Quasi-Maximum-Likelihood Multiuser Detection Using Semi-Definite Relaxation With Application to Synchronous CDMA

Wing-Kin Ma, *Member, IEEE*, Timothy N. Davidson, *Member, IEEE*, Kon Max Wong, *Fellow, IEEE*, Zhi-Quan Luo, *Member, IEEE*, and Pak-Chung Ching, *Senior Member, IEEE*

***Abstract*—The maximum-likelihood (ML) multiuser detector is well known to exhibit better bit-error-rate (BER) performance than many other multiuser detectors. Unfortunately, ML detection (MLD) is a nondeterministic polynomial-time hard (NP-hard) problem, for which there is no known algorithm that can find the optimal solution with polynomial-time complexity (in the number of users). In this paper, a polynomial-time approximation method called semi-definite (SD) relaxation is applied to the MLD problem with antipodal data transmission. SD relaxation is an accurate approximation method for certain NP-hard problems. The SD relaxation ML (SDR-ML) detector is efficient in that its complexity is of the order of $K^{3.5}$, where K is the number of users. We illustrate the potential of the SDR-ML detector by showing that some existing detectors, such as the decorrelator and the linear-minimum-mean-square-error detector, can be interpreted as degenerate forms of the SDR-ML detector. Simulation results indicate that the BER performance of the SDR-ML detector is better than that of these existing detectors and is close to that of the true ML detector, even when the cross-correlations between users are strong or the near-far effect is significant.**

***Index Terms*—Maximum likelihood detection, multiuser detection, relaxation methods, semi-definite programming.**

I. Introduction

In code division multiple access (CDMA), a major factor that limits system performance is the multiuser interference caused by the nonorthogonality of the user signature waveforms. Multiuser detection [1] is a powerful tool for combating the effects of this multiuser interference. Under some standard assumptions, the maximum-likelihood (ML) multiuser detector is optimum in the sense that it provides the minimum error probability in jointly detecting the data symbols of all users. Unfortunately, to implement the ML detector, it is necessary to solve a difficult combinatorial optimization problem. The ML detection (MLD) problem can be solved by an exhaustive search in which the log likelihood function is evaluated for all possible combinations of the data symbols. However, exhaustive search is prohibitive for a large number of users because of its exponentially increasing computational complexity. Hence, it would be desirable if there were algorithms that could efficiently find the (globally optimal) MLD solution. It is known that such MLD algorithms exist if the signal correlation matrix exhibits some special structure. Two structural constraints that are known to lead to efficient MLD solutions are i) a band-diagonal signal correlation matrix with a small number of nonzero diagonals [1]–[3] and ii) a nonpositive cross-correlation between all pairs of signature waveforms [4]. However, these structural constraints are rather restrictive and are satisfied only in some special scenarios of multiuser communications. In fact, for an arbitrary signal correlation matrix, it is unlikely that an efficient MLD algorithm exists because the MLD problem in this general case has been shown to be a nondeterministic polynomial-time hard (NP-hard) problem [5], which implies that there is no known algorithm that can solve the MLD problem with polynomial complexity in the number of users.

Because of the intrinsic difficulty in solving the MLD problem, there has been much interest in the development of suboptimal but computationally efficient ML detectors. A tree search method has been proposed to perform an incomplete search for the MLD solution with limited complexity [6]. Multistage detection [7], the coordinate ascent algorithm [8], and the expectation-maximization (EM) approach [9] are methods in which the detected symbols are iteratively updated in an attempt to increase the log likelihood function. These iterative methods are similar in that they perform some form of interference cancellation. The drawback of interference cancellation is that if the estimation of the interference is incorrect, the interference may be aggravated by the interference-canceling operation.

In this paper, we examine the approximation of the MLD solution using relaxation methods. Relaxation is an effective approximation technique for certain difficult optimization problems. Its rationale is simple in that it relaxes some of the constraints of the optimization problem such that the relaxed problem is easier to solve than the original problem. In this work, most of our emphasis will be placed on semi-definite (SD) relaxation [10], [11], which is an accurate and efficient approximation method for certain kinds of NP-hard problems. We will describe the SD relaxation algorithm for the Boolean

Manuscript received December 7, 2000; revised December 6, 2001. This work was supported in part by the Hong Kong Research Grant Council and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. The fourth author was also supported by the Canada Research Chair program. The associate editor coordinating the review of this paper and approving it for publication was Dr. Inbar Fijalkow.

W.-K. Ma and P.-C. Ching are with the Department of Electronic Engineering, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong (e-mail: wkma@ee.cuhk.edu.hk; pcching@ee.cuhk.edu.hk).

T. N. Davidson, K. M. Wong, and Z.-Q. Luo are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada (e-mail: davidson@mcmaster.ca; wongkm@mcmaster.ca; luozq@mcmaster.ca).

Publisher Item Identifier S 1053-587X(02)02389-9.

quadratic-programming (QP) problem [11] and will show how this algorithm can be applied to the MLD problem with anti-podal data transmission. There are three advantages of employing SD relaxation.

1) The SD relaxation algorithm is based on solving a convex optimization problem. Hence, this method does not suffer from local maxima.
2) The relaxed problem is a semi-definite programming problem, which is known to be efficiently solvable [12].
3) The SD relaxation algorithm has a theoretical guarantee that the approximation accuracy is, at worst, moderate [11]. Moreover, the performance of this algorithm in practice is substantially better than that of the worst case.

In addition to SD relaxation, we also consider two other relaxation methods that have recently been applied to multiuser detection [13], [14], namely, unconstrained relaxation and bound relaxation. These two relaxation algorithms are related to some existing detectors, such as the well-known decorrelating and linear-minimum-mean-square-error (LMMSE) detectors, and a modified form of the space-alternating generalized expectation-maximization (SAGE) detector [9]. We will show that both the unconstrained and bound relaxation methods can be considered to be further relaxations of the SD relaxation method. This result suggests that the SD relaxation ML (SDR-ML) detector should perform better than those existing detectors. This viewpoint will be supported by our simulation results for synchronous CDMA, where the bit error rate (BER) performance of the SDR-ML detector is shown to be better than that of other suboptimal detectors including the decorrelator, the LMMSE detector, and the SAGE detectors. Our simulation results will also show that the SDR-ML detector yields a BER performance close to that of the true ML detector, even when the cross-correlations between users are strong or the near-far effect is significant.

II. Problem Statement

Assuming antipodal data transmission, the received signal for a multiuser communication system can be represented by the following equation:

$$r(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sqrt{E_k} b_k s_k(t) + v(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{T} \tag{1}$$

where

$b_k \in \{-1, +1\}$	information symbol transmitted by kth user;
$s_k(t)$	unit-energy waveform carrying the information symbol of the kth user;
E_k	received signal energy for the kth transmitted waveform;
$v(t)$	zero-mean additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) with two-sided power spectral density $\mathcal{N}_o/2$;
K	number of users;
$\mathcal{T}$	observation interval.

