

# Power Allocation for OFDM-Based Cooperative Relay Systems

Victor K. Y. Wu, Ye (Geoffrey) Li, Marilyn P. Wylie-Green, Tony Reid, and Peter S. S. Wang

**Abstract:** Cooperative relays can provide spatial diversity and improve performance of wireless communications. In this paper, we study subcarrier power allocation at the relays for orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM)-based wireless systems. For cooperative relay with *amplify-and-forward* (AF) and *decode-and-forward* (DF) algorithms, we investigate the impact of power allocation to the mutual information between the source and destination. From our simulation results on *word-error-rate* (WER) performance, we find that the DF algorithm with power allocation provides better performance than that of AF algorithm in a single path relay network because the former is able to eliminate channel noise at each relay. For the multiple path relay network, however, the network structure is already resistant to noise and channel distortion, and AF approach is a more attractive choice due to its lower complexity.

**Index Terms:** Cooperative diversity, cooperative relay, power allocation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, *relays* are being exploited to improve performance in wireless communications systems. The relays are a network of transceiver nodes between the transmitter and receiver that facilitate the transfer of information. This type of scheme is known as *cooperation* or *cooperative communications* in the literature because the relay network is cooperating with the transmitter and receiver to improve performance. One application example of such technologies is the MIT-initiated One Laptop per Child (OLPC) project [1], which aims to provide affordable laptops equipped with meshed networking functionality to children in the developing world. Since cellular and Internet connectivity is sparse and sporadic in these regions, such laptops can cooperate to make the best use of available bandwidth. In this paper, we restrict ourselves to a single path relay network and a multiple path relay network in the context of orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM) systems with power allocation.

The authors in [2]–[4] have provided several physical layer relay algorithms. These include *amplify-and-forward* (AF) and *decode-and-forward* (DF). In AF, a node amplifies its received symbols, subject to a power constraint, before forwarding them to the next node. This algorithm is obviously with low complexity. In DF, a node fully decodes the received symbols, re-encodes them and then forwards them. In other words, this scheme attempts to eliminate channel distortion and noise at

each node by means of the redundancy of error-correct coding.

The authors in [5] and [6] have investigated cooperation for a single path of relays connected in series. The motivation for this network structure is that broader wireless coverage can be achieved while still maintaining a low power constraint at the transmitter. *Analog relaying* and *digital relaying* are considered as two possible relay algorithms. These are equivalent to the AF and DF algorithms, respectively. Each node has a certain transmit power limit. The outage probability is then minimized by allocating power among the relay network under these power constraints. This power allocation accounts for the channel conditions in the network in order to achieve the optimal outage probability. Simulations indicate that 2 dB of total power can be saved for 5 relays by using optimal power allocation instead of uniform power allocation. This is for the DF case. However, at high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) values, the DF and the AF cases are almost the same.

The authors in [7] have investigated cooperation for multiple paths of relays connected in parallel. In the conventional scheme, all relays use AF scheme. This is called *all-participate AF* (AP-AF). The authors also consider an algorithm where only one relay is selected in the transmission to maximize the mutual information. This is called *selection AF* (S-AF). S-AF selects the relay which results in the maximum mutual information between transmitter and receiver. Simulations of outage probability indicate that 5 dB of SNR can be saved for 3 relays by using S-AF instead of AP-AF. The authors in [8] derive symbol error probabilities for multiple paths of relays.

In this paper, we continue to investigate the series and parallel cooperative relay networks using OFDM signals. We consider a single path relay network and a multiple path relay network. Using the AF relay algorithm, we derive the input-output relations and the mutual informations for both networks. Using a power constraint at each relay, we consider two relay power allocation schemes: Constant gain allocation and equal power allocation. Using the DF relay algorithm, we derive input-output relations for both networks. We also compare *word-error-rates* (WERs) for the two networks using the AF and DF relay algorithms. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We study power allocation for the single path relay network in [5], [6] and the multiple path relay network in [7] in Sections II and III, respectively. Finally, Section IV concludes the paper and provides future research directions.

## II. SINGLE PATH RELAY NETWORK

In this section, we consider the single path relay network. We first study the impact of power allocation to the mutual information for the AF and the DF relay networks, respectively, and then present their WER performance from computer simulation.

Manuscript received November 7, 2007.

