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ABSTRACT

This paper considers the implementation of wireless power transfer scheme to non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) network at downlink. The single antenna power beacon (PB) provide capability of wireless charge to two NOMA users. In addition, full-duplex (FD) scheme is employed for two users. Outage probabilities related to system performance are evaluated in the scenario of the multi-antenna base station. Improved performance can be achieved since multi-antenna, energy harvesting capability. In particular, expressions of outage performance are derived in this system model to help to forward to serve far NOMA users. As the main advantage, NOMA and full-duplex schemes are two advantages and such a system is deployed to enhance the spectral efficiency. Our simulation results will indicate that main parameters such as a power allocation strategy, energy harvesting time, self-interference factor are the main impacts on considered system. The correct derived expressions are presented by matching Monte-Carlo simulation curves and analytical curves in numerical result section. As our main results, FD NOMA system corresponding the first user and the second user exhibits better than OMA 30% and 25% respectively when SNR at the source is 30 dB.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In recent work related to Full-duplex (FD) communication, its advantage motivated many applications since transceivers allow simultaneous downlink (DL) and uplink (UL) transmission over the same frequency band [1–4]. However, FD in this scheme leads to the expense of introducing strong self-interference (SI). A suboptimal precoding and power allocation algorithm is studied to provide maximization of the sum throughput FD systems serving multiple users [2]. In addition, the end-to-end throughput of an FD relay system was evaluated in terms of transmit beamforming design for maximization and the optimal joint receive [3]. The minimum signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) is considered as providing the DL and UL users in a FD system [4]. The authors studied the optimal beamforming and power allocation design [5]. In other improved spectrum efficiency scheme, non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) permits multiple users with different transmit power to access the same frequency [6–9]. To separate the different signals, the successive interference cancellation (SIC) is implemented at the receiver [9]. In emerging network of cognitive radio, the NOMA is implemented with cognitive radio networks and it will not only improve the spectrum efficiency but also serve more secondary users. Thanks to advantages of both the cognitive radio and NOMA techniques, and it benefits to the 5th generation mobile networks [10].

The limited performance is resulted from the limited energy supply of small devices in wireless network. In particular, it is hard to replace the battery and/or there is no power line. To overcome this problem, by harvesting the energy from the surrounding environments, they considered energy harvesting technique which is so-called as Radio frequency (RF) energy harvesting [11–15]. In this model, energy harvesting-assisted device is able to harvest the energy from the radio-frequency signals. Such energy
harvesting scheme can provide flexible, sustainable and stable energy supply for cognitive radio networks [16–20]. In [17] and [18], the primary spectrum or transmit power in the primary network provide RF energy for the secondary users with dynamically spectrum sensing technique and for battery charging. To enhance the secondary throughput by utilizing the harvested RF energy, an optimal channel selection method is introduced [19]. In cognitive radio sensor networks, the RF energy harvesting was also studied as in [20]. In fact, the RF energy harvesting model is ideal linear in most of recent works related to energy harvesting. However, the non-linear behaviors need be considered in the practical energy harvesting circuits [21–23]. In addition, the non-linear RF energy harvesting model is proposed and examined system performance of the secondary performance [21–23].

In other trends of research, the integration of FD and NOMA was advocated in thanks to the potential benefits of FD transmission [24–26]. In [24], maximization of the weighted system throughput in FD MCNOMA systems can be achieved by studying the optimal power and subcarrier allocation algorithm design. A NOMA-based FD relaying system is evaluated in terms of the outage probability and the ergodic sum rate [25]. In [26], outage probability of NOMA-based FD relaying systems was investigated by introducing the optimal power allocation minimization.

However, due to little amount of harvested power at users in previous work. Such open problem motivated us to study in this paper a new model of multi-antenna power beacon which serve as wireless charge to far NOMA users.