We assume that $\{s_k(t)\}$ is a set of nonorthogonal signals. Equation (1) can be considered to be a generic model for many multiple signal detection problems, such as the CDMA multiuser detection problems [1], [2]. In particular, for the detection problem of synchronous CDMA signals over one symbol period, $\{s_k(t)\}$ is defined to be a set of symbol-synchronous spreading-code waveforms

$$s_k(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{P-1} c_{ki} \psi(t - iT_p) \tag{2}$$

of duration T_b, where

P	number of chips per symbol;
$T_p = T_b/P$	chip duration;
$\{c_{ki}\}_{i=0}^{P-1}$	spreading-code sequence for the kth user;
$\psi(t)$	self-orthogonal chip waveform over the interval T_p.

The purpose of multiuser detection is to detect $\{b_k\}$ given the observed signal $r(t)$. The ML detector for such a received signal is optimum in that the probability of incorrectly detecting $\mathbf{b} = [b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_K]^T$ is minimized, under the following standard assumptions.

i) The sets $\{s_k(t)\}$ and $\{E_k\}$ are known.
ii) The bits b_k are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) and equiprobable.[1]

Maximum likelihood detection (MLD) can be formulated as [1]

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{ML}} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \{-1,+1\}^K} J(\mathbf{b}) \tag{3}$$

where

$$J(\mathbf{b}) = 2\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{H}\mathbf{b} \tag{4}$$

is an objective function proportional to the log likelihood function. Here, the kth element of the vector $\mathbf{y}$ is given by

$$y_k = \int_{\mathcal{T}} r(t) s_k(t) dt \tag{5}$$

and is the sampled matched filter output for the kth user, and $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{ARA}$ is the signal correlation matrix, with $\mathbf{A} = \mathrm{diag}(\sqrt{E_1}, \ldots, \sqrt{E_K})$, and

$$R_{ij} = \int_{\mathcal{T}} s_i(t) s_j(t) dt \tag{6}$$

being the (i, j)th element of normalized correlation matrix $\mathbf{R}$. To perform MLD, it is necessary to solve the combinatorial optimization problem in (3). As pointed out in Section I, Problem (3) can be solved using an exhaustive search, in which the MLD solution is found by evaluating $J(\mathbf{b})$ for all $\mathbf{b} \in \{-1, 1\}^K$. However, the complexity of the exhaustive search is $\mathcal{O}(2^K)$ and, thus, is prohibitive for large K. In fact, for an arbitrary $\mathbf{H}$, it is unlikely that the MLD problem can be efficiently solved (in the sense of polynomial-time complexity in K) because Problem (3) is an NP-hard problem [5].

III. Some Basic Concepts of Relaxation

In general, an optimization problem can be formulated as

$$f^\star = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} f(\mathbf{x}) \tag{7}$$

[1]An additional property of the ML detector is that for sufficiently high signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs), its bit error probability for any individual b_k approaches the lowest achievable [1], [15, pp. 45–48].

where $\mathcal{S}$, $f(\mathbf{x})$, and $f^\star$ represent the feasible set, the objective function, and the maximum objective value achieved by (7), respectively. The following problem

$$g^\star = \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{U}} f(\mathbf{x}) \tag{8}$$

is called a relaxation of (7) if $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{U}$. The intent of relaxation is to make the relaxed problem easier to solve than the original problem by appropriately choosing $\mathcal{U}$. However, the solution to the relaxed problem cannot be directly used as an approximate solution to (7) because it may not lie in $\mathcal{S}$. For this reason, some approximation techniques are usually required to convert the relaxation solution to an approximate solution to the original problem. Hence, a relaxation algorithm should consist of two steps.

i) Solve the relaxed problem.
ii) Use an approximation algorithm to convert the relaxation solution to an approximate solution to the original problem.

We now illustrate the principle of relaxation by a simple example in which an unconstrained relaxation method [13], [14] is applied to the MLD problem. For simplicity, we assume $\mathbf{R}$ to be of full rank. Now, if the alphabet constraint in (3) is removed, we obtain the following relaxation:

$$\max_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{R}^K} J(\mathbf{b}). \tag{9}$$

Problem (9) is a least-squares problem and, thus, is much easier to solve than the MLD problem. It can be shown that the solution to (9) is $\mathbf{H}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}$ [16]. Denote the approximate MLD solution by $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}}$. To obtain $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}}$, we can apply an element-by-element threshold decision to the solution to (9), i.e., choose $\hat{b}_{\mathrm{UR},k} = -1$ if $[\mathbf{H}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}]_k < 0$, and $\hat{b}_{\mathrm{UR},k} = 1$ otherwise. In fact, this relaxation method is closely related to one commonly known suboptimal detector, namely, the decorrelator. This will be elaborated in Section V.

We see that the maximum objective value achieved by the relaxed problem provides an upper bound on the maximum objective value achieved by the original problem, i.e., $f^\star \le g^\star$. Hence, if the gap $g^\star - f^\star$ is reduced, it is possible that the relaxation solution can be made closer to the solution of the original problem, and a more accurate approximate solution may be obtained. Similarly, if we have another relaxation

$$h^\star = \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{V}} f(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{V} \tag{10}$$

and $h^\star$ provides a tighter upper bound than $g^\star$ (i.e., $h^\star \le g^\star$), then it is expected that relaxation (10) should lead to a better approximation than relaxation (8). We say that one relaxation is tighter than another if the maximum objective value of the former is no greater than that of the latter. In designing a relaxation algorithm with good approximation accuracy, it is beneficial to employ a tight relaxation.

IV. Application of SD Relaxation to MLD

Unlike the unconstrained relaxation method, which modifies the alphabet constraint in the MLD problem, the SD relaxation method considers an increase in problem dimensionality to provide a tight relaxation. The relative tightness of various relaxation methods will be discussed in Section V. In this section, the SD relaxation algorithm for the Boolean quadratic-programming (QP) problem will be described. Then, by showing the link between the Boolean QP problem and the MLD problem, we will describe how the SD relaxation algorithm can be applied to the MLD problem. A summary of the SDR-ML detector is provided in Table I.