Wu and Li are with the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, email: vwu3@illinois.edu, liye@ece.gatech.edu.

Green, Reid, and Wang are with the Nokia Siemens Networks, Dallas, Texas, USA, email: {marilynn.green, tony.reid, peter.wang}@nsn.com.




Fig. 1. Single path relay network.

### A. Amplify-and-Forward

Fig. 1 shows the single path relay network. In the figure,  $r_0$  is the transmitter,  $r_{m+1}$  is the receiver, and  $r_1, \dots, r_m$  are  $m$  relay nodes connected in series forming a single path link between the transmitter and receiver. The relays perform AF relaying. We assume that OFDM with  $N$  subcarriers is used in the system.  $h_k^{(0)}, \dots, h_k^{(m)}$  are the complex subchannel gains at the  $k$ th subcarrier in the link, for  $k = 1, \dots, N$ .  $n_k^{(0)}, \dots, n_k^{(m)}$  are the corresponding noises, which are assumed to be mutually independent and circular symmetric complex Gaussians all with zero mean and variance  $N_0 B/N$ , where  $N_0$  is the power spectral density of the underlying continuous time noise process and  $B$  is the OFDM bandwidth of the system. Let  $p_k^{(0)} = P_{\text{tot}}/N$  be the transmit power on the  $k$ th subcarrier, where  $P_{\text{tot}}$  is the net transmitter power and  $\sqrt{p_k^{(l)}}$  be the amplifying gain used in the AF algorithm at the  $l$ th relay, for  $l = 1, \dots, m$ . The  $k$ th receive symbol at  $r_l$  is amplified by  $\sqrt{p_k^{(l)}}$  before it is forwarded to the next node. Let  $x_k^{(0)}$  be the  $k$ th transmit symbol with zero mean and unit variance,  $y_k$  be the  $k$ th receive symbol at the receiver, and  $x_k^{(l)}$  be the  $k$ th receive symbol at the  $l$ th relay. Note that  $x_k^{(l)}$  is also the  $k$ th transmit symbol at the  $l$ th relay.

Using Fig. 1, the input-output relation at the  $l$ th relay is

$$x_k^{(l)} = \left( \prod_{i=0}^{l-1} h_k^{(i)} \sqrt{p_k^{(i)}} \right) x_k^{(0)} + \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \left( \prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1} h_k^{(i)} \sqrt{p_k^{(i)}} \right) n_k^{(j)}. \quad (1)$$

The input-output relation at the receiver is

$$y_k = \left( \prod_{i=0}^m h_k^{(i)} \sqrt{p_k^{(i)}} \right) x_k^{(0)} + \sum_{j=0}^m \left( \prod_{i=j+1}^m h_k^{(i)} \sqrt{p_k^{(i)}} \right) n_k^{(j)}. \quad (2)$$

Denote

$$h_k = \prod_{i=0}^m h_k^{(i)} \sqrt{p_k^{(i)}}, \quad \gamma_k^{(j)} = \prod_{i=j+1}^m h_k^{(i)} \sqrt{p_k^{(i)}}, \quad (3)$$

and

$$w_k = \sum_{l=0}^m \gamma_k^{(l)} n_k^{(l)}. \quad (4)$$

Then, (2) can be written as

$$y_k = h_k x_k + w_k. \quad (5)$$

Now, consider the variance of  $w_k$ . Using (3) and (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{w_k w_k} &= E[w_k w_k^*] \\ &= \frac{N_0 B}{N} \sum_{j=0}^m \left( \prod_{i=j+1}^m b_k^{(i)} p_k^{(i)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $E[\cdot]$  is the expectation operator,  $(\cdot)^*$  is the complex conjugate operator for a scalar, and  $b_k^{(i)} = |h_k^{(i)}|^2$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, m$ .  $R_{w_k w_k}$  is positive for a nonzero  $N_0$ . We define a normalized version of the system in (5)

$$\tilde{y}_k = \tilde{h}_k x_k + \tilde{w}_k \quad (7)$$

where  $\tilde{y}_k = y_k / \sqrt{R_{w_k w_k}}$ ,  $\tilde{h}_k = h_k / \sqrt{R_{w_k w_k}}$ , and  $\tilde{w}_k = w_k / \sqrt{R_{w_k w_k}}$ . The variances of  $\tilde{w}_k$  and  $\tilde{y}_k$  are

$$E[\tilde{w}_k \tilde{w}_k^*] = 1 \quad (8)$$

and

$$E[\tilde{y}_k \tilde{y}_k^*] = \frac{1}{R_{w_k w_k}} \left( \prod_{i=0}^m b_k^{(i)} p_k^{(i)} \right) + 1, \quad (9)$$

respectively. The cross terms do not appear in (9) because  $\tilde{h}_k$ ,  $\tilde{w}_k$ , and  $x_k$  are mutually independent. Note that the normalized system has unit variance noise.

