

# Accurate Phase Synchronization for Precoding-Enabled GEO Multibeam Satellite Systems

LIZ MARTÍNEZ MARRERO<sup>1</sup> (Member, IEEE),  
JUAN CARLOS MERLANO DUNCAN<sup>1</sup> (Senior Member, IEEE),  
JORGE LUIS GONZÁLEZ<sup>1</sup> (Member, IEEE), JEVGENIJ KRIVUCHIZA<sup>1</sup> (Member, IEEE),  
SYMEON CHATZINOTAS<sup>1</sup> (Fellow, IEEE), BJÖRN OTTERSTEN<sup>1</sup> (Fellow, IEEE),  
AND ADRIANO CAMPS<sup>2,3,4</sup> (Fellow, IEEE)

<sup>1</sup>SnT, University of Luxembourg, 1855 Luxembourg City, Luxembourg

<sup>2</sup>CommSensLab, Department of Signal Theory and Communications, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, 08034 Barcelona, Spain

<sup>3</sup>Space Science and Technology Research Group CTE-UPC, Institut d'Estudis Espacials de Catalunya, 08034 Barcelona, Spain

<sup>4</sup>College of Engineering, UAE University, Abu Dhabi, UAE

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: L. MARTÍNEZ MARRERO (e-mail: liz.martinez-marrero@uni.lu)

This work was supported in part by the Luxembourg National Research Fund (FNR) through the CORE Project COHESAT: Cognitive Cohesive Networks of Distributed Units for Active and Passive Space Applications under Grant FNR11689919; in part by the Project DISBuS: Dynamic Beam Forming and In-Band Signalling for Next Generation Satellite Systems under Grant FNR13778945; in part by the European Space Agency through the Project Live Satellite Precoding Demonstration - CCN: MEO Case (LiveSatPreDem) under Grant 4000122451/18/NL/NR.

**ABSTRACT** Synchronizing the local oscillators in multibeam satellites with the objective of coherent communications is still an open challenge. It has to be addressed to implement full-frequency reuse approaches, such as precoding techniques using the already deployed multibeam satellites. This article addresses the required phase synchronization to enable precoding techniques in multibeam satellite systems. It contains the detailed design of a frequency and phase compensation loop based on the proportional-integral controller, which deals with the phase drift introduced by the hardware components. Specifically, the phase noise of the local oscillators used for up and down conversion at each system element (gateway, satellite, and user terminals). The implementation of the two-state phase noise model used to emulate this phase drift is included in the article. Besides, a comparative analysis of several methods to combine the frequency and phase measurements obtained from the user terminals is also included. Finally, the performance of the proposed closed-loop synchronization method is validated through simulations using our in-house developed MIMO end-to-end satellite emulator based on SDR platforms.

**INDEX TERMS** Geosynchronous orbit, multi-beam satellite, phase noise, phase synchronization, precoding, software-defined radio.

## I. INTRODUCTION

MULTIBEAM high throughput satellites are the primary providers for meeting the broadband needs of remote regions [1]. Realizing their full potential relies on advanced technologies such as precoding implementations [2], [3], [4]. Precoding is a signal processing technique to mitigate interference and enhance system performance. In multiple-input and multiple-output (MIMO) systems, precoding

algorithms calculate the optimal transmission weights for the antennas at the transmitter, considering the channel conditions, interference, and system constraints [5], [6]. These weights are then applied to the data symbols before transmitting them over the wireless channel. By using precoding, the transmitted signals can be tailored to exploit the channel characteristics, such as reducing the impact of interference and fading and improving the overall spectral

efficiency of the system [2]. However, because it involves manipulating the transmitted signal phase, its effectiveness depends on the accurate synchronization of the clock references, i.e., local oscillators (LOs) across all beams. Unless this issue is addressed, none of the widely studied and proposed approaches in non-terrestrial networks [2], [7], [8] would be feasible.