TABLE I
Summary of the SDR-ML Detector

Step 1. Set $n = K + 1$, and

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{H} & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} \\ (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y})^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Step 2. Solve the semi-definite program

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \arg \max_{\substack{\mathbf{X}\succeq\mathbf{0} \\ X_{ii}=1\ \forall\ i}} \mathrm{Trace}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Q})$$

Step 3. Factorize $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T\hat{\mathbf{V}}$.
Step 4. Randomization: Denote the number of randomizations by M_{rand}.
for i=1,2,...,M_{rand}
Randomly generate a vector $\mathbf{u}_i$ uniformly distributed on an n-dimensional unit sphere. Compute $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \sigma(\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T\mathbf{u}_i)$.
end;
Choose $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j$ as the approximation of $\mathbf{x}^\star$, where $j = \arg \max_{i=1,\ldots,M_{\mathrm{rand}}} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^T\mathbf{Q}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i$.
Step 5. Take $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{SDR}} = \hat{x}_{K+1}[\ \hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_K\ ]^T$ as the approximate MLD solution.

A. Semi-Definite Relaxation

We consider the following *Boolean QP problem*:

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\{-1,+1\}^n} \mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x} \tag{11}$$

where $\mathbf{Q}$ can be any symmetric matrix. To present SD relaxation, we consider a reformulation of the Boolean QP problem. Since $\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x} = \mathrm{Trace}(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{Q})$, Problem (11) is equivalent to the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\max \mathrm{Trace}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Q}) \\ &\text{s.t. } \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T, \quad \mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n \\ &\qquad X_{ii} = 1, \quad i = 1,\ldots,n. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The constraint $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T$ implies that $\mathbf{X}$ is symmetric, positive semi-definite (PSD), and of rank 1. Due to the constraint $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T$, Problem (12) is a nonconvex optimization problem. Now, if the rank-1 constraint is removed from (12), we obtain the following relaxed problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\max \mathrm{Trace}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Q}) \\ &\text{s.t. } \mathbf{X} \succeq \mathbf{0} \\ &\qquad X_{ii} = 1, \quad i = 1,\ldots,n \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{X} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ means that $\mathbf{X}$ is symmetric and PSD. Problem (13) is known as a *semi-definite programming* (SDP) *problem* [12], and therefore, (13) is called an *SD relaxation* of (11). An advantage of using SD relaxation is that (13) is a convex optimization problem and, hence, does not suffer from local

maxima. Furthermore, an efficient optimization algorithm based on interior-point methods has been developed for the SDP problem in (13) [17], [18]. This algorithm is efficient in that for a given accuracy, a solution to (13) can be found in at most $\mathcal{O}(n^{3.5})$ operations.[2] The SD relaxation problem has an interesting property that will become important later.

Property 1 [11]: The solution to (13) is independent of the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{Q}$.

This property can be verified by defining $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} : P_{ii} = 0, i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ and letting

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}. \tag{14}$$

Substituting (14) into (13), the SD relaxation problem is reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \max \ & \sum_{i=1}^{n} Q_{ii} + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1, i\neq j}^{n} P_{ij}Q_{ij} \\ \text{s.t. } & \mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P} \\ & \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{P} \succeq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Obviously, the solution to the SD relaxation problem does not depend on the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{Q}$.

B. Approximate Boolean QP Solution via Randomization

We have seen that by replacing the rank-1 constraint of the original problem with a symmetric PSD constraint, SD relaxation leads to an increase in problem dimension. Since the original and relaxed problems have different problem dimensions, some special techniques are required to convert the SD relaxation solution to an approximate Boolean QP solution. A randomization method has been proposed for this conversion process [10], [11]. To gain an intuitive understanding of the randomization, we consider alternative expressions of the Boolean QP and SD relaxation problems. The Boolean QP problem in (11) can be expressed as

$$\max_{\substack{x_i^2=1,\\ i=1,\ldots,n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_i x_j Q_{ij}. \tag{16}$$

Define $\mathbf{x}^\star$ to be the solution of (16). Notice that $-\mathbf{x}^\star$ is also the solution of (16) because both $\mathbf{x}^\star$ and $-\mathbf{x}^\star$ achieve the same objective value. For the SD relaxation problem, let $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{V}$, where $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_n]$ is any square-root factor (e.g., the Cholesky factor) of $\mathbf{X}$. Substituting $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{V}$ into (13), we obtain the following equivalent problem:

$$\max_{\substack{||\mathbf{v}_i||=1,\\ i=1,\ldots,n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{v}_i^T\mathbf{v}_j Q_{ij} \tag{17}$$

where $||\cdot||$ represents the 2-norm. Define $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ to be the solution of the SD relaxation problem in (13), and define $\hat{\mathbf{V}} = [\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \ldots, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n]$ to be a square-root factor of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$. Then, $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ is the solution of the equivalent problem in (17). Comparing (16) with (17), an interesting parallel can be observed: The increase in dimensionality in the SD relaxation problem causes the replacement of the scalar product $x_i x_j$ with the inner product $\mathbf{v}_i^T\mathbf{v}_j$. Hence, it appears that one should be able to approximate $x_i^\star$ using $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i$. In the randomization process described below, $x_i^\star$ is approximated by making a vector-domain threshold decision on $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i$ with the cutting hyperplane being randomly chosen. Define $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ to be the approximate solution generated by the randomization method. The randomization consists of the following steps.

1) Randomly generate a cutting hyperplane that passes through the origin. Such a hyperplane can be represented by $\{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{u} = 0\}$, where $\mathbf{u}$ is a random vector uniformly distributed on an n-dimensional unit sphere.
2) For $k = 1, \ldots, n$, choose $\tilde{x}_k = -1$ if $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_k$ lies "below" the cutting hyperplane, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_k^T\mathbf{u} < 0$, and choose $\tilde{x}_k = 1$ otherwise.

Define $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ to be a function where the ith element of $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ is 1 if $x_i \geq 0$ and -1 otherwise. We notice that the above two steps of the randomization can simply be expressed as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \sigma(\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T\mathbf{u}). \tag{18}$$

Usually, to further improve the approximation quality, the randomization is repeated a number of times, and the randomized solution yielding the largest objective function value is chosen as the approximate solution. This procedure is stated in Step 4 of Table I. Often, this randomization method can achieve an accurate approximation with a modest number of randomizations. For example, in the application of CDMA multiuser detection, which will be shown in Section VI, the number of randomizations required to achieve good BER performance is 10 to 20. We also point out that the randomization process (with a modest number of randomizations) is computationally efficient since its operation count is $\mathcal{O}(n^2 M_{\text{rand}})$, where M_{rand} stands for the number of randomizations. In fact, the complexity of the randomization process (with modest M_{rand}) is almost negligible compared with that of solving the SDP problem.

As we point out in the following property, in some situations, it is sufficient to perform the randomization only once.

Property 2: Let $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ with $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, and let $\mathbf{u}$ be a random vector uniformly distributed on an n-dimensional unit sphere. For any rank-1 $\mathbf{X}$ such that $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T$

$$\sigma(\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{u}) = \pm\sigma(\mathbf{x}) \tag{19}$$

holds with probability 1.