#### A.1 Mutual Information

To derive the mutual information, note that the differential entropy of a circular symmetric complex Gaussian vector,  $\mathbf{v}$ , with covariance matrix,  $\mathbf{K}$ , is  $h(\mathbf{v}) = \log_2 \det(\pi e \mathbf{K})$  [9]. When the circular symmetric complex Gaussian is a scalar,  $v$ , the differential entropy is  $h(v) = \log_2(\pi e \sigma_v^2)$ , where  $\sigma_v^2$  is the variance of  $v$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}_k$  be the mutual information between the transmitter and receiver on the  $k$ th subcarrier

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_k &= h(\tilde{y}_k) - h(\tilde{w}_k) \\ &= \log_2 \left[ \frac{1}{R_{w_k w_k}} \left( \prod_{i=0}^m b_k^{(i)} p_k^{(i)} \right) + 1 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The total mutual information between the transmitter and receiver,  $\mathcal{I}$ , is the sum of all  $\mathcal{I}_k$  divided by  $N$ . That is, after substituting (6) into (10), we have

$$\mathcal{I} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \log_2 \left( 1 + \text{SNR} \left[ \frac{b_k^{(0)} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m b_k^{(i)} p_k^{(i)} \right)}{\sum_{j=0}^m \left( \prod_{i=j+1}^m b_k^{(i)} p_k^{(i)} \right)} \right] \right) \quad (11)$$

where  $\text{SNR} = P_{\text{tot}}/N_0 B$ .

#### A.2 Relay Power Allocation

We assume that the net transmit power at the transmitter and at each relay is  $P_{\text{tot}}$ , that is,

$$\sum_{k=1}^N E \left\{ \left| \sqrt{p_k^{(l)}} x_k^{(l)} \right|^2 \right\} = P_{\text{tot}}. \quad (12)$$

At the transmitter, we assume a uniform power distribution, that is,  $p_k^{(0)} = P_{\text{tot}}/N$ . To derive the power constraint at each relay, substitute (1) into (12) to arrive at

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{p_k^{(l)}}{N} \left[ b_k^{(0)} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} b_k^{(i)} p_k^{(i)} \right) + \frac{1}{\text{SNR}} \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1} b_k^{(i)} p_k^{(i)} \right] = 1. \quad (13)$$

Note that (13) is defined recursively. The power constraint for  $p_k^{(l)}$  depends on  $p_k^{(1)}, \dots, p_k^{(l-1)}$ .  $p_k^{(1)}$  is the base case in the recursion, which follows from (13), when  $l = 1$ .

One power allocation at the  $l$ th relay is to set  $p_k^{(l)}$  constant for all subcarriers. This results in moving  $p_k^{(l)}$  in (13) out of the summation because it is no longer a function of  $k$

$$p_{k,ct}^{(l)} = p_{ct}^{(l)} = \frac{N \text{SNR}}{\sum_{k=1}^N \left[ \text{SNR} b_k^{(0)} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} b_k^{(i)} p_{ct}^{(i)} \right) + \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1} b_k^{(i)} p_{ct}^{(i)} \right]}. \quad (14)$$

We call this *constant gain allocation* (CT). This is in fact the AF scheme as defined in [2], where a receive symbol is multiplied by a constant gain to satisfy a power constraint. In our context, this means that every subcarrier is multiplied by the same gain,  $p_{ct}^{(l)}$ . Note that this power allocation does not require each relay to have any channel state information (CSI). That is, we do not actually need to use (14). We can use (12) directly to solve for  $p_{ct}^{(l)}$ .

