughout this paper we assume the target SINR to be provided to each of the $K$ users is equal. To achieve this equal SINR condition, we use the approach given in [26] for solving the power control problem in mobile scenarios using Perron’s theorem.

Let us define a matrix $\Psi \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K}$, where

$$\Psi_{k,i} = \begin{cases} \frac{|v_k^Hw_i|^2}{||v_k||^2}, & \text{for } i \neq k \\ \frac{|v_k^Hw_i|^2}{||v_k||^2}, & \text{for } i = k. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Since, in our analysis the variance of $z$ is considered to be 1, therefore, to meet the equal SINR condition for the $K$ users, the uplink power vector $p^{UL}$ has to satisfy the following condition [[26], eq. (29-33)]

$$p^{UL} \Psi = 1_{(1 \times K)}. \quad (30)$$

Simplifying (29) and (30), the power assigned to each uplink user can be given as

$$p_k^{UL} = \frac{\gamma^{UL}_k}{q_k - \gamma^{UL}_kG_{ki}}, \quad (31)$$

where,

$$q_k = \frac{|v_k^Hw_k|^2}{||v_k||^2} \quad \text{and} \quad G_{ki} = \begin{cases} \frac{|v_k^Hw_i|^2}{||v_k||^2}, & \text{for } i \neq k \\ 0, & \text{for } i = k. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

The total transmitted power for $K$ users during uplink can be given as

$$P^{UL} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} p_k^{UL}. \quad (33)$$

The model in [26] can be looked upon as a simplified generalization of our model without the mutual coupling effects. The power loss due to mutual coupling, $P^{\text{cou}}$ in no way impacts the powers allocated to the users as this power loss is totally compensated for at the BS with additional circuitry. Moreover, any disparities in power distribution can also be accounted for by properly designing efficient detector or precoder matrices to meet the specific power constraints of the system.
now be given as
\[ p_{i}^{UL} = E \{ 1_{\{1 \times K \}} \mathbf{P}^{UL} \}. \] (33)

**Remark 2.** The power allocation problem states \( p_{k}^{UL} > 0 \).
Hence, the necessary condition for \( p_{k}^{UL} \) to have a positive solution is that \( q_{k} - \gamma_{k} G_{ki} \) be non-negative for \( \gamma_{k} > 0 \).

We now define the uplink SE for the \( k \)th user as [1]
\[ R_{k}^{UL} = \frac{\left( \frac{r^{UL}}{r^{UL} - \tau^{UL} K} \right) \tilde{R}_{k}^{UL}}{T} \] (34)

where \( A \in \{ MRC, ZF \} \), \( T \) is the coherence interval in symbols, \( \tau^{UL} \) is the transmitted uplink pilot sequence and \( r^{UL} \) is the fraction of uplink transmission as described earlier.

**Definition 1.** Let a \( p \times p \) matrix, \( Q \sim \mathcal{C} \mathcal{W}_{p}(q, S) \), where \( p \) is the dimension, \( q \) is the degree of freedom and \( S \) is the covariance. Then from [27] for any integer \( r > 0 \),

1. \( E \{ Q^{r} \} = \tilde{c}(r, q, p) S \), where \( \tilde{c}(r, q, p) \) is a constant depending on \( r, q, p \). If \( r = 1 \), then \( \tilde{c}(1, q, p) = q \). Hence, \( E \{ Q \} = q S \) and \( E \{ tr(Q) \} = pq S \).
2. If \( r = 1 \), then \( E \{ Q^{r} \} = \tilde{c}(1, q, p) S^{-1} \) and \( \tilde{c}(1, q, p) = (p - q)^{-1} \). Hence, \( E \{ Q^{-1} \} = (p - q)^{-1} S^{-1} \) and \( E \{ tr(Q^{-1}) \} = p(p - q)^{-1} S^{-1} \).