Most synchronization algorithms reported in the literature for distributed MIMO systems rely on inter-satellite links [9], [10], [11]. However, this approach is not feasible in multi-beam satellite systems. While using a common LO as a clock reference may seem like a potential solution, it is not a practical alternative in satellite systems. This limitation arises from various technical constraints, including independence between payloads, autonomy, robustness, prevention of cross-interference between radio frequency (RF) channels, and the incorporation of redundancy, as outlined in [12]. Additionally, the work in [13] formally demonstrated that even when a common clock reference is used at the transponder, the Doppler effect and the oscillator's phase noise degrade the system performance.

Practical implementations of precoding-enabled satellite systems must address the phase drift introduced by different system components, such as the phase noise introduced by the LOs used for up and down conversion at each system element (gateway (GW), satellite, and user terminals (UTs)). The phase noise is an inherent characteristic of the oscillators, and it can be attributed to factors such as aging, thermal noise, mechanical vibrations, and more. This phenomenon means that the output of an oscillator is not limited to a single spectral line at the nominal frequency; instead, it exhibits side-band power, leading to phase and frequency instabilities, as noted in Rutman's work [14]. However, in many cases, oscillators are assumed to be ideal during the precoding design process. For instance, [15] and [16] proposed the design and performance analysis of precoding-enabled satellite systems considering the time-varying phase noise introduced by onboard satellite oscillators. Both studies modeled the phase uncertainty as a Gaussian random process with a mean of zero and a standard deviation within the range of  $2^\circ$  to  $20^\circ$ . Another example can be found in Mubarak Umar Aminu's work [17], where the authors investigated the effects of non-ideal oscillators in a multi-antenna hybrid digital-analog beamforming transceiver architecture. Through simulations, they determined that the system performance is more affected when the phase noise is modeled as a Wiener process rather than a Gaussian process.

In practice, oscillator noise is influenced by various other phenomena not considered in the above-mentioned models. Many researchers have delved into this topic, aiming to develop advanced models for characterizing oscillator near-carrier power spectral density (PSD) [18], [19]. One such model, the Two-state Phase Noise Model proposed by Galleani in [20], accounts for the frequency deviation of a cesium clock using two components: a white noise and a Wiener process. The latter is responsible for the

random walk nature of the frequency deviation, while the white noise represents the local oscillations. This model balances complexity and rigor, making it a suitable choice. Consequently, we have chosen the two-state phase noise model to emulate the phase noise in our system, thus validating our synchronization algorithm design.

During precoding operations, the differential phase errors product of the phase noise are perceived by the UT as part of the channel state information (CSI), which the precoding matrix will compensate for. However, the variation rate of this differential phase error is faster than CSI estimation loop frequency, implying that the compensation applied by the precoding matrix is insufficient, thus degrading the system performance [13]. To solve this problem, we propose a phase synchronization loop with a faster response than the typical precoding loop. Our design estimates and compensates for the phase error between beams in a sample-based mode. Meanwhile, the precoding matrix is calculated and applied by groups of symbols or frames following a conventional precoding implementation.

Additionally, we compare several methods for combining the differential phase estimations between beams. Given that all the UTs report the differential phase between beams, while the compensation loop requires a single measurement as input, we have examined four approaches to address this problem effectively. In this context, some authors have highlighted the advantages of the weighted average algorithm over the equal gain combining method [21], [22]. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the weighted average algorithm depends on the careful selection of weights for each estimation [21], [22].

Combining estimations from different sensors also presents challenges in cognitive radio systems engaged in cooperative spectrum sensing [23], [24]. Despite some similarities between this scenario and satellite communication systems, a key distinction preventing the direct application of cooperative spectrum sensing methods is that, in the former case, decision fusion involves a binary problem—detecting the presence or absence of the primary user. Meanwhile, in the scenario discussed in this paper, our objective is to combine different angle measurements, which can assume any value within the interval  $(-\pi, \pi)$ . While other methods proposed for multi-sensor data fusion, such as the evidence theory [25], fuzzy theory [26], Z-number [27], and D-number [28], [29], do consider the combination of angle measurements, they tend to be more complex due to their objective of combining different types of data. For this reason, we have incorporated the well-known Weighted Average algorithm and three selective approaches named the Basic, the Best Receiver, and the Best Estimation approaches. These choices were made to strike a balance between effectiveness and complexity in addressing the input requirements of our phase synchronization loop.