### Table 1: Key parameters of the system model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_i$</td>
<td>The power allocation coefficient with $i \in {1, 2}$, $a_1 + a_2 = 1$ and $a_1 &lt; a_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_B$</td>
<td>The transmit power at BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_a$</td>
<td>The transmit power at PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_i$</td>
<td>The AWGN noise term followed $n_i \sim CN(0, \sigma^2_1, 1)<em>{N</em>{U_i}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_i$</td>
<td>The target rate at $U_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>Time duration of signal frame as consideration in Fig. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>The energy conversion efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Time percentage to perform wireless power transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>The channel link between BS and $U_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>The channel link between BS and $U_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_1$</td>
<td>The channel link between PB and $U_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_2$</td>
<td>The channel link between PB and $U_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_1$</td>
<td>The channel self-interference at $U_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_2$</td>
<td>The channel self-interference at $U_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. SYSTEM MODEL

![Fig. 1: System model of wireless powered NOMA system relying power beacon.](image)

It can be seen from Fig. 1, the system include multi-antenna base station (BS) serves two NOMA users at downlink. It can be facilitated the BS with multiple antennas, $N_S$. Link BS-user $U_1$, and link BS-user $U_2$ are characterized by $h_1$, $h_2$, respectively. Two users $U_1$, $U_2$ is facilitated with FD mode, $f_1$, $f_2$ are self-interference channel related two users $U_1$, $U_2$, respectively. In this scenario, wireless charge is served by the power beacon (PB) equipped with one transmit antenna. Then, $g_1$, $g_2$ are channels to provide energy harvesting ability to two users.

![Fig. 2: Energy harvesting protocol.](image)

Fig. 2 describes the key parameters related information processing and energy harvesting. In particular, there are two time slots in the time switching-based relaying (TSR) protocol for energy harvesting and information processing at the relay. In Fig. 2, information is transmitted from the source node to the destination node in $\alpha T$, in which $T$ is the block time, and $\alpha$ is the fraction of the block time allocated for energy harvesting, and its condition is $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. The remaining block time, $(1 - \alpha) T$ is used information transmission from the source to destination.

It is noted that proper selection of the time fraction, $\alpha$ is important and it is used for optimal amount of harvesting energy at the relay node, and then it affects the achievable throughput at the destination.
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The following subsections analyze performance of the energy harvesting and information processing at the relay node.

The channel power gains \( \| h_i \|^2 \), \( \| h_2 \|^2 \), \( |g_1|^2 \) and \( |g_2|^2 \) are assumed to be exponentially distributed random variables (RVs) with the parameters \( \Omega_{h_1}, \Omega_{h_2}, \Omega_{g_1} \) and \( \Omega_{g_2} \), respectively. We call \( P_S \) as transmit power of the BS. Especially, the maximum ratio transmission (MRT) is used with beamforming vector to achieve optimal transmission scheme as in [29, 31], with \( \| w_i \| = 1, i = 1, 2 \)

\[
w_i = \frac{h_i}{\| h_i \|}, \quad i \in \{1, 2\},
\]

where \( \| \cdot \| \) denotes the Euclidean norm of a matrix. \( h_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N_x \times 1} \) and \( g_i \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times 1} \) are the BS - \( U_i \) and PB - \( U_i \) link channel vector, respectively. During energy harvesting time \( \alpha T \), the harvested energy, \( E_{U_i} \) is given by [30, Eq. (2)]

\[
E_{U_i} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\eta P_S |g_1|^2 T, & i \in 1 \\
\eta P_S |g_2|^2 T, & i \in 2
\end{array} \right.
\]

where \( \eta \) is the energy conversion efficiency. Depending on the quality of energy harvesting electric circuitry, \( 0 < \eta < 1 \).

From obtained \( E_{U_i} \) in (2), the transmitted power from relay node, \( P_{U_i} \) is given by

\[
P_{U_i} = E_{U_i} / (1 - \alpha) T
\]

\[
= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\eta P_S |g_1|^2 / (1 - \alpha), & i \in 1 \\
\eta P_S |g_2|^2 / (1 - \alpha), & i \in 2
\end{array} \right.
\]

To implement NOMA scheme, \( P_S \) is also as the normalized transmission powers at the BS. \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) are the signals for \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \), respectively while \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \) are the corresponding power allocation coefficients. To make better fairness between the relay node, it can be assumed that \( a_1 < a_2 \), and they are constrained by \( a_1 + a_2 = 1 \).