**Proposition 1.** The first negative moment of the SINR for the \( k \)th user assuming \( M > 2 \), perfect CSI and MRC detection at the BS can then be given as
\[ E \{ \gamma_{k}^{UL-MRC} \}^{-1} = \frac{Tr[\Sigma_{M}^{-1}]}{p_{k}^{UL}(M - 1) \beta_{k}}. \] (35)

Accordingly, the uplink rate can be given as
\[ \tilde{R}_{k}^{UL-MRC} = \log_{2} \left( 1 + \left\{ E \{ \gamma_{k}^{UL-MRC} \} \right\}^{-1} \right) = \log_{2} \left( 1 + \frac{p_{k}^{UL}(M - 1) \beta_{k}}{Tr[\Sigma_{M}^{-1}] \left( Tr[\Sigma_{M}] \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{K} p_{i}^{UL} \beta_{i} + 1 \right)} \right). \] (36)

Now if \( \tilde{\gamma}_{k} \) is the minimum target SINR required to achieve a minimum rate of \( \tilde{R}_{k} \) for the \( k \)th user, then the power required can be given as
\[ p_{k}^{UL-MRC} = \frac{Tr[\Sigma_{M}^{-1}] \gamma_{k}^{UL-MRC}}{(M - 1) \beta_{k} - \gamma_{k}^{UL-MRC} Tr[\Sigma_{M}] \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{K} \beta_{i}}. \] (37)

**Proof.** See Appendix A.

**Proposition 2.** The first negative moment of the SINR for the \( k \)th user assuming \( M > K + 1 \), perfect CSI and ZF detection at the BS can thus be given as
\[ E \{ \gamma_{k}^{UL-ZF} \}^{-1} = \frac{Tr[\Sigma_{M}^{-1}]}{p_{k}(M - K) \beta_{k}}. \] (38)

Accordingly, the uplink rate can be given as
\[ \tilde{R}_{k}^{UL-ZF} = \log_{2} \left( 1 + \left\{ E \{ \gamma_{k}^{UL-ZF} \} \right\}^{-1} \right) = \log_{2} \left( 1 + \frac{p_{k}^{UL}(M - K) \beta_{k}}{Tr[\Sigma_{M}^{-1}]} \right). \] (39)

If \( \tilde{\gamma}_{k} \) is the minimum target SINR required to achieve a minimum rate of \( \tilde{R}_{k} \) for the \( k \)th user, then the power required can be given as
\[ p_{k}^{UL-ZF} = \frac{Tr[\Sigma_{M}^{-1}] \gamma_{k}^{UL-ZF}}{(M - K) \beta_{k}}. \] (40)

**Proof.** See Appendix B.

**B. Downlink**

Since we use TDD transmission technique, the downlink channel can be represented as a Hermitian transpose of the uplink channel. The BS transmits data streams simultaneously to all the \( K \) users which creates an interfering broadcast channel. To encounter its effect we use a \( M \times K \) precoding matrix at the BS denoted by \( T \). The signal received by the \( k \)th user can be given as
\[ r_{k} = p_{k}^{DL} f_{k}^{H} t_{k} x_{k} + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{K} p_{i}^{DL} f_{k}^{H} t_{i} x_{i} + z_{k}, \] (41)

where \( x \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times 1} \) is the symbol transmitted by \( M \) antennas. \( p_{k}^{DL} \) is the power corresponding to the \( k \)th user similar to uplink with the same constraints while \( z_{k} \) is the noise associated with the \( k \)th user. \( t_{k} \) is the vector of the precoding matrix associated with the \( k \)th user and \( f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{TT^{H}}} \) is a normalization parameter to constrain the average transmitted power. Almost identical to the case of uplink, we consider two linear precoding schemes namely MRT and ZF. Accordingly,
\[ T = \begin{cases} \mathbf{W}, & \text{for MRT} \\ \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{W}^{H} \mathbf{W})^{-1}, & \text{for ZF} \end{cases} \] (42)

The desired SINR can thus be given as
\[ \gamma_{k}^{DL} = \frac{p_{k}^{DL} \frac{|w_{k}^{H} t_{k}|^{2}}{||t_{k}||^{2}}}{\sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{K} p_{i}^{DL} \frac{|w_{k}^{H} t_{i}|^{2}}{||t_{i}||^{2}} + 1}. \] (43)

Similar to uplink, we assume the target SINR to be provided to each of the \( K \) users is equal. Following the same approach as used to derive (31), the downlink power for the \( k \)th user can be assigned as
\[ p_{k}^{DL} = \gamma_{k}^{DL} \frac{q_{k}^{DL}}{q_{k} - \gamma_{k} G_{ki}}, \] (44)

where
\[ q_{k} = \frac{|w_{k}^{H} t_{k}|^{2}}{||t_{k}||^{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad G_{ki} = \begin{cases} \frac{|w_{k}^{H} t_{k}|^{2}}{||t_{k}||^{2}}, & \text{for } i \neq k \\ 0, & \text{for } i = k. \end{cases} \] (45)
The total transmitted power for $K$ users during downlink can now be given as
\[ p^D_L = E\{1_{(1\times K)}P^D_L\}. \]  