Unlike cooperative spectrum sensing in cognitive radio and multi-sensor data fusion, the problem of phase combining in precoding-enabled satellite systems remains largely

unexplored. This is primarily due to the relative novelty of precoding-enabled satellites; all practical demonstrations thus far have involved only a single receiver [30], [31]. We propose incorporating some simple and well-known combinatorial approaches to address this gap. For instance, using the sensor's signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) as a decision fusion metric has shown promise in cooperative spectrum sensing [32], [33]. In addition to this metric, we consider each beam's received power and explore various combination approaches.

Precoding techniques have been employed in commercial wireless networks for several years, starting from the 802.11n Wi-Fi standard [34]. However, there are only a few field trials of precoding-enabled satellite systems [30], [31]. Both examples [30], [31] considered two transmitters and two receivers and synchronization algorithms based on phase-locked loops (PLLs). In [30], the frequency synchronization is guaranteed using a digital PLL with 7 Hz bandwidth. According to the theoretical analysis presented in [30], the system could achieve 5° of phase uncertainty after compensation by using their solution. Meanwhile, the over-the-air demonstration in [31] used a frequency and phase tracking and compensation loop implemented in the GW. The article demonstrates how this compensation effectively stabilizes frequency and phase drift. However, it is important to note that none of the previously mentioned articles provide an in-depth analysis of the synchronization algorithm's design or its impact on the system's performance. The present article addresses this gap by comprehensively explaining the synchronization algorithm employed in [31]. Additionally, we analyze the impact of the synchronization on the system performance.

In brief, this article presents the design of the phase synchronization method required to enable the precoding implementations in the geostationary orbit (GEO) scenario. The proposed solution requires only small modifications to the already deployed satellite systems. The only modification with respect to traditional precoding design is including a controller at the GW. As a further step in the validation of the proposed solution, we performed experiments over an FPGA-based system emulator. This approach enables us to achieve a more realistic approximation to the actual precoding-enabled satellite system scenario without incurring the expenses associated with conducting over-the-air tests. For instance, this method helps us address challenges such as the return link variable delay, which are often overlooked in traditional MATLAB simulations.

Summarizing, the main contributions of this article are:

- Modeling the phase drift introduced by the LOs in a multi-beam satellite as a two-state clock model.
- The design of the closed-loop phase synchronization method from a practical implementation point of view, considering the phase drift introduced by the hardware components.
- The analysis of different approaches for using the phase estimation reported by the UTs in combinatorial and selective algorithms.

- The hardware implementation of the closed-loop phase synchronization and the combinatorial phase estimation algorithms.
- The experimental real-time validation of the proposed solution using the in-house developed MIMO end-to-end satellite emulator based on software-defined radio (SDR) platforms.

The rest of this article is organized as follows: Section II describes the system model. Meanwhile, Section III details the design of the proposed phase synchronization method. The hardware implementation is described in Section IV. Section V contains the validation of the proposed solution using the MIMO end-to-end satellite emulator, and Section VI concludes the article.

#### A. LIST OF ACRONYMS

CFO	carrier frequency offset
ChEm	channel emulator
CSI	channel state information
DVB-S2X	extension of the Digital Video Broadcasting - Satellite second generation
FLL	frequency-locked loop
FM	frequency modulated
GEO	geostationary orbit
GW	gateway
IF	intermediate frequency
LO	local oscillator
MAE	mean absolute error
MIMO	multiple-input and multiple-output
MMSE	minimum mean square error
NCO	numerically-controlled oscillator
PI	proportional-integral
PLL	phase-locked loop
PSD	power spectral density
SDR	software-defined radio
SNIR	signal-to-noise-plus-interference ratio
UT	user terminal
USRP	universal software radio peripherals.