Proof: Since $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T$, its square-root factor is determined as

$$\mathbf{V} = [x_1\mathbf{z}, x_2\mathbf{z}, \ldots, x_n\mathbf{z}] \tag{20}$$

for some $||\mathbf{z}|| = 1$. Assuming that $\mathbf{z}^T\mathbf{u} \neq 0$, we have

$$\sigma(\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{u}) = \sigma(\mathbf{z}^T\mathbf{u})\sigma(\mathbf{x}) \tag{21}$$

where $\sigma(\mathbf{z}^T\mathbf{u})$ may either be 1 or -1. To prove that (21) holds with probability 1, we consider the probability that $\mathbf{z}^T\mathbf{u} = 0$. According to [10], $\mathbf{u}$ can be obtained by drawing an i.i.d. Gaussian random vector, followed by a normalization, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{u} = \frac{\mathbf{w}}{||\mathbf{w}||}, \quad \mathbf{w} \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}). \tag{22}$$

[2]Interior-point algorithms are iterative algorithms that terminate once a prespecified accuracy has been reached. For the SDP in (13), the complexity per iteration is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ [17], [18], and for a given accuracy, the number of iterations required is at most $\mathcal{O}(n^{0.5})$.

The condition $\mathbf{z}^T\mathbf{u} = 0$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{z}^T\mathbf{w} = 0$. Then, it can be easily shown that the probability $P[\mathbf{z}^T\mathbf{w} = 0]$ tends to zero, and thus, (19) holds with probability 1. □

Applying Property 2 to the SD relaxation algorithm, we see that if $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ is of rank 1, then, with probability 1, the approximate solution for any number of randomizations is equal to either the sign of the dominant eigenvector of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ or its negative version. This special property will be useful in proving an important theorem in the next section.

Finally, we point out that the approximation accuracy of the randomization method has been theoretically analyzed by Nesterov [11]. It was shown that for a sufficient (yet finite) number of randomizations, the approximation accuracy of the randomization method is, at worst, moderate. However, as will be apparent from the simulation results in Section VI, the SD relaxation algorithm often exhibits very good approximation accuracy in practice. Furthermore, the number of randomizations required to achieve good approximation accuracy is often much smaller than that suggested by Nesterov's (worst-case) analysis.

C. SD Relaxation ML Detector

To apply the SD relaxation algorithm to the MLD problem, the original MLD problem has to be rewritten in the same form as (11). Define a scalar $c \in \{-1, 1\}$. Since $c\mathbf{b} \in \{-1, 1\}^K$ for any $\mathbf{b} \in \{-1, 1\}^K$, (3) can be rewritten as

$$\max_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,+1\}^K} J(\mathbf{b}) \equiv \max_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,+1\}^K \\ c\in\{-1,+1\}}} \tag{23a}$$

$$J(c\mathbf{b}) = \max_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,+1\}^K \\ c\in\{-1,+1\}}} 2c\mathbf{b}^T\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b}^T\mathbf{H}\mathbf{b} \tag{23b}$$

$$= \max_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,+1\}^K \\ c\in\{-1,+1\}}} [\mathbf{b}^T c] \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{H} & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} \\ (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y})^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b} \\ c \end{bmatrix}. \tag{23c}$$

Clearly, (23c) is equivalent to the Boolean QP problem in (11), where $n = K + 1$, $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{b}^T \ c]^T$, and

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{H} & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} \\ (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y})^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{24}$$

Let $(\mathbf{b}^\star, c^\star)$ be the optimal solution of (23a). Since $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{ML}}$ and $c^\star\mathbf{b}^\star$ attain the same maximum objective value in (23a)

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{ML}} = c^\star\mathbf{b}^\star. \tag{25}$$

Hence, we can use the SD relaxation algorithm described in previous subsections to approximate the solution to (23c) and then use the relationship in (25) to obtain an approximate MLD solution. A summary of the SDR-ML detector is given in Table I. Finally, we conclude from previous subsections that the complexity of the SDR-ML detector is $\mathcal{O}((K+1)^{3.5}) \simeq \mathcal{O}(K^{3.5})$.

V. Relationship of SDR-ML Detector to Other Multiuser Detectors

In this section, we will consider two other relaxation methods called unconstrained relaxation and bound relaxation for the MLD problem. It will be illustrated that some existing multiuser detectors can be viewed as approximate MLD algorithms using these two methods. Then, we will prove that both the unconstrained and bound relaxation methods are further relaxation of the SD relaxation method, and therefore, it is expected that the SDR-ML detector should perform better than those existing detectors.

A. Unconstrained Relaxation and Bound Relaxation

The unconstrained relaxation (UR) algorithm, which has been briefly described in Section III, is formulated as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}} = \arg\max_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{R}^K} J(\mathbf{b}) \tag{26a}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}} = \sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}}) \tag{26b}$$

where

$J(\mathbf{b})$	given by (4);
$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}}$	approximate solution using UR;
$\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$	element-wise threshold decision function.

UR is a loose relaxation since there is no restriction on the possible values of $\tilde{b}_{\mathrm{UR},k}$. An *ad hoc* method that may partially compensate this problem is to add a penalty function to (26a):

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}} = \arg\max_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{R}^K} J(\mathbf{b}) - \gamma||\mathbf{b}||^2 \tag{27}$$

where $\gamma||\mathbf{b}||^2$ is the penalty function, and $\gamma \geq 0$ is a constant. The reason for choosing such a penalty function is to implicitly constrain the magnitude of b_k while maintaining the least-squares nature of the relaxed problem. Interestingly, the penalized UR problem in (27) is still a relaxation of the MLD problem. To illustrate this point, we consider a restriction of (27), where the original feasible set is replaced by the alphabet set

$$\max_{\mathbf{b}\in\{-1,1\}^K} J(\mathbf{b}) - \gamma||\mathbf{b}||^2. \tag{28}$$

Clearly, Problem (28) is an equivalent MLD problem because $||\mathbf{b}||^2$ is a constant for any $\mathbf{b} \in \{-1, 1\}^K$. Thus, (27) is a relaxation of the equivalent MLD problem in (28).

As described in Section III, the major advantage of using UR is the availability of a closed-form solution. Assuming $\mathbf{H} + \gamma\mathbf{I}$ to be a full-rank matrix, the solution to (27) is given by [16]

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}} = (\mathbf{H} + \gamma\mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} \tag{29}$$

and it can be shown that

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}} = \sigma((\mathbf{R} + \gamma\mathbf{A}^{-2})^{-1}\mathbf{y}). \tag{30}$$

To see how the penalized UR method is related to some of the existing suboptimal detectors, we consider the outputs of three well-known linear detectors, viz. the matched filter detector, the decorrelator, and the LMMSE detector, which are given, respectively, by

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{MF}} = \sigma(\mathbf{y}) \tag{31}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{DC}} = \sigma(\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{y}) \tag{32}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{LMMSE}} = \sigma\left(\left(\mathbf{R} + \frac{\mathcal{N}_o}{2}\mathbf{A}^{-2}\right)^{-1}\mathbf{y}\right). \tag{33}$$

See [1] for the detailed derivations of the above detectors. Basically, the matched filter detector is a single-user detector that is optimal in the absence of multiuser interference, whereas the decorrelator and the LMMSE detector use different forms of linear mapping to suppress the multiuser interference.