During the \( k \)-th time slot, \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) receives the superimposed signal and loop interference signal simultaneously. The observation at \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) are given by

\[
y_{U_1} [k] = \| h_1 w_1 \| \left( \sqrt{a_1 P_S} x_1 [k] + \sqrt{a_2 P_S} x_2 [k] \right) + \sqrt{P_{U_1} f_1 x_{L_1-1} [k - \tau]} + n_{U_1} [k], \quad \text{self-interference, AWGN}
\]

\[
y_{U_2} [k] = \| h_2 w_2 \| \left( \sqrt{a_1 P_S} x_1 [k] + \sqrt{a_2 P_S} x_2 [k] \right) + \sqrt{P_{U_2} f_2 x_{L_2-1} [k - \tau]} + n_{U_2} [k], \quad \text{self-interference, AWGN}
\]

where \( x_{L_i-1} [k - \tau] \) is called as loop interference signal, \( \tau \) stands for the processing delay at \( U_i \) \( (i \in \{1, 2\}) \) with \( \tau > 1 \) is integer. It is noted that the time \( k \) satisfies the relationship \( k \geq \tau \). \( n_{U_i} [k] \) the zero mean additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) vector. These noise terms follow \( n_{U_i} \sim \mathcal{CN} (0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{N_x}) \) with equal variance \( \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_N = a^2 \) and \( f_i \sim \mathcal{CN} (0, \Omega_{f_i}) \) is self-interference channel at the \( U_i \).

In NOMA, SIC is required to \( U_1 \) first detect \( U_2 \) who has a larger transmit power, which has less interference signal. Then the signal of \( U_2 \) can be detected from the superposed signal.

Therefore, the received signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio(SINR) need be computed and such computation performing at \( U_1 \) to detect \( U_2 \)'s message \( x_2 \)

\[
\gamma_{U_2+1} = \frac{a_2 P_S \| h_1 \|^2}{a_1 P_S \| h_1 \|^2 + P_{U_1} |f_1|^2 + \sigma^2} = \frac{a_2 P_S \| h_1 \|^2}{a_1 P_S \| h_1 \|^2 + \theta |g_1|^2 |f_1|^2 + 1},
\]

where \( \rho_S = \frac{P_S}{\sigma^2} \) is the transmit signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and \( \theta = \frac{\rho_S}{(1-\rho)}. \)

In NOMA, two signals \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) are superimposed at the BS to transmit to far users. They are normalized unity power signals, i.e. \( E \{ x_1^2 \} = E \{ x_2^2 \} = 1 \) in which \( E \{ \cdot \} \) is the expectation operator.

After SIC, the received SINR at \( U_1 \) can be calculated. SINR need be known to detect its own message \( x_1 \) and it is given by

\[
\gamma_{U_1} = \frac{a_1 P_S \| h_1 \|^2}{a_1 P_S \| h_1 \|^2 + \theta |g_1|^2 |f_1|^2 + 1}.
\]

Similarly, the received SINR at \( U_2 \) need be computed to detect \( x_2 \) and it is formulated by

\[
\gamma_{U_2} = \frac{a_2 P_S \| h_2 \|^2}{a_1 P_S \| h_2 \|^2 + \theta |g_2|^2 |f_2|^2 + 1}.
\]

3. OUTAGE PROBABILITY ANALYSIS

In preliminary, we assume that all channel coefficients are modeled as independent Rayleigh-distributed random variables (RVs).