A second power allocation is to choose  $p_k^{(l)}$  such that every subcarrier transmits the same power at the  $l$ th relay. That is, (12) becomes  $E\{|\sqrt{p_{k,eq}^{(l)}} x_k^{(l)}|^2\} = P_{\text{tot}}/N$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, N$ . This is equivalent to setting every summand on the left hand side of (13) to  $1/N$ . We then have

$$p_{k,eq}^{(l)} = \frac{\text{SNR}}{\text{SNR} b_k^{(0)} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} b_k^{(i)} p_{k,eq}^{(i)} \right) + \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1} b_k^{(i)} p_{k,eq}^{(i)}}. \quad (15)$$

We call this *equal power allocation* (EQ). Note that this power allocation does require each relay to have the CSI of its upstream channels.

### B. Decode-and-Forward

In DF, each relay fully recovers the information bits (with possible errors) after receiving an OFDM symbol. It then converts the information bits back into an OFDM symbol and then transmits it. The transmitter and all the relays transmit with the same uniform power distribution. That is,

$$p_k^{(0)} = p_k^{(l)} = \frac{P_{\text{tot}}}{N} \quad (16)$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, N$  and for  $l = 1, \dots, m$ .

Let  $x_k^{(0)}$  be the  $k$ th transmit symbol from the transmitter and  $x_k^{(l)}$  be the  $k$ th transmit symbol from the  $l$ th relay, all with with




Fig. 2. WERs in a single path relay network with TU channels using AF and DF for  $N = 128$ : (a)  $m = 2$  and (b)  $m = 4$ .

zero mean and unit variance. Let  $y_k^{(m+1)}$  be the  $k$ th receive symbol at the receiver and  $y_k^{(l)}$  be the  $k$ th receive symbol at the  $l$ th relay. Using Fig. 1, the input-output relation at the  $l$ th relay is

$$y_k^{(l)} = h_k^{(l-1)} \sqrt{\frac{P_{\text{tot}}}{N}} x_k^{(l-1)} + n_k^{(l-1)}. \quad (17)$$

The input-output relation at the receiver is

$$y_k^{(m+1)} = h_k^{(m)} \sqrt{\frac{P_{\text{tot}}}{N}} x_k^{(m)} + n_k^{(m)}. \quad (18)$$

### C. Simulations

We simulate WERs versus SNR for both the AF and DF cases. At the transmitter (and at the transmitter structure of a relay using DF), each information word contains 83 bits. We use a rate 1/3 convolutional encoder with generator sequences [111], [111], and [110] to encode the information word into a 255-bit codeword. A zero bit is padded at the end to make 256 bits. The bits are then interleaved and modulated onto  $N = 128$  QPSK

subcarriers to form one OFDM symbol. At the receiver (and at the receiver structure of a relay using DF), the codeword is recovered (with possible errors) using a matched filter and deinterleaving. A Viterbi decoder is used to decode the codeword. Both hard decisions and soft decisions are used.

We consider the  $m = 2$  and 4 relays cases. We assume that all distances between any two adjacent transceiver nodes are the same. Therefore, all path loss effects are normalized to 0 dB. Shadowing is assumed to be log-normally distributed. That is, the received power gain due to shadowing in dB is a zero-mean Gaussian with variance of 8 dB, which is typical for cellular land mobile applications [10]. We model frequency selective fading as Typical Urban (TU) channels [10]. We use an OFDM bandwidth of 800 kHz divided into  $N = 128$  equal blocks. Maintaining OFDM orthogonality, this translates into an OFDM symbol period of  $T_s = 160 \mu s$ . The simulation results are shown in Fig. 2.

As shown in the plots, there are significant error rate performance gains when using DF instead of AF. The gains are even larger when we increase the distance between the transmitter and receiver (and thus, add more relays). The AF error rates suffer because more channel distortion and noise enter the system. The DF error rates suffer only slightly because noise and channel distortion are eliminated at each relay. This results in the large performance gains for  $m = 4$ . In terms of power allocation when using AF, CT is the preferable choice since EQ requires CSI and only results in small performance gains over CT. As expected, soft decisions give better performance than hard decisions in Viterbi decoding.

### III. MULTIPLE PATH RELAY NETWORK

In this section, we consider a multiple path relay network, following the same structure as Section II.