Comparing (30) with (31)–(33), the equivalence between the UR detector and the linear detectors above can be clearly seen. If the UR problem is not penalized, i.e., $\gamma = 0$, then $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}} \equiv \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{DC}}$. On the other hand, if γ is chosen to be $\mathcal{N}_o/2$ such that the influence of the penalty function to the UR problem is adjusted according to the noise power, then $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}} \equiv \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{LMMSE}}$. Finally, if the UR problem is overpenalized such that $\gamma \gg \max E_k$, the approximate solution $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{UR}}$ approaches $\sigma((\gamma\mathbf{A}^{-2})^{-1}\mathbf{y}) = \sigma(\mathbf{y}) \equiv \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{MF}}$. Thus, each of the linear detectors in (31)–(33) can be viewed as approximate ML detectors under UR.

Next, we consider the bound relaxation (BR) method, which has been recently applied to multiuser detection in [13] and [14]. Instead of allowing the relaxation solution to lie in $\mathbb{R}^K$, the BR method constrains the relaxation solution to lie within a K-dimensional cube. The BR algorithm is formulated as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{BR}} = \arg \max_{\substack{-1 \le b_k \le 1 \\ k=1,\ldots,K}} J(\mathbf{b}) \tag{34a}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{BR}} = \sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{BR}}). \tag{34b}$$

Bound relaxation has two advantages.

i) It is tighter than the unpenalized UR method.
ii) The relaxed problem has a concave (quadratic) objective function and linear inequality constraints, and hence, (34a) is a convex optimization problem [19].

There is an existing multiuser detector that is closely related to the BR method. In [9], Nelson and Poor considered the SAGE algorithm as a method of suboptimally solving the MLD problem. It can be seen that one of the modified SAGE detectors, namely, the SAGE detector with unit-clipper M-step, actually uses a coordinate ascent method [8] to solve (34a) and then takes the sign of the solution to (34a) as the approximate MLD solution. (See [13] and [15, pp. 89–92] for details.)

B. Relative Tightness of Various Relaxation Methods

We note that we can represent the UR and BR methods, both with and without a penalty function, by a generalized expression as

$$\begin{aligned} h^\star &= \max_{\substack{-d \le b_k \le d \\ k=1,\ldots,K}} J(\mathbf{b}) - \gamma\|\mathbf{b}\|^2 \\ &= \max_{\substack{-d \le b_k \le d \\ k=1,\ldots,K}} 2\mathbf{b}^T\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b}^T(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I})\mathbf{b} \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where $d \ge 1$ and $\gamma \ge 0$ are constants, and $h^\star$ denotes the maximum objective value achieved by Problem (35). We call (35) the generalized bound relaxation (GBR) problem. It is observed that if $\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I}$ is positive definite, then the objective function in (35) is strictly concave, and thus, the solution to (35) is unique [19]. (Note that if $\mathbf{R}$ is of full rank, or if $\gamma > 0$, then $\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I}$ is positive definite.) Let $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{GBR}}$ be the solution of (35), and let $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{GBR}} = \sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{GBR}})$ be the approximate MLD solution of the GBR problem. By following the same procedure as described in Section IV-C, (35) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} h^\star &= \max_{\substack{x_k^2 \le d^2, k=1,\ldots,K \\ x_{K+1}^2 = 1}} \mathbf{x}^T\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{x} \\ &= \max \ \mathrm{Trace}(\mathbf{X}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}) \\ &\quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T \\ &\quad X_{ii} \le d^2, \quad i = 1,\ldots,K \\ &\quad X_{K+1,K+1} = 1 \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{b}^T \ c]^T$ with $c \in \{-1, 1\}$, and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} = \begin{bmatrix} -(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I}) & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} \\ (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y})^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{37}$$

If the rank-1 constraint in (36) is replaced by a symmetric PSD constraint, we obtain an SD relaxation of the GBR problem

$$\begin{aligned} l^\star &= \max \mathrm{Trace}(\mathbf{X}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}) \\ &\quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{X} \succeq \mathbf{0} \\ &\quad X_{ii} \le d^2, \quad i = 1,\ldots,K \\ &\quad X_{K+1,K+1} = 1 \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where $l^\star$ is the maximum objective value achieved by (38). Let $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ be the solution of (38), and let $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{GBR\text{-}SDR}}$ be an approximate MLD solution obtained from applying the randomization procedure in Section IV-B to $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$. We have the following equivalence theorem.

Theorem 1: The GBR problem given by (35) and its SD relaxed version given by (38) are equivalent in that they achieve the same maximum objective value, i.e.,

$$h^\star = l^\star. \tag{39}$$

Furthermore, if $\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I}$ is positive definite, then with probability 1

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{GBR-SDR}} = \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathrm{GBR}} \tag{40}$$

for any number of randomizations.

Proof: We first prove (39) by showing $h^\star \le l^\star$ and $h^\star \ge l^\star$. The former is obvious since (38) is a relaxation of (35). To show the latter, we consider a reformulation of (38). Let

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Z} & \zeta \\ \zeta^T & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{41}$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times K}$ is a symmetric matrix, and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K$. We note that $\mathbf{X} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{Z} - \zeta\zeta^T \succeq \mathbf{0}$ due to the Schur complement [20]. By substituting (41) into (38), Problem (38) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} l^\star &= \max 2\zeta^T\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} - \mathrm{Trace}(\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I})) \\ &\quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{Z} - \zeta\zeta^T \succeq \mathbf{0} \\ &\quad Z_{ii} \le d^2, \quad i = 1,\ldots,K. \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Since $\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I} \succeq \mathbf{0}$

$$\mathrm{Trace}((\mathbf{Z} - \zeta\zeta^T)(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I})) \ge 0 \tag{43}$$

for any $\mathbf{Z}-\zeta\zeta^T \succeq \mathbf{0}$. It follows from (43) that

$$\text{Trace}(\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I})) \geq \zeta^T(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I})\zeta \tag{44}$$

for any feasible $(\mathbf{Z},\zeta)$. Furthermore, since the diagonal elements of a PSD matrix are non-negative

$$\zeta_i{}^2 \leq Z_{ii} \leq d^2, \quad i=1,\ldots,K \tag{45}$$

for any feasible $(\mathbf{Z},\zeta)$. Now, define $(\mathbf{Z}^\star,\zeta^\star)$ to be the solution of (42). Applying (44) and (45) to (42), we get

$$l^\star = 2(\zeta^\star)^T\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} - (\zeta^*)^T(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I})\zeta^* \tag{46a}$$

$$\leq \max_{\zeta_i{}^2\leq d^2,\forall i} 2\zeta^T\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} - \zeta^T(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I})\zeta = h^\star. \tag{46b}$$

Thus, (39) follows.