**Remark 3.** Adhering to the power constraint $p^D_L > 0$, the necessary condition for $p^D_L$ to have a positive solution is that
\[ q_k - \gamma^{D_L}_{k}G_{k} \text{ be non-negative for } \gamma^{D_L}_{k} > 0. \]

The downlink rate similar to the uplink for the $k$th user can now be given as
\[ R^D_{k} = \frac{T\gamma^{D_L}_{k} - \tau^{D_L}}{T} \tilde{R}^D_{k} - A, \]  
where $A \in \{MRC, ZF\}$, $T$ is the coherence interval in symbols, $\tau^{D_L}$ is the transmitted downlink pilot sequence and $\gamma^{D_L}_{k}$ is the fraction of downlink transmission as described earlier.

**Proposition 3.** With $M \geq 2$ and assuming perfect CSI and MRC detection at the BS, the first negative moment of the SINR for the $k$th user can be given as
\[ E((\gamma^{D_L}_{k} - MRC)^{-1}) = \frac{Tr[\Sigma_M^{-1}]}{p^D_L (M - 1)\beta_k}. \]  
The downlink rate, $\tilde{R}^D_{k} - MRC$, follows accordingly similar to proposition 1. Also if $\gamma^{D_L}_{k}$ is the minimum target SINR required to achieve a minimum rate of $\tilde{R}_k$, then the power required can be given as
\[ p^{D_L - MRC} = \frac{\tilde{R}^D_{k} - \gamma^{D_L}_{k}MRC}{(M - 1)\beta_k - \gamma^{D_L}_{k}MRC Tr[\Sigma_M] \sum_{i=1,i \neq k}^{K} \beta_i}. \]  

**IV. ENERGY EFFICIENCY**

EE of a communication link as stated in Section I is the total transmit energy consumption required per bit i.e., ratio of the sum rate achieved to the consumed power, and can be expressed in bits/joule as [1], [7], [21], [31], [32], [35].

\[ \xi^A = \frac{R^A}{p^{PA} + p^{RF} + p^{Coup}}, \]  
where $R^A = \sum_{k=1}^{K}(R^U_{k} - A + R^D_{k} - A)$ is the total sum rate for the $K$ users through an entire process of uplink and downlink, $p^{PA}$ is the power consumed by the power amplifiers, $p^{RF}$ is the power consumed by the RF components of the systems, $p^{Coup}$ is the power loss due to mutual coupling among the antennas located in close proximity of each other and $A \in \{MRC, ZF\}$.

**Remark 4.** In order to obtain insights on how the number of antennas, the physical space and the transmitted power affect the total EE of a massive MIMO system, it makes sense to look at the total rate and divide it by the total power. Hence, the EE metric used in this paper focuses on the total rate and power of both uplink and downlink. Following [7], [31], [32], we look at the system as a whole, but with the important discrepancy that the increase in the number of BS antennas happens in a fixed physical space.

**A. Power Amplifiers**

The average power in watt consumed by the power amplifiers during uplink and downlink can be approximated as [21], [7]
\[ p^{PA} = p^{U_L} (\alpha^{U_L} + 1) + p^{D_L} (\alpha^{D_L} + 1), \]  
where $\alpha^{U_L} = \frac{c^{U_L}}{\eta^{U_L}} - 1$ and $\alpha^{D_L} = \frac{c^{D_L}}{\eta^{D_L}} - 1$ with $c^{U_L}$ and $\eta^{D_L}$ being the modulation-dependent peak to average power ratios (PAPR) for uplink and downlink respectively while $\eta^{U_L}$ and $\eta^{D_L}$ are the power amplifier efficiencies at the UD and BS respectively and $p^{U_L}, p^{D_L}$ are the transmitted powers in the uplink and downlink respectively as described earlier. It is to be noted that the total PAPR for UL and DL is equal to 1.