It can be denoted that \( f_{X_i} (x) \) as the probability density functions (PDFs) of \( X_i \sim \mathcal{CN} (0, \| h_i \|^2) \) is written as [32]

\[
f_{X_i} (x) = \frac{x^{N_x - 1} e^{-\frac{x^2}{\| h_i \|^2}}}{(N_x - 1)! \| h_i \|^2}, \quad i \in \{1, 2\}
\]

Next, \( F_{X_i} (x) \) is the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of \( X_i \) is given by [33]

\[
F_{X_i} (x) = 1 - e^{-\frac{x^2}{\| h_i \|^2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N_x - 1} \frac{x^n}{n! \| h_i \|^2}, \quad i \in \{1, 2\}
\]

Regarding self-interference channel due to FD deployment, \( f_{Y_i} (x) \) is the probability density functions
(PDFs) of $Y_i \overset{d}{=} |f_i|^2$ is formulated by
\[
 f_{Y_i}(x) = \frac{1}{\pi 
u_i} e^{-\frac{x^2}{\nu_i}}, \quad i \in \{1, 2\}.
\] (10)

We have $F_{Y_i}(x)$ is the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of $Y_i$ is given by
\[
 F_{Y_i}(x) = 1 - e^{-\frac{x^2}{\nu_i}}, \quad i \in \{1, 2\}.
\] (11)

3.1 Analysis on Outage performance in FD mode

In principle, the target rates of relay node are determined since they are related quality of service (QoS). In particular, the outage probability is considered as an important metric and then performance evaluation can be achieved.

We will evaluate the outage probability in two representative users in NOMA in the following.

Outage Probability of $U_1$:

According to NOMA protocol, the complementary events of outage at $U_1$ can be required as: $U_1$ is able to detect $x_2$ firstly and then detects its own message $x_1$. Therefore, the outage probability of $U_1$ is formulated by
\[
 O_{\text{FD}}^{U_1} = \Pr \left( U_1 \cap \gamma_{1}^{\text{FD}} \cup U_1 \cap \gamma_{1}^{\text{FD}} \right) = 1 - \Pr \left( \gamma_{1}^{\text{FD}} \cup \gamma_{1}^{\text{FD}} \right) = 1 - \Pr \left( \|h_1\| \geq \zeta (\|g_1\|^2 |f_1|^2 + 1) \right),
\] (12)

where $\gamma_1^{\text{FD}} = 2R_1 - 1$ with $R_1$ being the target rate at $U_1$ to detect $x_1$ and $\gamma_2^{\text{FD}} = 2R_2 - 1$ with $R_2$ being the target rate at $U_1$ to detect $x_2$. $\varphi_2 = \frac{\gamma_2^{\text{FD}}}{\rho_2(a_2^2 - \gamma_2^{\text{FD}})}$ and $\zeta = \max(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)$.

Then, $O_{\text{FD}}^{U_1}$ can be solved by
\[
 O_{\text{FD}}^{U_1} = 1 - \Pr \left( \|h_1\|^2 \geq \zeta (\|g_1\|^2 |f_1|^2 + 1) \right) = 1 - \int_0^\infty \int_y 0 \infty f_{\|h_1\|^2} (x) f_{|g_1|^2} (y) [1 - F_{\|h_1\|^2} (\zeta (\|g_1\|^2 |f_1|^2 + 1))] \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y
\] (13)

\[
 = 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{N_s-1} \frac{\zeta^n e^{-\frac{x^2}{\nu_1}}}{n! \Omega_g \Omega_{f_1}^{n-k-1}} \int_0^{\infty} \int_y 0 \infty e^{-\frac{y^2}{\nu_1}} e^{-y} \left( \frac{y^2}{\nu_1} + \frac{x^2}{\nu_1} \right) (\theta y + 1)^n \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y.
\]

Based on [27, Eq. (1.111)] and [27, Eq. (3.351.3)], $O_{\text{FD}}^{U_1}$ is given by
\[
 O_{\text{FD}}^{U_1} = 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{N_s-1} \frac{\zeta^n e^{-\frac{x^2}{\nu_1}}}{n! \Omega_g \Omega_{f_1}^{n-k-1}} \int_0^{\infty} \int_y 0 \infty e^{-\frac{y^2}{\nu_1}} e^{-y} \left( \frac{y^2}{\nu_1} + \frac{x^2}{\nu_1} \right) (\theta y + 1)^n \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y.
\]

Outage Probability of $U_2$:

The outage probability of $U_2$ is computed as
\[
 O_{\text{FD}}^{U_2} = \Pr \left( U_2 \cap \gamma_{2}^{\text{FD}} \right) = 1 - \Pr \left( \|h_2\|^2 < \varphi_2 (\|g_2\|^2 |f_2|^2 + 1) \right)
\] (17)

\[
 = 1 - \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} f_{\|h_2\|^2} (g(x,y)) \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y.
\]

where $f_{\|h_2\|^2} (g(x,y)) = \left[ 1 - F_{\|h_2\|^2} (\varphi_2 (\theta y + 1)) \right].$

Similarly with solving $O_{\text{FD}}^{U_1}$, it can be obtained
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\[ \mathcal{O}_{\text{4D}} \] as

\[ \mathcal{O}_{\text{4D}} \approx 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{N_h-1} \sum_{k=0}^{Q} \binom{n}{k} \frac{k! \pi^2 \rho S^2 \theta_k \Omega_k}{n! 4Q \Omega_p \rho S \Omega_{h1}} \times \left( \Omega_{h2} + \Omega_{f2} \varphi_2 \theta \tan(\pi \xi_2 / 4) \right)^{k+1} \times \left( \xi_2 \right)^{k+1} e^{-\frac{n \rho S \pi}{\rho S \pi / 2} - \tan(\pi \xi_2 / 4)} \]

where \( \xi_2 = \cos \left( \frac{(2g-1)\pi}{2} \right) \)

### 3.2 Consideration on half-duplex (HD) mode

With HD mode, the received signal at \( U_i \), \( i = 1,2 \) in the downlink of NOMA is given by

\[ y_{U1} = \|h_1 w_1\| \left( \sqrt{a_1 P S x_1} |k| + \sqrt{a_2 P S x_2} |k| \right) + n_{U1} \]

\[ y_{U2} = \|h_2 w_2\| \left( \sqrt{a_1 P S x_1} |k| + \sqrt{a_2 P S x_2} |k| \right) + n_{U2} \]

(19b)

Based on (19a), the outage probabilities with imperfect SIC for the \( U_1 \) link can be written as

\[ \mathcal{O}_{\text{4D}, \text{ipSIC}} = 1 - \Pr \left( \gamma_2 = \gamma_1 \right) \]

\[ = 1 - \Pr \left( \|h_1\|^2 \geq \Phi_{\text{max}}, |h_I| \leq \frac{1}{\rho S} \left( \frac{\|h_1\|^2 - 1}{\Phi_{\text{max}}} \right) \right) \]

(20)

where \( \gamma_2 = \frac{a_2 \rho S |h_2|^2}{a_1 \rho S \|h_1\|^2 + 1} \), \( \gamma_{\text{ipSIC}} = \frac{a_2 \rho S |h_2|^2}{a_1 \rho S |h_1|^2 + 1} \), \( h_I \sim CN(0, \Omega_{h1}) \) with \( \Omega_{h1} (0 \leq \Omega_{h1} < 1) \) denotes as the level of residual interference caused by imperfect SIC. More precisely, the value of \( \Omega_{h1} = 0 \) and \( \Omega_{h1} < 1 \) are the perfect SIC (pSIC) and imperfect SIC (ipSIC), respectively. \( \gamma_1 = 2R_I - 1 \), \( \gamma_2 = 2R_2 - 1 \), \( \Phi_1 = \frac{\rho S}{a_1 \rho S |h_1|^2 + 1} \), \( \Phi_2 = \frac{\rho S}{a_2 \rho S |h_2|^2 + 1} \), and \( \Phi_{\text{max}} = \max(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) \).