#### A. Amplify-and-Forward

Fig. 3 shows the multiple path relay network. In the figure,  $r_0$  is the transmitter,  $r_{m+1}$  is the receiver, and  $r_1, \dots, r_m$  are  $m$  relay nodes connected in parallel forming a multiple path link between the transmitter and receiver. The relays perform AF relaying. We assume that OFDM with  $N$  subcarriers is used in the system.  $h_k^{(0|1)}, \dots, h_k^{(0|m)}, h_k^{(1|m+1)}, \dots, h_k^{(m|m+1)}$  are the complex subchannel gains at the  $k$ th subcarrier in the link, for  $k = 1, \dots, N$ .  $n_k^{(0|1)}, \dots, n_k^{(0|m)}, n_k^{(1|m+1)}, \dots, n_k^{(m|m+1)}$  are the corresponding noises, which are assumed to be mutually independent, zero-mean, circular symmetric complex Gaussians all with variance  $N_0 B/N$ , where  $N_0$  is the power spectral density of the underlying continuous time noise process and  $B$  is the OFDM bandwidth of the system. Let  $p_k^{(0)} = P_{\text{tot}}/N$  be the transmitter power on the  $k$ th subcarrier, where  $P_{\text{tot}}$  is the net transmitter power and  $\sqrt{p_k^{(l)}}$  be the amplifying gain used in the AF algorithm at the  $l$ th relay, for  $l = 1, \dots, m$ . The  $k$ th receive symbol at  $r_l$  is amplified by  $\sqrt{p_k^{(l)}}$  before it is forwarded to the next node. Let  $x_k$  be the  $k$ th transmit symbol with zero mean and unit variance and  $y_k^{(l)}$  be the  $k$ th receive symbol from the  $l$ th path at the receiver.




Fig. 3. Multiple path relay network.

Using Fig. 3, the input-output relation for the  $l$ th path is

$$y_k^{(l)} = \left( h_k^{(0|l)} h_k^{(l|m+1)} \sqrt{p_k^{(0)}} \sqrt{p_k^{(l)}} \right) x_k + h_k^{(l|m+1)} \sqrt{p_k^{(l)}} n_k^{(0|l)} + n_k^{(l|m+1)}. \quad (19)$$

Denote

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \left[ y_k^{(1)} \quad \dots \quad y_k^{(m)} \right]^T, \quad (20)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_k = \begin{bmatrix} h_k^{(0|1)} h_k^{(1|m+1)} \sqrt{p_k^{(0)}} \sqrt{p_k^{(1)}} \\ \vdots \\ h_k^{(0|m)} h_k^{(m|m+1)} \sqrt{p_k^{(0)}} \sqrt{p_k^{(m)}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}_k = \begin{bmatrix} h_k^{(1|m+1)} \sqrt{p_k^{(1)}} & & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ 0 & & h_k^{(m|m+1)} \sqrt{p_k^{(m)}} & \\ & & & \mathbf{I}_{m \times m} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

$$\mathbf{n}_k = \begin{bmatrix} n_k^{(0|1)} \\ \vdots \\ n_k^{(0|m)} \\ n_k^{(1|m+1)} \\ \vdots \\ n_k^{(m|m+1)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

and

$$\mathbf{w}_k = \mathbf{\Gamma}_k \mathbf{n}_k. \quad (24)$$

Then, (19), for all  $l = 1, \dots, m$ , can be written as

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \mathbf{h}_k x_k + \mathbf{w}_k. \quad (25)$$

The large boldface zeros in (22) represent zero values in the off diagonal entries in the left  $m \times m$  submatrix of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_k$ .

Now, consider the covariance of  $\mathbf{w}_k$ . Using (21) to (24), we have

$$R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k} = \frac{N_0 B}{N} \begin{bmatrix} b_k^{(1|m+1)} p_k^{(1)} + 1 & & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \\ 0 & & & b_k^{(m|m+1)} p_k^{(m)} + 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (26)$$

where  $b_k^{(i|j)} = |h_k^{(i|j)}|^2$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, m$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, m+1$ , and  $i \neq j$ . Since the diagonal entries of  $R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}$  are never zero,  $R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-1}$  and  $R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  are well defined, where  $R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} = R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-1}$ . Also, if we define  $R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}$  as  $R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{\frac{1}{2}} R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{\frac{1}{2}} = R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}$ , then  $R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{\frac{1}{2}} = R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{\frac{1}{2}} R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \mathbf{I}$ . We define a normalized version of the system in (25)

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k x_k + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k \quad (27)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k = R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{y}_k$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k = R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}_k$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k = R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{w}_k$ . The covariance matrices of  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k$  are

$$E[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k^H] = \mathbf{I} \quad (28)$$

and

$$E[\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k^H] = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k^H + \mathbf{I}, \quad (29)$$

respectively. The cross terms do not appear in (29) because  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k$  and  $x_k$  are mutually independent. Note that the normalized system has identity covariance noise.