Next, we prove the equivalence in (40), using the assumption that the matrix $\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I}$ is positive definite. Since $h^\star = l^\star$, the equality sign holds in (46a) and (46b). Comparing (42) with (46a), we see that $(\mathbf{Z}^\star,\zeta^\star)$ must satisfy the following condition:

$$\text{Trace}(\mathbf{Z}^\star(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I})) - (\zeta^\star)^T(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I})\zeta^\star = 0 \tag{47a}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\text{Trace}((\mathbf{Z}^\star - \zeta^\star(\zeta^\star)^T)(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I})) = 0. \tag{47b}$$

Using standard properties of positive definite and semi-definite matrices [21, p. 318], it can be shown that (47b) holds if and only if

$$(\mathbf{Z}^\star - \zeta^\star(\zeta^\star)^T)(\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I}) = 0. \tag{48}$$

Hence, for a positive definite (and thus invertible) $\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I}$, we must have

$$\mathbf{Z}^\star = \zeta^\star(\zeta^\star)^T. \tag{49}$$

Subsequently, the solution to (38), which is denoted by $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$, is of the form

$$\bar{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}^T, \quad \mathbf{q} = [(\zeta^\star)^T \quad 1]^T. \tag{50}$$

Comparing the two equivalent problems (35) and (42), we see that $\zeta^\star = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{GBR}}$. We also notice that $\zeta^\star$ is unique because $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\text{GBR}}$ is unique for a positive definite $\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I}$. Finally, by applying Property 2 to (50), it can be shown that for any number of randomizations, (40) holds with probability 1. □

Theorem 1 provides the important implication that the SD relaxation algorithm for the GBR problem is equivalent to the GBR algorithm itself in the sense that they have the same tightness and that they produce the same approximate solution under the assumption of $\mathbf{H}+\gamma\mathbf{I}$ being positive definite. More importantly, due to Property 1 (in Section IV-A), the SD relaxation problem in (13) can be re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\max \text{Trace}(\mathbf{X}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}) \\ &\text{s.t. } \mathbf{X} \succeq \mathbf{0} \\ &\quad X_{ii} = 1, \quad i=1,\ldots,n \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$



Fig. 1. Near–far performance of (a) the SDR-ML detector and the true ML detector. (b) Various multiuser detectors. The number of users is 4, and the user of interest is 3 with $2E_3/\mathcal{N}_o = 11$ dB. Note that for the SAGE detectors, decorrelator initialization is employed, and the number of stages is 5.

where $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ is given by (37). Obviously, the equivalent GBR problem in (38) is a relaxation of (51), where K of the equality constraints in (51) are replaced by inequality constraints. Hence, SD relaxation is tighter than GBR, and therefore, it is expected that the SDR-ML detector should yield a better approximation than any GBR-based detectors. The superior performance of the SDR-ML detector is demonstrated in the following section.

VI. Simulation Results

We now demonstrate the performance of the SDR-ML detector in a number of synchronous CDMA scenarios.

Example 1: The purpose of this example is to compare the BER performance of the ML detector and that of the SDR-ML detector. Since the ML detector is computationally prohibitive

TABLE II
MAXIMUM-ABSOLUTE CROSS-CORRELATION VALUES AND SUM-SQUARED CROSS-CORRELATION VALUES OF TWO SPREADING CODES. GOLD-31 AND KAS-15, RESPECTIVELY STAND FOR THE LENGTH-31 GOLD CODES WITH $K = 16$, AND THE LENGTH-15 KASAMI CODES (LARGE SET) WITH $K = 15$

User Index (i)	$\max_{j\neq i}\lvert R_{ij}\rvert$		$\sum_{j\neq i} R_{ij}^2$	
	Gold-31	Kas-15	Gold-31	Kas-15
1	0.226	0.6	0.365	1.38
2	0.29	0.333	0.515	0.276
3	0.226	0.6	0.265	1.34
4	0.29	0.467	0.415	0.916
5	0.226	0.467	0.415	0.56
6	0.29	0.467	0.382	0.524
7	0.29	0.6	0.515	0.667
8	0.29	0.6	0.349	1.06
9	0.29	0.467	0.582	0.56
10	0.29	0.333	0.399	0.347
11	0.29	0.6	0.682	0.916
12	0.29	0.6	0.332	1.59
13	0.29	0.467	0.232	0.56
14	0.29	0.6	0.332	0.88
15	0.29	0.467	0.365	0.88
16	0.29	-	0.465	-

to implement for large K, we are restricted to the case of a small number of users. In this example, we consider a four-user system with spreading factor equal to 7. The corresponding signal correlation matrix is given by

$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{1}{7}\begin{bmatrix} 7 & -1 & 3 & 3 \\ -1 & 7 & 3 & -1 \\ 3 & 3 & 7 & -1 \\ 3 & -1 & -1 & 7 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{52}$$

We are interested in a near–far simulation scenario in which the BER performance of a particular user is evaluated under various interfering user signal energies. The simulation setting is similar to that in [9] and is given as follows. User 3 is chosen to be the desired user with SNR fixed at $2E_3/\mathcal{N}_o = 11\text{dB}$, whereas users 1, 2, and 4 are treated as interferers with $2E_1/\mathcal{N}_o = 2E_2/\mathcal{N}_o = 2E_4/\mathcal{N}_o$. (Similar results are obtained when one of the other users is chosen as the desired user.) The number of trials for the simulation is set to be 1 000 000. The near-far performance of the true ML detector (implemented via exhaustive search) and the SDR-ML detector is plotted in Fig. 1(a), where the symbol M_{rand} represents the number of randomizations. For reference, the no-interference lower bound is plotted in the same figure. (The no-interference bound is the performance of user 3 in the absence of users 1, 2, and 4, and, hence, is independent of the abscissa.) It is seen that the performance of the SDR-ML detector improves significantly with M_{rand} and that its BER for $M_{\text{rand}} = 10$ is almost the same as that of the true ML detector. We also compare the BER performance of the SDR-ML detector with that of various suboptimal multiuser detectors in Fig. 1(b), using the same scenario as in Fig. 1(a). Recall from Section V that the matched filter detector, the decorrelator, and the LMMSE detector can be regarded as unconstrained-relaxation detectors, whereas the SAGE detector with unit-clipper M-step can be viewed as a bound-relaxation detector. (It should also be pointed out that the SAGE detector with hard-decision M-step is structurally equivalent to a serial-update interference-canceling detector [9].) It is seen that