**B. RF Chains**

The average power in watt consumed in the RF chains for a typical MIMO transmitter-receiver set can be given as [21]
\[ p^{RF} = p^{f_{fix}} + M p^{BS} + K p^{DE}, \]  
where $p^{f_{fix}}$ is the fixed power consumption at the BS dependent on the processing scheme $A \in \{MRC, ZF\}$, $p^{BS}$ is the...
power required at the BS to run the circuit components, $p^{UE}$ is the power associated with the user equipments which are defined as follows

$$p^{BS} = p_{mix}^{BS} + p_{filt}^{BS} + p_{ADC}^{BS} + p_{DAC}^{BS} + p_{OSC}^{BS},$$  \(55\)

$$p^{UE} = p_{mix}^{UE} + p_{filt}^{UE} + p_{ADC}^{UE} + p_{DAC}^{UE} + p_{OSC}^{UE},$$  \(56\)

where $p_{mix}, p_{filt}, p_{ADC}, p_{DAC}$ and $p_{OSC}$ denote the power consumed by the mixers, filters, analog-to-digital converters, digital-to-analog converters and local oscillators respectively.

### C. Mutual Coupling

The mutual coupling effect among antennas in the vicinity of each other as discussed earlier increases the power consumption of the system. Applying simple circuit theory analysis on Fig. 2, the terminal voltage for a particular antenna at the BS can be given as [10]

$$v_i = \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{M} i_j \Gamma_{i,j},$$  \(57\)

where, $v_i$ denotes the terminal voltage at the $i$th antenna element due to a unity current in the $j$th antenna element when the current in all other antenna elements is zero and $\Gamma_{i,j}$ is the total mutual coupling experienced by the $i$th antenna element due to all other antennas as discussed in section III. Furthermore, $i_{BS} = [i_1, i_2, i_3, \ldots, i_M]^T$, and $v_{BS} = [v_1, v_2, v_3, \ldots, v_M]^T$ where, $i_{BS}$ and $v_{BS}$ are vectors of currents and voltages respectively associated with the dipole antennas in the rectangular array. The power loss due to coupling based on the current maximum now follows as

$$p^{coup} = v_{BS}^*i_{BS}.$$  \(58\)

In order to maintain a fixed SINR, this loss is compensated at the BS. Using (52)-(58) we now derive an analytical expression for $\xi$. For the sake of simplicity, we consider the minimum SINR, $\gamma$ targeted for every users to be equal for both uplink and downlink.

Hereinafter, we consider a minimum fixed rate, $\bar{R}$ to be provided to each and every user for both uplink and downlink which leads to the uplink and downlink rates being $\Upsilon^{UL}\bar{R}$ and $\Upsilon^{DL}\bar{R}$ respectively. Thus the total SE of the system for one complete cycle of uplink and downlink can be given as

$$R^A = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left[ \left( \frac{T\Upsilon^{UL} - K\tau^{UL}}{T} \right) \bar{R}_k^{UL} - A \ight. \right.$$  

$$\left. + \left( \frac{T\Upsilon^{DL} - K\tau^{DL}}{T} \right) \bar{R}_k^{DL} \right]$$

$$= K\bar{R} \left[ T - K(\tau^{UL} + \tau^{DL}) \right].$$  \(59\)

*Proposition 5.* Taking into account the diversity loss due to mutual coupling, we aim at guaranteeing a minimum rate of $\bar{R}$. We accomplish this by dynamically allocating power to the users and hence, define a parameter $\bar{p} = f(\gamma, \bar{R})$. Therefore, considering ZF processing at the BS, with no loss of generality, we can define $\bar{R}$ as

$$\bar{R} = \log_2(1 + \bar{p}(M - K)).$$  \(60\)

Thus the total power consumed by the power amplifiers during one complete cycle of uplink and downlink when a ZF processing scheme is employed at the BS is

$$p^{PA}_{ZF} = K\bar{R}T\left[\frac{\xi^{UL}}{\eta^{UL}} + \frac{\xi^{DL}}{\eta^{DL}}\right].$$  \(61\)

*Proof.* See Appendix C.

### D. Energy Efficiency and Analytical Optimum of $M$ for ZF

The EE of the system now follows from (50) on top of the following page as (62), where $p^{BS}, p^{UE}$, and $p^{coup}$ are obtained from (53), (54) and (58) respectively.