### A.1 Mutual Information

Let  $\mathcal{I}_k$  be the mutual information between the transmitter and receiver on the  $k$ th subcarrier

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_k &= h(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k) - h(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k) \\ &= \log_2 \left( 1 + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k^H R_{\mathbf{w}_k \mathbf{w}_k}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_k \right). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

The total mutual information between the transmitter and receiver,  $\mathcal{I}$ , is the sum of all  $\mathcal{I}_k$  divided by  $N$ . That is, after substituting (21) and (26) into (30), we have

$$\mathcal{I} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \log_2 \left[ 1 + \text{SNR} \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \frac{b_k^{(0|i)} b_k^{(i|m+1)} p_k^{(i)}}{b_k^{(i|m+1)} p_k^{(i)} + 1} \right) \right]. \quad (31)$$

### A.2 Relay Power Allocation

We assume that the net transmit power at the transmitter and at each relay is  $P_{\text{tot}}$ , as in (12). At the transmitter, we assume a uniform power distribution, that is,  $p_k^{(0)} = P_{\text{tot}}/N$ . To derive the power constraint at each relay and thus, possible power allocations, we use a derivation similar to the one in Section II-A to arrive at

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{p_k^{(l)}}{N} \left( b_k^{(0|l)} + \frac{1}{\text{SNR}} \right) = 1. \quad (32)$$

CT in this case is

$$p_{k,ct}^{(l)} = p_{ct}^{(l)} = \frac{N \text{SNR}}{\sum_{k=1}^N \left( \text{SNR} b_k^{(0|l)} + 1 \right)}. \quad (33)$$

Again, this power allocation does not require each relay to have any channel state information (CSI). The  $l$ th relay only has to

multiply its entire OFDM receive symbol by a constant,  $\sqrt{p_{ct}^{(l)}}$ , such that the total transmit power is  $P_{\text{tot}}$ , similar to constant gain allocation in Section II-A.

Equal power allocation (EQ) in this case is

$$p_{k,eq}^{(l)} = \frac{\text{SNR}}{\text{SNR} b_k^{(0|l)} + 1}. \quad (34)$$

Note that this power allocation does require each relay to have the CSI of its upstream channel.

### B. Decode-and-Forward

In DF, each relay fully recovers the information bits (with possible errors) after receiving an OFDM symbol. It then converts the information bits back into an OFDM symbol and then transmits it. The transmitter and all the relays transmit with the same uniform power distribution. That is,

$$p_k^{(0)} = p_k^{(l)} = \frac{P_{\text{tot}}}{N} \quad (35)$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, N$  and for  $l = 1, \dots, m$ .

Let  $x_k^{(0)}$  be the  $k$ th transmit symbol from the transmitter and  $x_k^{(l)}$  be the  $k$ th transmit symbol from the  $l$ th relay, all with zero mean and unit variance. Let  $y_k^{(m+1)}$  be the  $k$ th receive symbol at the receiver and  $y_k^{(l)}$  be the  $k$ th receive symbol at the  $l$ th relay. Using Fig. 3, the input-output relation at the  $l$ th relay is

$$y_k^{(l)} = h_k^{(0|l)} \sqrt{\frac{P_{\text{tot}}}{N}} x_k^{(0)} + n_k^{(0|l)}. \quad (36)$$

The input-output relation at the receiver is

$$y_k^{(m+1)} = \sum_{i=1}^m \left( h_k^{(i|m+1)} \sqrt{\frac{P_{\text{tot}}}{N}} x_k^{(i)} + n_k^{(i|m+1)} \right). \quad (37)$$