#### II. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider a GEO satellite generating  $N$  beams towards  $K \leq N$  single-antenna UTs as represented in Fig. 1. We collect in  $\mathbf{h}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$  the complex (i.e., magnitude and phase) coefficients of the frequency-flat slow fading channels between the beams generated at the GW and the  $i$ -th UT. At a given symbol period, independent data symbols  $\{s_i: 1 \leq i \leq K\}$  are to be transmitted to the UTs, where  $s_i$  denotes the symbol intended for the  $i$ -th user. Under the above assumptions, the received vector containing the symbol-sampled complex baseband signals of all  $K$  UTs can be modeled as

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{z}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{H} = [\mathbf{h}_1 \dots, \mathbf{h}_K]^T$  denotes the  $K \times N$  complex-valued channel matrix,  $\mathbf{W}$  stands for the  $N \times K$  precoding




FIGURE 1. System model.

matrix,  $\mathbf{s} = [s_1 \dots, s_K]^T$  is a  $K \times 1$  complex-valued vector containing the UTs' intended modulated symbols, and  $\mathbf{z}$  collects independent additive noise components at the UTs' receivers, which are circularly symmetric complex Gaussian random variables with zero mean and variance  $\sigma^2 = k_B T_e B$ , where  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann's constant,  $T_e$  is the equivalent noise temperature at the input of the receiver [35], and  $B$  is the UT bandwidth.

The UTs estimate the channel amplitude and phase using the non-precoded pilots periodically transmitted by the GW. The non-precoded pilots contain octogonal Walsh-Hadamard sequences that allows to the UTs to estimate the channel response for each of the received beams. This CSI is sent to the GW where it is used to calculate the precoding matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  using linear or symbol-level precoding techniques. The experimental results included in Section V were obtained using the linear precoding method minimum mean square error (MMSE). However, the synchronization algorithm proposed in this article is also suitable for symbol-level precoding techniques.

The actual channel matrix can be written as

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} |h_{11}|e^{j\psi_{11}} & \dots & |h_{1N}|e^{j\psi_{1N}} \\ |h_{21}|e^{j\psi_{21}} & \dots & |h_{2N}|e^{j\psi_{2N}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ |h_{K1}|e^{j\psi_{K1}} & \dots & |h_{KN}|e^{j\psi_{KN}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where  $h_{i,j} = |h_{i,j}|e^{j\psi_{i,j}}$  denotes the channel coefficient between the  $i$ -th UT and the  $j$ -th generated beam in the transmit antenna, for any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$  and  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , and  $|h_{i,j}|$  and  $\psi_{i,j}$  respectively represent its magnitude and phase.

However, we have to include a time-varying matrix  $\Phi(t)$  to represent the estimated channel matrix available at the GW after collecting the measurements from all the  $K$  UTs.  $\Phi(t) \triangleq \text{diag}(e^{j\phi_1(t)}, e^{j\phi_2(t)}, \dots, e^{j\phi_N(t)})$  accounts for each beam phase drift due to the hardware impairments described in [13]. It was formally demonstrated in [13] that precoding techniques performance is only affected by the phase errors in the uplink channel. The phase noise of the UTs' LOs doesn't impact precoding performance [8]. As a result,  $\Phi(t)$  only includes the phase drift in the uplink channel, which is caused by the phase noise of the transponder's LOs. The complete channel matrix can then be written as

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}(t) = \mathbf{H}\Phi(t). \quad (3)$$

The following section shows a more detailed description of the model used to emulate  $\Phi(t)$ .

### A. TWO-STATE PHASE NOISE MODEL

The output voltage  $u_0(t)$  of a generic oscillator with nominal frequency  $f_0$  is

$$u_0(t) = [A + a(t)] \cos[2\pi f_0 t + \phi(t)], \quad (4)$$

where  $A$  is the mean amplitude of the oscillator output,  $a(t)$  is the zero-mean amplitude noise and  $\phi(t)$  is an error term due to the LO phase noise. We consider that the effects of amplitude noise are overshadowed by the effects of phase noise, which is a common assumption in published work in this field [19], [20].