*Definition 2.* If a local maximum exists in a strictly quasi-concave function, it is also the global maximum [37]. This global optimum can then be obtained by setting the partial derivative of the quasi-concave function to zero.

*Proposition 6.* Considering ZF processing scheme at BS and diversity loss due to mutual coupling, the maximum number of antennas, $M$ that can be accommodated within a fixed physical space, $\Delta$ which maximizes the EE, $\xi^{ZF}$ can be given on top of the following page as (63), where $W(*)$ is the product logarithm function and $e = 2.71828$ is the Euler’s number. The rest of the parameters have already been discussed before.

*Proof.* See Appendix D.

Furthermore, it can also be shown that the stationary point $M_{max}$ is also a global maximum and the EE curve is quasi-concave, which increases for $K + 1 \leq M \leq M_{max}$, attains a global maximum, $M_{max}$ and then decreases for $M_{max} \leq M \leq \infty$ (See Appendix D).

At this point it is worth mentioning the relation between $S_{M}$ and $M$. While there is no explicit mathematical expression relating these two parameters directly, from (15) it can be seen that $S_{M}$ is related to $\Gamma$, which in turn is related to $Z$ through (13-16). However, $Z$ depends on $n, n$ and the distance $d$ through (17-22). Since the physical space $\Delta$ of the antenna array is constant, any changes made on $M$ will affect the mutual coupling $Z$ and subsequently the resulting correlation $S_{M}$, which is indeed intuitive.

*Proposition 7.* Considering ZF processing scheme at BS and diversity loss due to mutual coupling, the parameter $\bar{p}$ that maximizes the EE, $\xi^{ZF}$ provided $M$ is kept constant can be given on top of the following page as (64).

*Proof.* See Appendix E.
To comprehend the effects of constrained physical spaces in a carrier wavelength:

B. Proposed model- Antenna spacing less than half the carrier wavelength:

In this sub-section we analyze the behaviour of the proposed model by increasing the number of antennas at the BS while keeping the area of the rectangular array fixed. Typically for a fixed physical spacing, increasing the number of antennas is associated with decreasing the antenna spacing; thus increasing mutual coupling which in turn reduces the EE. Therefore, there is a fundamental trade-off between the EE of the system and the number of antennas at the BS, which will be evident from the simulation results.

Fig. 3 illustrates the SE of the proposed system with a fixed physical space and shows its variation as a function of $M$. The spacing among the antennas varies depending on the number of antennas which in turn affects the mutual coupling matrix. Here we show the achievable SE in a massive MIMO system with coupling, considering MRC/MRT and ZF detection and precoding at the BS. The length and width of the array are constrained as $\alpha = 5$ and $\beta = 5$ which is kept fixed hereinafter unless stated otherwise. We increment the total number of antennas in squares. For example, $n = 1, 3, 5, \ldots$ and $m = 1, 3, 5, \ldots$ which implies $M = 1, 9, 25, \ldots$ where $n$ and $m$ are the number of antennas along the width and length respectively of the array. As expected with the increase in $M$, the SE of the system also increases. We note however, that the improvement in SE saturates for high numbers of antennas due to the significant correlation and coupling. For the same reason ZF outperforms MRC by a large extent. Also it can be seen that systems corresponding to LTE systems with a lower fixed transmission power offer higher SE as compared to WIFI systems with a higher fixed transmission power offer higher SE as compared to WIFI systems with a lower fixed transmission power.
not bounded by any limitations while for the other, a similar setting to Fig. 3 is considered. For the first setting, the antennas are spaced far apart to negate any effects of coupling. This figure provides insights into EE of massive MIMO systems with and without coupling with MRC detection/precoding. We plot the EE with respect to the number of BS antennas $M$. The dashed lines show the performances of WIFI systems while the continuous line represents LTE systems like before. Now as $d$ is inversely proportional to $M$, it decreases with increasing $M$; thus also decreasing EE which is evident from the curve. For example, for $M = 100$ the EE falls from 4.8 Kbits/J (without coupling) to 2.7 Kbits/J when coupling is considered. Also to be noted is the shape of the EE curve. As stated in proposition 6, the EE curve considering coupling is seen to be concave. However, the EE curve without coupling is also seen to be concave which eventually decreases with increasing $M$. This is due to the more accurate power consumption model we have used in the paper, which is further exacerbated by the increasing correlation between the antennas. For example, each antenna at the BS has its individual circuitry, which has non-zero power consumption and hence the power consumed by the BS is a multiple of the number of antennas, $M$. Most existing works consider $p^{BS}$ to be constant and accordingly when $M$ goes to infinity, the EE becomes unbounded. Our results on the contrary show that when the power at the BS is equal to $Mp^{BS}$ the EE does not always increase and is a concave function of $M$. Furthermore, when coupling is not considered, $p^RF$ in (52) still holds with $\xi^FF$ in (60) staying the same but without the mutual coupling term, $Tr[\Sigma_{\otimes}]$ which can be shown to be concave similar to what was shown in proposition 6.