By exploiting result from (8), (10) and with the help of the [27, Eq. (3.351.2)], \( \mathcal{O}_{\text{4D}, \text{ipSIC}} \) is calculated as

\[ \mathcal{O}_{\text{4D}, \text{ipSIC}} = 1 - \Pr \left( \|h_1\|^2 \geq \Phi_{\text{max}}, |h_I| \leq \frac{1}{\rho S} \left( \frac{\|h_1\|^2 - 1}{\Phi_{\text{max}}} \right) \right) \]

\[ = 1 - \Pr \left( \|h_1\|^2 \geq \Phi_{\text{max}}, |h_I| \leq \frac{1}{\rho S} \left( \frac{\|h_1\|^2 - 1}{\Phi_{\text{max}}} \right) \right) \]

\[ = 1 - \Pr \left( \|h_1\|^2 \geq \Phi_{\text{max}}, |h_I| \leq \frac{1}{\rho S} \left( \frac{\|h_1\|^2 - 1}{\Phi_{\text{max}}} \right) \right) \]

(21)

where \( \Xi = \frac{1}{\Omega_{h1}} + \frac{\rho S \Omega_{h1}}{a_1 \rho S} \), \( \chi = \frac{1}{\rho S \Omega_{h1}} - \frac{2 \rho S \Omega_{h1}}{\Xi} \)

### 3.3 Asymptotic Outage Probability Analysis for Two User’s

We conduct the asymptotic outage probability analysis in the high SNR region. Based on analytical result in (16) and (18), when \( \rho S \rightarrow \infty \), the asymptotic outage probability of \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) for FD NOMA with \( e^{-x} \rightarrow 1 - x \) is given by

\[ \mathcal{O}_{\text{4D}} \approx 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{N_h-1} \sum_{k=0}^{Q} \binom{n}{k} \frac{k! \pi^2 \rho S^2 \theta_k \Omega_k}{n! 4Q \Omega_p \rho S \Omega_{h1}} \times \left( \Omega_{h2} + \Omega_{f2} \varphi_2 \theta \tan(\pi \xi_2 / 4) \right)^{k+1} \times \left( \xi_2 \right)^{k+1} e^{-\frac{n \rho S \pi}{\rho S \pi / 2} - \tan(\pi \xi_2 / 4)} \]

(23)

\[ \mathcal{O}_{\text{4D}} \approx 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{N_h-1} \sum_{k=0}^{Q} \binom{n}{k} \frac{k! \pi^2 \rho S^2 \theta_k \Omega_k}{n! 4Q \Omega_p \rho S \Omega_{h1}} \times \left( \Omega_{h2} + \Omega_{f2} \varphi_2 \theta \tan(\pi \xi_2 / 4) \right)^{k+1} \times \left( \xi_2 \right)^{k+1} e^{-\tan(\pi \xi_2 / 4)} \]

(24)
where $\xi = \cos\left(\frac{(2q-1)\pi}{2Q}\right)$ and $\zeta = \cos\left(\frac{(2q-1)\pi}{2Q}\right)$.

$\Upsilon(x) = \frac{\sin^2(\pi(x+1)/4)}{x} - \frac{\sin^2(\pi(x+1)/4)}{x}$ and $\Psi(x) = \frac{\sin^2(\pi(x+1)/4)}{x} - \frac{\sin^2(\pi(x+1)/4)}{x}$.

The same situation can be seen for HD mode, the asymptotic outage probability of $U_1$ and $U_2$ for HD NOMA with $e^{-x} \rightarrow 1 - x$ is given by

$$OP_{U_1}^{HD,ipSIC,\infty} = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{\Phi_{\max}}{\Omega_{h_1}} \right)^{N_{h_1}-1} \frac{\Phi_{\max}}{\Omega_{h_2}^{2h_1}}$$

and

$$OP_{U_2}^{HD,\infty} = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_1^{HD}}{\rho_2 (a_2 - a_1 \gamma_1^{HD})} \right) \times \frac{(a_2 - a_1 \gamma_1^{HD})^n}{n! \rho_2^n}$$

4. NUMERICAL RESULTS

To confirm accuracy of the proposed analytical expressions in term of the outage probabilities, this section provides the simulated results which are derived in the previous section. Furthermore, the lowest outage performance can be evaluated to check the performances of such NOMA system under different simulated parameters. Finally, the effect of main parameters on the performances is further determined. We use $a_1 = 0.2$ and $a_2 = 0.8$ as power allocation factors. Regarding energy harvesting, we set $\eta = 1$ and $\alpha = 0.2$. Target rates are $R_1 = 2$ and $R_2 = 1$. To perform approximate computation, $Q = K = 500$. The channel gains are $\Omega_{h_1} = \Omega_{g_1} = 0.6$, $\Omega_{g_2} = \Omega_{h_2} = 0.5$ and $\Omega_{f_1} = \Omega_{f_2} = 0.01$.