From (4), we can obtain two fundamental quantities used to characterize clocks: phase and frequency deviation. The frequency deviation  $y(t)$ , is defined as the derivative of the phase deviation  $x(t) = \frac{\phi(t)}{2\pi f_0}$ :


$$y(t) = \frac{dx(t)}{dt}. \quad (5)$$

Numerous measurements have shown that the continuous phase noise PSD  $S_\phi(f)$  tends to be well approximated by a sum of power-law processes

$$S_\phi(f) = \begin{cases} \sum_{\alpha=-4}^0 h_\alpha f^\alpha & 0 < f < f_h \\ 0 & f \geq f_h, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $f_h$  is the high-frequency cut-off of an infinitely sharp low-pass filter [18]. These  $h_\alpha f^\alpha$  terms are related to random walk frequency modulated (FM), flicker FM, white FM, flicker, and white phase noise, respectively [36].

As described in [37], the output phase noise combines contributions from the reference oscillator and a PLL synthesizer. At offset frequencies above 10 kHz, the noise power is dominated by the PLL synthesizer's voltage-controlled oscillator (VCO) phase noise as well as spurs due to digital-to-analog converter (DAC) quantization noise and nonlinearities. For synchronization purposes, we are concerned with oscillator drift at time scales larger or equal to 100  $\mu$ s, which is determined by noise power at offset frequencies below 10 kHz. At this frequency range, performance is dominated by the reference oscillator and


**FIGURE 2.** Two-state clock noise model.

shows two regions: white FM phase noise ( $\alpha = 2$ ) and random walk FM phase noise ( $\alpha = 4$ ) [19]. This is known as the two-state phase noise model.

Experimental evidence confirms that the frequency deviation of a cesium clock is made by the white noise and Wiener process [19]. The last one is responsible for the random walk nature of the frequency deviation, while the white noise accounts for the local oscillations. Therefore, the frequency deviation can be written as

$$y(t) = \xi_1(t) + \int_0^t \xi_2(i) di, \quad (7)$$

where  $\xi_1(t)$  and  $\xi_2(t)$  are two independent zero-mean Gaussian random processes with variance  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  respectively. The term  $\int_0^t \xi_2(i) di$  represents a Wiener process resultant from the integration of the  $\xi_2(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, q_2)$ .

To obtain the two-state model of the phase noise, we substitute (5) in (7) and we integrate both sides

$$x(t) = \int_0^t \left( \xi_1(i) + \int_0^i \xi_2(i) di \right) di. \quad (8)$$

Equation (8), shown in graphical form in Fig. 2, describes the two-state phase noise model [19].

According to [38],  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are directly related to the Allan variance  $\sigma_y^2(\tau)$  through

$$\sigma_y^2(\tau) = \frac{q_1}{\tau} + \frac{q_2\tau}{3}. \quad (9)$$

This is a typical tool used to characterize the noise in oscillators and could be obtained from experimental measurements. Besides, the IEEE Standard Definitions of Physical Quantities for Fundamental Frequency and Time Metrology [36] relates the Allan variance to the noise PSD in (6) by

$$\sigma_y^2(\tau) = h_{-4} \frac{2\pi^2}{3} \tau + h_{-3} 2 \ln 2 + h_{-2} \frac{1}{2\tau} + h_{-1} \frac{1.038 + 3 \ln(2\pi f_h \tau)}{4\pi^2 \tau^2} + h_0 \frac{3f_h}{4\pi^2 \tau^2}. \quad (10)$$

For the two-state model implemented in this paper, we only consider the first and the third terms in (10). Then, equalling (9) and (10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 &= \frac{h_{-2}}{2} \\ q_2 &= 2\pi^2 h_{-4}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Using these equations, we can emulate the phase noise for any real or theoretical phase noise PSD. For instance,




**FIGURE 3.** Estimated PSD of the phase noise samples generated with the Two-state model.

**FIGURE 4.** Two-state model's output. Some realizations of the phase noise random process.

Fig. 3 shows the PSD of the phase noise emulated with the Two-state model using  $h_{-2} = 1.25 \times 10^{-4}$  and  $h_{-4} = 0.49$ . The target phase noise mask  $-75$  dBc @ 10 Hz is also represented in the figure for comparison. As can be appreciated, the PSD obtained with the emulator is very similar to the target one. Besides, the model output has both slopes:  $-40$  dB/dec and  $-20$  dB/dec, corresponding to  $f^{-4}$  and  $f^{-2}$  terms in (6) and it is  $-72.81$  dBc/Hz at 10 Hz which is very close to the expected value  $-75$  dBc/Hz. With these points in mind, we can conclude that our implementation of the two-state clock model is accurate, and it can be used to emulate the impairments in our simulations.