Note that in this situation, there are  $m$  (modified in general) copies of the original  $k$ th transmit symbol  $x_k^{(0)}$ , namely,  $x_k^{(1)}, \dots, x_k^{(m)}$ . Therefore, the receiver has to assume (incorrectly in general) that all  $m$  relays perform perfect recovery of the information bits so that  $x_k^{(l)} = x_k^{(0)}$ . That is, the receiver assumes the  $k$ th receive symbol is

$$y_k^{(m+1)} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^m h_k^{(i|m+1)} \sqrt{\frac{P_{\text{tot}}}{N}} \right) x_k^{(0)} + \sum_{i=1}^m n_k^{(i|m+1)}. \quad (38)$$

This allows the receiver to use a filter that is matched to  $\sum_{i=1}^m h_k^{(i|m+1)}$ .

### C. Simulations

We simulate WERs versus SNR for both the AF and DF cases. We use exactly the same configuration in Section II-C. The simulation results are shown in Fig. 4.

The performance gains resulting from using DF instead of AF diminish as we add more paths between the transmitter and receiver (and thus, add more relays). This is because for  $m = 4$




Fig. 4. WERs in a multiple path relay network with TU channels using AF and DF for  $N = 128$ : (a)  $m = 2$  and (b)  $m = 4$ .

relays and thus, for 4 paths, the system is already resistant to noise and channel distortion. Therefore, DF cannot provide any more significant improvement over AF. In such a situation, AF might be a more attractive choice due to its lower complexity. In terms of power allocation when using AF, CT is the preferable choice because it gives better performance than EQ and does not require CSI. As expected, soft decisions give better performance than hard decisions in Viterbi decoding.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we exploit cooperative relays by studying two subcarrier power allocation schemes as well as the system mutual information in OFDM-based wireless networks. WER simulations indicate that the DF relay algorithm provides better performance than that of AF in a single path relay network because the former is able to eliminate channel noise at each relay. For the multiple path relay network, however, the network structure is already resistant to noise and channel distortion, and AF is more attractive due to its lower complexity.

Future research includes investigating additional relay algo-

rithms, such as hybrid schemes. For example, depending on the channel conditions, a relay can AF, DF, or even just discard sub-carrier symbols. This in turn leads to more possibilities for relay power allocation. In this paper, we only investigate the single path relay network and the multiple path relay network. Other general relay networks need to be considered in the context of OFDM as well. This will lend more insight into developing a general theoretical framework for OFDM in cooperative relay networks.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] (2005) One laptop per child. [Online]. Available: <http://laptop.media.mit.edu/>
- [2] J. N. Laneman, "Cooperative diversity in wireless networks: algorithms and architectures," Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA, Sept. 2002.
- [3] J. N. Laneman, D. N. C. Tse, and G. W. Wornell, "Cooperative diversity in wireless networks: Efficient protocols and outage behavior," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, pp. 3062–3080, Dec. 2004.
- [4] J. N. Laneman, G. Wornell, and D. N. C. Tse, "An efficient protocol for realizing cooperative diversity in wireless networks," in *Proc. IEEE ISIT 2001*, June 2001, p. 294.
- [5] M. O. Hasna and M. Alouini, "Performance analysis of two-hop relayed transmission over rayleigh-fading channels," in *Proc. IEEE VTC 2002-fall*, Sept. 2002, pp. 1992–1996.
- [6] —, "Optimal power allocation for relayed transmissions over rayleigh-fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 3, pp. 1999–2004, Nov. 2004.
- [7] Y. Zhao, R. Adve, and T. J. Lim, "Improving amplify-and-forward relay networks: Optimal power allocation versus selection," in *Proc. IEEE ISIT 2006*, July 2006, pp. 1234–1238.
- [8] A. Ribeiro, X. Cai, and G. B. Giannakis, "Symbol error probabilities for general cooperative links," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 4, pp. 1264–1273, May 2005.
- [9] I. E. Telatar, "Capacity of multi-antenna gaussian channels," *Eur. Trans. Telecom.*, vol. 10, pp. 585–596, Nov. 1999.
- [10] G. L. Stüber, *Principles of Mobile Communications*, 2nd ed. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.



**Victor K. Y. Wu** received his B.A.Sc. in 2005, from the Division of Engineering Science at the University of Toronto, Toronto and his M.S. in 2006, from the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta. He is currently pursuing a Ph.D. from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. His research interests are wireless networks and RFID systems.