In Fig. 3, the curves of outage probability for two NOMA users versus transmit SNR $\rho_2$ at the BS is observed. It can be seen clearly that the theoretical curves achieved by mathematical analysis shows a considerable match with the Monte Carlo simulations. The saturation trends can be seen in FD mode for both users at high SNR, as $\rho_2$ is greater than 40 (dB). The reason is that self-interference exists due to FD mode and it makes system performance become worse. The figure clearly shows that with increased SNR at the BS, outage will be improved significantly. It is confirmed that outage performance of user $U_2$ is better than that of user $U_1$. It can be explained that performance gap exist due to different power allocated $a_1$; $a_2$. In contrast with FD mode, higher SNR leads to improved outage at HD mode. Furthermore, asymptotic curves tend to locate near to the curves of exact computation.

Fig. 4: Comparison on NOMA and OMA, with $\Omega_{h_1} = -40$ (dB).

Next, in Fig. 4, we investigate performance differences between OMA and NOMA. It can be observed that outage behavior in NOMA with HD mode is still
better than that if OMA in entire SNR region.

Regarding energy harvesting, Fig. 5 evaluate impact of level of harvested energy $\alpha$ on the outage probability in FD mode. The reason is that in FD mode, self-interference channel is resulted from harvested power. Increasing percentage of harvested power leads to worse performance because less time for information processing. While HD mode does not depend on interference channel, and then outage performance keeps stable in whole range of $\alpha$.

**Fig. 6:** Impact of self-interference channel on outage behavior, with $\rho_S = 25$ (dB).

Regarding energy harvesting, Fig. 6 evaluate impact of level of interference on the outage probability in FD mode. Furthermore, as in previous figures, more antennas equipped at the BS lead to better outage performance.

**Fig. 7:** Outage performance versus fixed data rates $R_1$ and $R_2$, with $\rho_S = 25$ (dB), $\Omega_{h_1} = -40$ (dB), $a_1 = 0.1$ and $a_2 = 0.9$.

Fig. 7 plots the outage probability for two NOMA users as increasing target rates. The performance gap among two users remains at low region from 0.5 to 1.5, but at high required data rate, system meets outage event.

**Fig. 8:** Outage probabilities versus $a_1$, with $\Omega_{h_1} = -40$ (dB), $R_1 = 2, R_2 = 0.5$ and $\rho_S = 25$ (dB).

Fig. 8 shows the impact of power allocation coefficient $a_1$ on the outage event of considered schemes. It is confirmed that outage performance of $U_2$ better than that of $U_1$ at very low value of $a_1$. Interestingly, optimal outage for user $U_1$ in HD mode can be achieved at $a_1 = 0.5$.

**Fig. 9:** Throughput performance of two relays node, with $\Omega_{h_1} = -40$ (dB), $R_1 = 2$ and $R_2 = 1$.

As seen from Fig. 9, since the throughput is computed based on achievable outage probability, it can be further evaluate throughput in delay-limited transmission mode as $r_\ell = (1 - OP_\ell) R_\ell$ with $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\ell \in \{FD, HD\}$. The throughput of two relays node increase significantly since data rates are main factor. It is seen clearly that throughput increases once data rates increase.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we developed a theoretical framework to analyze NOMA downlink system performance under deployment of FD mode and energy harvesting. Analytical results are derived to show reasonable outage performance. For the downlink NOMA system, two different outage performance of
two users can be shown due to different power allocation factors for each NOMA user. The study shows that increasing transmit SNR leads to significant performance improvement. It is also provided guidelines as reasonable selection of the number of antennas at the BS are performed, outage probability meets ideal value.
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