Besides, Fig. 4 shows 20 realizations with a duration of one second. As the figure suggests, the two-state phase noise behavior is smoother than that of a simple Wiener process since it contains a Wiener process plus an integrated Wiener process. This is confirmed by Fig. 5, which represents the mean and variance of the realizations shown in Fig. 4. As can




FIGURE 5. Mean and variance of the realizations represented in Fig. 4.

be appreciated, the variance grows quadratically with time, while the variance of a Wiener process increases linearly.

### III. DIFFERENTIAL PHASE COMPENSATION LOOP

The proposed closed-loop phase synchronization method is depicted in Fig. 6, where only phase and frequency variables are represented. In the figure,  $\phi[k] = [\phi_1[k] \phi_2[k] \cdots \phi_N[k]]^T$  is an  $N \times 1$  vector containing the phase drift of each beam. We define  $k$  as the discrete-time variable such that  $t[k] = kT_s$  with sampling time  $T_s$ . The objective of our design is to pre-compensate the superframe data streams to minimize the value of  $\phi_e[k] = \phi[k] - \phi_c[k]$  towards zero. From now on, we will refer to  $\phi_e[k]$  as the phase error. The variable  $\phi_c[k] = [\phi_c^1[k] \phi_c^2[k] \cdots \phi_c^N[k]]^T$  is an  $N \times 1$  vector representing the phase of the transmitted beams after compensation. The input  $\Psi$  represents the phase rotation introduced by the channel matrix  $H$ .

The vector  $\theta[k] = [\theta_1[k] \theta_2[k] \cdots \theta_K[k]]^T$  in Fig. 6 is a  $K \times 1$  vector representing the phase of the received signals at the UTs. The objective of the CSI Estimation block at the UTs is to estimate the attenuation and phase rotation introduced by the channel for each beam using the non-precoded pilots. In a formal notation, the CSI estimated by the  $k$ th UT can be represented as a  $1 \times N$  complex-valued vector  $\hat{h}_i[k] = [\hat{h}_{i1}[k] \hat{h}_{i2}[k] \cdots \hat{h}_{iN}[k]]$  where each element  $\hat{h}_{ij}[k] = |\hat{h}_{ij}[k]|e^{j(\hat{\theta}_{ij}[k])}$ ,  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Note that  $\hat{\theta}_{ij}[k]$  are relative phase measurements of the  $j$ th beam with respect to the intended beam  $i$ . These relative phase estimations are the only measurements in practical precoding implementations, as stated in [13]. In a mathematical notation,  $\hat{\theta}_{ij}[k] = \psi_{ij}[k] + \phi_j^e[k] - \psi_{ii}[k] - \phi_i^e[k]$ , where  $\psi_{ij}[k] + \phi_j^e[k]$  and  $\psi_{ii}[k] + \phi_i^e[k]$  are the respective absolute phases of the  $j$ th and the  $i$ th beams received at the  $i$ th UT. Besides, it is essential to note that  $\hat{\theta}_{ij}[k]$  contains the differential phase rotation introduced by the channel ( $\psi_{ij} - \psi_{ii}$ ) but also the differential phase drift experienced for the

beam ( $\phi_j^e[k] - \phi_i^e[k]$ ). However, it is not possible to measure each of them independently. Additionally, we calculate the carrier frequency offset between beams  $\hat{f}[k]$  at each UT to use it in the compensation loop. This operation is represented as the derivative block in Fig. 6.  $\hat{f}[k]$  is a  $K \times 1$  vector with elements

$$\hat{f}_j[k] = (\hat{\theta}_j[k] - \hat{\theta}_j[k-1]) / 2\pi T_s. \quad (12)$$


At the GW, the CSI estimation from all the UTs is grouped in a  $K \times N$  complex-valued matrix  $\hat{H}[k] = [\hat{h}_1[k] \hat{h}_2[k] \cdots \hat{h}_K[k]]^T$  which is used to calculate the precoding matrix  $W$  in (1). For a given set of UTs, the precoding matrix is not calculated continuously but rather at sufficient intervals to capture the very slow temporal variations of the channel matrix. On the other hand, the compensation loop can operate in a sample-based mode, calculating a compensation phase from each transmitted non-precoded pilot. Our solution was designed as a two-step algorithm that uses the carrier frequency offset at the ‘coarse’ synchronization step and the differential phase at the ‘fine’ synchronization step.