Fig. 2. BER performance in a 16-user synchronous CDMA system using length-31 Gold codes. (a) Average BER of the SDR-ML detector with different number of randomizations. (b) Average BERs of various multiuser detectors. Note that for the SAGE detectors, decorrelator initialization is employed, and the number of stages is 5.

the SDR-ML detector provides better BER performance than these alternative suboptimal detectors, which supports our viewpoint in Section V that SD relaxation should perform better than unconstrained relaxation and bound relaxation. □

Example 2: In the second example, we are interested in average BER performance of a number of multiuser detectors when all users have the same signal strength. Two sets of spreading codes, namely, the length-31 Gold codes with $K = 16$ and the length-15 Kasami codes (large set) with $K = 15$, are chosen for the test. Measures of the cross-correlations of the two spreading code sets are tabulated in Table II. It is observed that the length-15 Kasami codes exhibit a much stronger cross-correlation than the length-31 Gold codes. Figs. 2 and 3 show the average BER performance of the various multiuser detectors for the two code sets. For reference, we



Fig. 3. BER performance in a 15-user synchronous CDMA system using length-15 Kasami codes. (a) Average BER of the SDR-ML detector with different number of randomizations. (b) Average BERs of various multiuser detectors. Note that for the SAGE detectors, decorrelator initialization is employed, and the number of stages is 5.



Fig. 4. Near–far performance plots illustrating the average BERs of the desired users versus the SNRs of the interfering users. (a) Sixteen-user synchronous CDMA system using length-31 Gold codes. (b) Fifteen-user synchronous CDMA system using length-15 Kasami codes. Note that for the SAGE detectors, decorrelator initialization is employed, and the number of stages is 5.

have also plotted the no-interference lower bound and Verdú's theoretical upper bound [1] on the BER performance of the true ML detector. We first observe that the SDR-ML detector provides good BER performance for $M_{\text{rand}} \geq 10$. Moreover, it is seen that the BER performance of the SDR-ML detector is better than that of the other multiuser detectors, particularly in the case of length-15 Kasami codes, where the performance of other detectors is considerably degraded by the strong signal cross-correlations. In the case of length-31 Gold codes, the BER of the SDR-ML detector ($M_{\text{rand}} \geq 15$) lies well below Verdé's upper bound [1] on the BER of the true ML detector. In the case of length-15 Kasami codes, the BER of the SDR-ML detector ($M_{\text{rand}} = 20$) is below Verdú's upper bound for $2E_k/\mathcal{N}_o < 10$ dB, and slightly above Verdé's upper bound at $2E_k/\mathcal{N}_o = 11$ dB. Since Verdú's upper bound is tight for sufficiently high SNRs [1], we infer that the performance difference between the SDR-ML detector and the true ML detector should be small. (Recall that the computational cost of empirically evaluating the BER performance of the exact ML detector is prohibitive in this scenario.) □

Example 3: In the third example, we use the length-31 Gold codes and the length-15 Kasami codes in the previous example to test the near–far performance of the various detectors. The simulation setting is as follows: Users 1 to 8 are the interferers with $2E_1/\mathcal{N}_o = 2E_2/\mathcal{N}_o = \cdots = 2E_8/\mathcal{N}_o$. Users 9 to K are the desired users with SNRs fixed at $2E_9/\mathcal{N}_o = 2E_{10}/\mathcal{N}_o = \cdots = 2E_K/\mathcal{N}_o = 11$ dB. The number of trials for the simulation is 1 000 000. Due to space limitations, we illustrate the average near–far performance of the desired users in Fig. 4, instead

of showing the near–far performance plots for each user. Again, the SDR-ML detector is seen to provide better average BER performance than the other suboptimal detectors. Although it is not shown here, the near–far performance of the SDR-ML detector for each user was also observed to be better than that of the other detectors. □

VII. Conclusion and Discussion

In this paper, we have applied the SD relaxation method to approximately solve the NP-hard MLD problem with a polynomial-time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(K^{3.5})$. Simulation results have shown that the SDR-ML detector achieves BER performance close to that of the true ML detector, even when the signal cross-correlations are strong or the near–far effect is significant. Moreover, we have shown that some existing detectors such as the decorrelator, the LMMSE detector, and a particular form of the modified SAGE detector can be considered as degenerate forms of the SDR-ML detector. The resulting expectation that the SDR-ML detector should perform better than those detectors was confirmed by simulations that showed that the SDR-ML detector often provides substantially improved performance. Since those existing detectors require $\mathcal{O}(K^3)$ operations [cf., (32) and (33)], the SDR-ML detector offers an attractive tradeoff between BER performance and computational cost.

The work presented here leads to a few interesting future directions. First, this work has focussed on the application of SD relaxation to synchronous CDMA systems. It will be interesting to see how the SDR-ML detection technique may be applied to other scenarios, such as CDMA over frequency-selective fading channels and asynchronous CDMA systems. Second, we have implemented the SDR-ML detector using a standard algorithm [17], [18]. It remains to be seen whether fast implementations of this algorithm can be developed for SDR-ML detection applications.

References

[1] S. Verdú, *Multiuser Detection*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.

[2] T. Kailath and H. V. Poor, "Detection of stochastic processes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 44, pp. 2230–2259, Nov. 1998.

[3] S. Verdú and H. V. Poor, "Abstract dynamic programming models under commutativity conditions," *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 990–1006, 1987.

[4] C. Sankaran and A. Ephremides, "Solving a class of optimum multiuser detection problems with polynomial complexity," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 44, pp. 1958–1961, Sept. 1998.

[5] S. Verdú, "Computational complexity of optimum multiuser detection," *Algorithmica*, vol. 4, pp. 303–312, 1989.

[6] L. Wei, L. K. Rasmussen, and R. Wyrwas, "Near optimum tree-search detection schemes for bit-synchronous multiuser CDMA systems over Gaussian and two-path Rayleigh-fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 45, pp. 691–700, June 1997.

[7] M. K. Varansi and B. Aazhang, "Near-optimum detection in synchronous code-division multiple-access systems," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 39, pp. 725–736, May 1991.

[8] I. Sharfer and A. O. Hero, III, "A maximum likelihood digital receiver using coordinate ascent and the discrete wavelet transform," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 47, pp. 813–825, Mar. 1999.

[9] L. B. Nelson and H. V. Poor, "Iterative multiuser receivers for CDMA channels: An EM-based approach," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 44, pp. 1700–1710, Dec. 1996.

[10] M. X. Goemans and D. P. Williamson, "Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problem using semi-definite programming," *J. ACM*, vol. 42, pp. 1115–1145, 1995.