**Ye (Geoffrey) Li** received his B.S.E. and M.S.E. degrees in 1983 and 1986, respectively, from the Department of Wireless Engineering, Nanjing Institute of Technology, Nanjing, China, and his Ph.D. degree in 1994 from the Department of Electrical Engineering, Auburn University, Alabama. He was a teaching assistant and then a lecturer with Southeast University, Nanjing, China from 1986 to 1991, a research and teaching assistant with Auburn University, Alabama from 1991 to 1994, and a post-doctoral research associate with the University of Maryland at College Park,

Maryland from 1994 to 1996. He was with AT&T Labs—Research at Red Bank, New Jersey as a senior and then a principal technical staff member from 1996 to 2000. Since 2000, he has been with the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Georgia Institute of Technology as an associate and then a full professor. He is also holding a visiting chair professor position at the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China since March 2006. His general research interests include statistical signal processing and telecommunications, with emphasis on OFDM and MIMO techniques, cross-layer optimization, and signal processing issues in cognitive radios. In these areas, he has published over

100 papers in refereed journals or conferences and filed about 20 patents. He also has two books, entitled, *Blind Equalization and Identification* (co-authored with Z. Ding, published by Marcel Dekker, Inc. in 2000) and *OFDM for Wireless Communications* (co-authored with G. Stüber, published by Springer in 2006). He is active in professional societies. He once served or is currently serving as an editor, a member of editorial board, and a guest editor for 6 technical journals. He organized and chaired many international conferences, including technical program vice-chair of the IEEE 2003 International Conference on Communications. He has been awarded an IEEE fellow for his contributions to signal processing for wireless communications in 2005.



**Marilynn P. Wylie-Green** received the B.S. and M.S.E. degrees in electrical engineering from Temple University in 1989 and 1991, respectively and the M.S.E.E. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from the University of Pennsylvania in 1993 and 1995, respectively. In 1995, she worked at the Wireless Information Laboratory (WINLAB) of Rutgers University on the research topic of mobile location estimation. In 1997, she joined the Nokia Research Center where she became involved with various aspects of advanced physical layer design for several wireless systems, including GSM, W-CDMA, UWB, and WiMAX. In 2007, she transitioned into the Research and Technology arm of Nokia Siemens Networks. She is the author of approximately 45 international publications and 26 granted/pending patents. She is a senior member of the IEEE.

She is a member of several national honor societies including Eta Kappa Nu National Engineering Honor Society, Golden Key National Honor Society, Alpha Lambda Delta National Honor Society, and she is a former recipient of the National Science Foundation Fellowship for graduate study. Her current research interests include statistical signal processing, optimized transceiver design and cross-layer optimization.



**Anthony Reid** received his B.S.E.E. (Cum Laude) from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, M.S.E.E. from Stanford University and Ph.D. from Southern Methodist University (SMU). He has over 3 decades of industry experience in the telecommunications and military defense arenas. He has worked in the telecomm industry at Bell Labs, Nortel Networks and Nokia Research Center (NRC) and in the defense industry at Sandia Laboratories, TI, and Raytheon Company. Most recently he is an Engineering Fellow at Raytheon working in the areas of algorithms and systems for Space and Airborne Systems. As a Principal Scientist at NRC his work covered design, research and standardization of physical layer for wireless mobile systems (e.g., WiMAX, WLAN, 4G, and GSM/EDGE). He is senior member of IEEE. He has over 20 publications and 25 granted/pending patents. His research interests are in mobile wireless communications and also applied optimal estimation theory and statistical signal processing.



**Peter S. S. Wang** received his M.S.E. and Ph.D. degrees in 1986 and 1991, respectively, from the Department of Electrical Engineering Department at the University of Texas at Arlington, Texas. He was a visiting assistant professor with University of Texas at Arlington from 1991 to 1994. He was a staff engineer with Motorola Research Lab. in Texas from 1994 to 1998. He was a senior research scientist at Nokia Research Center in Texas from 1998 to 2006. Since 2006, he has been work with Nokia Siemens Networks in Texas. His work covers wireless mobile location services, RF channel modeling, and wireless communication systems. His research interests are mobile wireless communications and diffractive optics.