Moreover, WIFI systems with low power consumption naturally perform better from EE point of view like before but when coupling is considered the gap in their performances reduces with the increase in the number of antennas, $M$. Furthermore, depending on the system model and channel detection/precoding technique used, it is a concave or quasi-concave function of $M$.

Hereinafter, we consider three scenarios with three different physical spaces: a) $\Delta = 3\lambda \times 3\lambda$, b) $\Delta = 5\lambda \times 5\lambda$, c) $\Delta = 7\lambda \times 7\lambda$. Fig. 5 considers scenario (a) and compares the performances of MRC/MRT and ZF with respect to EE considering mutual coupling at the BS. The settings are kept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of coherence interval, $T$</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Length of the dipoles, $l$</td>
<td>$0.5\lambda$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction of UL Transmission, $\Upsilon^{UL}$</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>PAPR uplink, $\zeta^{UL}$</td>
<td>$0.4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction of DL Transmission, $\Upsilon^{DL}$</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>PAPR downlink, $\zeta^{DL}$</td>
<td>$0.6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel coherence time, $T_c$</td>
<td>1 ms</td>
<td>PA efficiency BS, $\eta^{DL}$</td>
<td>$0.39$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of pilots, $\tau^{UL}, \tau^{DL}$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PA efficiency UE, $\eta^{UL}$</td>
<td>$0.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Array length, $\alpha\lambda$</td>
<td>$5\lambda$</td>
<td>$p^{WIFI}_{fix}$</td>
<td>$25$ dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Array width, $\beta\lambda$</td>
<td>$5\lambda$</td>
<td>$p^{LTE}_{fix}$</td>
<td>$34$ dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antenna impedance, $Z_A$</td>
<td>$50\Omega$</td>
<td>$P_{BS}$</td>
<td>$33$ dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load impedance, $Z_L$</td>
<td>$50\Omega$</td>
<td>$P_{OSC}$</td>
<td>$17$ dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length:Width ratio of array, $\alpha : \beta$</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>$P_{mix} + P_{filt}^{BS} + P_{DAC}^{BS} + P_{DAC}^{UE}$</td>
<td>$30$ dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of DODs/DOAs, $D$</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$P_{mix} + P_{filt}^{UE} + P_{DAC}^{BU} + P_{DAC}^{UE}$</td>
<td>$16.9$ dBm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3: Spectral Efficiency with respect to $M$ using MRC/MRT and ZF detection/precoding at the BS for two fixed power consumption schemes. In this example, $\alpha = 5$ and $\beta = 5$.

Fig. 4: Energy Efficiency with respect to $M$ with and without coupling at the BS using MRC detection/precoding at the BS for two fixed power consumption schemes. In this example, $\alpha = 5$ and $\beta = 5$. 
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to the consideration of the circuit power consumption at
the BS which is a function of \( M \), though the SE increases
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been taken into consideration in the previous results and figures, this figure specifically explains the variation of power loss due to mutual coupling. The settings are kept similar to Fig. 3. It can be seen from the figure that as the spacing between antennas is reduced, mutual coupling increases and so does the power loss due to coupling. The large variation between the $3\lambda \times 3\lambda$ and the other two curves is due to more compact physical spacing among the antennas, which results in more loss due to mutual coupling. As stated before, we aim at restricting the physical space to within $1\text{m}^2$. Hence, for example, considering about 100 antennas for the case of $3\lambda \times 3\lambda$ scenario, the spacing between any two adjacent antennas is equal to $0.1\lambda$, which is less than half the wavelength of a 900 MHz GSM band and this introduces increasing amount of mutual coupling with increasing numbers of antennas. The constructive and destructive superposition of the signals due to mutual coupling is periodic with this decrease in separation for a fixed wavelength, which contributes to the periodic behavior of the power loss.