[11] Y. E. Nesterov, "Quality of Semidefinite Relaxation for Nonconvex Quadratic Optimization,", Belgium, CORE Discussion Paper #9719, Mar. 1997.

[12] L. Vandenberghe and S. Boyd, "Semidefinite programming," *SIAM Rev.*, vol. 38, pp. 49–95, 1996.

[13] A. Yener, R. D. Yates, and S. Ulukus, "A nonlinear approach to CDMA multiuser detection," in *Conf. Rec. Thirty-Third Asilomar Conf. Signals, Syst., Comput.*, vol. 2, 1999, pp. 1579–1583.

[14] P. H. Tan, L. K. Rasmussen, and T. J. Lim, "Constrained maximum-likelihood detection in CDMA," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 49, pp. 142–153, Jan. 2001.

[15] W.-K. Ma, "Maximum-likelihood detection for multiuser communication systems," Ph.D. dissertation, Chinese Univ. Hong Kong, Shatin, July 2001.

[16] S. M. Kay, *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing: Estimation Theory*. Englewood Cliifs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1993.

[17] F. Rendl, R. J. Vanderbei, and H. Wolkowicz, "Max-min eigenvalue problems, primal-dual interior point algorithms, and trust region subproblems," *Optim. Meth. Softw.*, vol. 5, pp. 1–16, 1995.

[18] C. Helmberg, F. Rendl, R. J. Vanderbei, and H. Wolkowicz, "An interior-point method for semidefinite programming," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 342–361, 1996.

[19] R. Fletcher, *Practical Methods of Optimization*. New York: Wiley, 1987.

[20] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985.

[21] F. A. Graybill, *Matrices with Applications in Statistics*, 2nd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1983.

Wing-Kin Ma (M'01) was born in Hong Kong. He received the B.Eng. (Hons.) degree in electrical and electronic engineering from the University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, U.K., in 1995. He received the M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees, both in electronic engineering, from the Chinese University of Hong Kong, in 1997 and 2001, respectively.

In 2000, he was with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada, as a Visiting Scholar. Presently, he is a Research Associate with the Department of Electronic Engineering, the Chinese University of Hong Kong. His research interests lie in signal processing for communications and statistical signal processing, with recent focus on multiuser detection.

Dr. Ma's Ph.D. dissertation was commended to be "of very high quality and well deserved honorary mentioning" by the Faulty of Engineering, the Chinese University of Hong Kong, in 2001.

Timothy N. Davidson (M'96) received the B.Eng. (Hons. I) degree in electronic engineering from The University of Western Australia (UWA), Perth, in 1991 and the D.Phil. degree in engineering science from the The University of Oxford, Oxford, U.K., in 1995.

He is currently an Assistant Professor with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada. His research interests are in signal processing, communications, and control, with current activity focused on signal processing for digital communication systems. He has held research positions at the Communications Research Laboratory, McMaster University, the Adaptive Signal Processing Laboratory, UWA, and the Australian Telecommunications Research Institute, Curtin University of Technology, Perth.

Dr. Davidson was awarded the 1991 J. A. Wood Memorial Prize (for "the most outstanding [UWA] graduate" in the pure and applied sciences) and the 1991 Rhodes Scholarship for Western Australia.

Kon Max Wong (F'02) was born in Macau. He received the B.Sc.(Eng.), DIC, Ph.D., and D.Sc.(Eng.) degrees, all in electrical engineering, from the University of London, London, U.K., in 1969, 1972, 1974, and 1995, respectively.

He was with the Transmission Division of Plessey Telecommunications Research Ltd., London, in 1969. In October 1970, he was on leave from Plessey, pursuing postgraduate studies and research at Imperial College of Science and Technology, London. In 1972, he rejoined Plessey as a Research Engineer and worked on digital signal processing and signal transmission. In 1976, he joined the Department of Electrical Engineering, Technical University of Nova Scotia, Halifax, NS, Canada, and in 1981, he moved to McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada, where he has been a Professor since 1985 and served as Chairman of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering from 1986 to 1987 and from 1988 to 1994. He was on leave as Visiting Professor wiht the Department of Electronic Engineering, Chinese University of Hong Kong. He is now NSERC-Mitel Professor of Signal Processing and Director of the Communication Technology Research Centre at McMaster University. His research interest is in the area of signal processing and communication theory.

Prof. Wong received the IEE Overseas Premium for the best paper in 1989 and is a Fellow of IEE, the Royal Statistical Society, and Institute of Physics. He also served as an Associate Editor for the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON SIGNAL PROCESSING from 1997 to 1999.

Zhi-Quan Luo (M'90) was born in Nanchang, Jiangxi province, China. He received the B.Sc. degree in applied mathematics in 1984 from Peking University, Beijing, China. From 1984 to 1985, he was with the Nankai Institute of Mathematics, Tianjin, China and, from 1985 to 1989, with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he received the Ph.D. degree in operations research.

In 1989, he joined the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada, where he is now the Department Chair and holds the Canada Research Chair in Information Processing. His research interests lie in the union of large-scale optimization, information theory and coding, data communications, and signal processing. He is an Associate Editor for the *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, *the SIAM Journal on Optimization*, *Mathematics of Computation*, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, and *Optimization and Engineering*.

Prof. Luo is a member of SIAM and MPS. He is also presently serving as an Associate Editor for the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON SIGNAL PROCESSING.

Pak-Chung Ching (SM'90) received the B.Eng. (Hons.) and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering and electronics from the University of Liverpool, Liverpool, U.K., in 1977 and 1981, respectively.

From 1981 to 1982, he worked as a Research Officer at the School of Electrical Engineering, University of Bath, Bath, U.K. From 1982 to 1984, he was a Lecturer with the Department of Electronic Engineering of the then Hong Kong Polytechnic University. Since 1984, he has been with the Chinese University of Hong Kong, where he is presently Dean of Engineering and a Full Professor with the Department of Electronic Engineering. He has taught courses in digital signal processing, stochastic processes, speech processing, and communication systems. His research interests include adaptive filtering, time delay estimation, statistical signal processing, and hands-free speech communication.

Dr. Ching has actively participated in many professional activities. He was the Chairman of the IEEE Hong Kong Section from 1993 to 1994. He is a member of the Signal Processing Theory and Methods Technical Committee of the IEEE Signal Processing Society and served as an Associate Editor for the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON SIGNAL PROCESSING from 1997 to 2000. He is a member of the Accreditation Board and Fellowship Committee of the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers. He has also been involved in organizing many international conferences including the 1997 IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems, where he was the Vice-Chairman, and the forthcoming 2003 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, where he will serve as the Technical Program Co-chair. He is a Fellow of the IEE and the HKIE.