Fig. 8: An illustration of the trade-off between energy efficiency and spectral efficiency. In this example, $\alpha = 5$ and $\beta = 5$.

Fig. 9: Power loss due to mutual coupling with respect to $M$ considering different array dimensions.

VI. CONCLUSION

Conventionally, massive MIMO systems are considered to achieve high EE with the increase in number of BS antennas which might be misleading when antenna coupling along with circuit power consumptions are considered. We have given an analysis of the effects of mutual coupling on the EE for realistic massive MIMO systems. Simulation results show that as the spacing between the antennas is reduced, the coupling among them increases, resulting in a dip in EE performance. We also reveal that the EE is a decreasing concave or quasi-concave function of $M$. A trade-off between the number of antennas, $M$, the fixed physical space, $\Delta$ and EE is found. Depending on the physical space, optimum number of antennas are found with the objective of achieving high EE. It is evident that high EE can be obtained but at the cost of reducing $M$ or increasing $\Delta$.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

For MRC, $\gamma_{k}^{UL-MRC} = \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{K} p_i^{UL} ||w_i||^4}{\sum_{i=1}^{K} p_i^{UL} ||w_i||^2 + ||w_i||^2} \right)$. Dividing both the numerator and denominator by $||w_k||^2$ and defining $\bar{w}_i = \frac{w_i^H w_i}{||w_i||^2}$, where $\bar{w}$ is a Gaussian random variable with variance $Tr(\Sigma_M)\beta_i$, we have

$$E\{\gamma_{k}^{UL-MRC}\} = \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{K} p_i^{UL} E\{||\bar{w}_i||^2\} + 1}{p_k^{UL} ||w_k||^2} \right).$$  
(65)

Now using the property $||A|| = \sqrt{Tr(A^H A)}$ and definition 1, we have

$$E\{\gamma_{k}^{UL-MRC}\} = \left( \frac{Tr(\Sigma_M) \sum_{i=1}^{K} p_i^{UL} \beta_i + 1}{p_k^{UL} (M - 1) \beta_k} \right).$$  
(66)

Following a similar approach on (33), we obtain (37).

APPENDIX B

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

For ZF, $\gamma_{k}^{UL-ZF} = \frac{p_k^{UL}}{||W^H W||^{-1}_{kk}}$. Hence

$$E\{[W^H W]^{-1}\}_{kk} = \frac{1}{K\beta_k} E\{[W^H W]^{-1}\} = \frac{Tr(\Sigma_M^{-1})}{p_k^{UL}(M-K)\beta_k},$$  
(67)

which is obtained by using definition 1. Now from (33) and (38) we obtain (40).

APPENDIX C

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3

For ZF, $\gamma_{k}^{UL-ZF} = \frac{p_k^{UL}}{||W^H W||^{-1}_{kk}}$. Hence, from (60) we have, $p_k^{ZF} = \bar{p}(M-K)[[W^H W]^{-1}]_{kk}$. Therefore, using
definition 1 and from (40), (51) and (53) we have
\[
p^{PA}_Z = Kp(M - K)\left(\frac{\zeta^{UL}}{\eta_{UL}} + \frac{\zeta^{DL}}{\eta_{DL}}\right)E\left\{Tr\left[(W^H W)^{-1}\right]\right\}
\]
\[
= Kp(M - K)\left(\frac{\zeta^{UL}}{\eta_{UL}} + \frac{\zeta^{DL}}{\eta_{DL}}\right)\frac{Tr\left[\Sigma^{-1}_M\right]}{M - K}
\]
\[
= KpTr[\Sigma^{-1}_M]\left(\frac{\zeta^{UL}}{\eta_{UL}} + \frac{\zeta^{DL}}{\eta_{DL}}\right). \tag{68}
\]

**Appendix D**

**Proof of Proposition 6**

We rewrite (62) as
\[
\xi^{ZF}(M) = \frac{Kp}{T} \left((T - K(\tau^{UL} + \tau^{DL}))\log_2(1 - \bar{p}K + \bar{p}M)\right)
\]
\[
= \frac{Kp}{T} \left[\frac{\zeta^{UL}}{\eta_{UL}} + \frac{\zeta^{DL}}{\eta_{DL}}\right] + Kp^{UE} + p^{Coup} + M^{BS}.
\]
\[
\xi^{ZF}(M) = \frac{Kp}{T} \left[\frac{\zeta^{UL}}{\eta_{UL}} + \frac{\zeta^{DL}}{\eta_{DL}}\right] + Kp^{UE} + p^{Coup} + c^{BS} = c + M^{BS}. \tag{69}
\]

Let \((1 - \bar{p}K) = a, \bar{p} = b, KpTr[\Sigma^{-1}_M]\left(\frac{\zeta^{UL}}{\eta_{UL}} + \frac{\zeta^{DL}}{\eta_{DL}}\right) + Kp^{UE} + p^{Coup} = c^*, p^{BS} = d\) and \(\frac{Kp}{T} \left((T - K(\tau^{UL} + \tau^{DL}))\right) = f\).

Therefore, (69) implies
\[
\xi^{ZF}(M) = \frac{f^{\log_2(a + bM)}}{c + dM}. \tag{70}
\]

In order to prove that the objective function, \(\xi^{ZF}(M)\) is quasi-concave it is sufficient to prove that the upper contour sets \(S_\psi = \{M \geq 0 | \xi^{ZF}(M) \geq \psi\}\) of \(\xi^{ZF}(M)\) are convex for any \(\psi \in \mathbb{R}\) [34]. We investigate the cases when \(\psi \leq 0\) and \(\psi > 0\). When \(\psi \leq 0\) the set is empty in the contour \(\xi^{ZF}(M) = \psi\). Thus \(\xi^{ZF}(M)\) is strictly quasi-convex when \(\psi \leq 0\). Now when \(\psi > 0\), \(S_\psi\) is equivalent to
\[
\left\{M \geq 0 : \frac{f^{\log_2(a + bM)}}{c + dM} \geq \psi\right\}
\]
\[
\Rightarrow \left\{M \geq 0 : cw + dM\psi - f^{\log_2(a + bM)} \leq 0\right\}. \tag{71}
\]

Let \(F = cw + dM\psi - f^{\log_2(a + bM)}\). Now, \(F\) is strictly convex within the range of \(M\) as its Hessian is positive definite. Hence, \(S_\psi\) is strictly convex, which concludes that \(\xi^{ZF}(M)\) is a quasi-concave function of \(M\).

Now using Definition 2, we can say that the local maximum of \(\xi^{ZF}\) is also the global maximum. Furthermore, as \(M \to \infty, \xi^{ZF} \to 0\). Since \(M \leq 0\), the local maximum is obtained by calculating the first derivative and setting it to zero as shown below. From (70) we have
\[
\frac{\partial \xi^{ZF}(M)}{\partial M} = \frac{\partial \left(f^{\log_2(a + bM)}\right)}{\partial M}
\]
\[
= \frac{f^b}{(a + bM)(c + dM)\ln 2} - \frac{f d\ln(a + bM)}{(c + dM)^2\ln 2}. \tag{72}
\]

Now equating the right hand side of (71) to zero, we have
\[
\frac{f(c + dM)}{a + bM} = \frac{d\ln(a + bM)}{a + bM}
\]
\[
\Rightarrow bc - ad = d(a + bM)(\ln(a + bM) - 1). \tag{73}
\]

This result can be proved similarly to the proof of proposition 6 by changing the differentiation variable from \(M\) to \(\bar{p}\). Accordingly we can parameterize \(a, b, c, d\) as \(1, (M - K), (Kp^{UE} + p^{Coup} + M^{BS}), KTr[\Sigma^{-1}_M]\left(\frac{\zeta^{UL}}{\eta_{UL}} + \frac{\zeta^{DL}}{\eta_{DL}}\right)\) respectively. The quasi-concavity of \(\xi^{ZF}(\bar{p})\) follows accordingly similar to the proof in Appendix D. Hence, the local maximum will also be the global maximum which can be found by setting the first derivative to zero, i.e.,
\[
\frac{\partial \xi^{ZF}(\bar{p})}{\partial \bar{p}} = 0. \tag{75}
\]

Solving (75) in a way similar to Appendix D, we obtain the desired result. The details are omitted due to space limitations.
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