Unlike the precoding matrix calculation, which relies on CSI from all the UTs, the compensation loop’s input requires the phase difference between beams that can be estimated without requiring measurements from every UT. Consequently, we designed the ‘Combine Estimates’ block to merge estimations from all the UTs and generate the inputs for the compensation loop. In simpler terms, this block utilizes either a  $K \times N$  matrix,  $F[k]$  for the ‘coarse’ step or  $\Theta[k]$  for the ‘fine’ step, to produce a  $N \times 1$  vector,  $f[k]$  for the ‘coarse’ step or  $\theta[k]$  for the ‘fine’ step. Within this block, the algorithm selects the reference beam (RB), whose frequency and phase act as a reference and remain uncompensated. Further details regarding the design of this block will be discussed in Section III-B.

The core of our solution is to calculate a compensation phase vector using the combined estimates vectors previously described. This operation is done by the  $N - 1$  proportional-integral (PI) Controllers represented in Fig. 6. The design of this block is addressed in Section III-A.

The numerically-controlled oscillator (NCO) blocks are fed with  $f_{ctrl}[k]$  during the first or ‘coarse’ synchronization state. This allows shorter lock times. When the differential frequency between beams  $f_n[k]$  decreases below a pre-defined threshold  $\gamma$ , the algorithm starts feeding the NCOs with  $\theta_{ctrl}[k]$ . We refer to this state as the ‘fine’ synchronization step.

Variable  $\phi_{ctrl}[k] = [\phi_1^{ctrl}[k] \phi_2^{ctrl}[k] \cdots \phi_N^{ctrl}[k]]^T$  is an  $N \times 1$  vector containing the outputs of the  $N$  NCOs. For the sake of the design simplicity,  $\phi_{ctrl}[k]$  is defined as an  $N \times 1$  vector, but the element corresponding to the reference beam is zero. The election of the reference beam is described in Section III-B.



**FIGURE 6.** Differential phase-error compensation loop. In the diagram, the highlighted blocks—NCO, PI Controller, and Combine Estimates—are the only modifications necessary to implement this solution in a precoding-enabled multibeam satellite system.

### A. PI CONTROLLER DESIGN

The following equation describes the system response of the  $j$ -th PI Controller:

$$G[z] = \begin{cases} G_{FLL}[z] & \sigma_{\phi_e} < \gamma \\ G_{PLL}[z] & \sigma_{\phi_e} \geq \gamma, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$


where  $G_{FLL}[z]$  and  $G_{PLL}[z]$  are the system responses for the ‘coarse’ and ‘fine’ synchronization steps, respectively. The parameter  $\gamma$  is the threshold to enable the ‘fine’ synchronization, and it is related to the lock-in bandwidth of  $G_{PLL}[z]$ . Both system responses can be designed independently [39], as discussed in the following sections.

#### 1) FREQUENCY SYNCHRONIZATION

The ‘coarse’ or frequency synchronization step can be described as a first-order frequency-locked loop (FLL). Fig. 7 represents the main components of a digital FLL as described in [39]. As previously described, the Frequency Detector is implemented as a maximum likelihood phase detector plus an integrator. Besides, there is the first-order Loop Filter with gain  $K_0$ , an Integrator, and the NCO as a Frequency Controller [39]. The operation of the FLL can be described by its closed-loop frequency response represented in (14).

$$G_{FLL}[z] = \frac{\phi_{out}[z]}{\phi_{in}[z]} = \frac{K_0 z}{z^D(z-1) - K_0 z}, \quad (14)$$

where  $K_0$  is the loop gain, and  $D$  is a natural number representing the loop delay in samples. Considering that the




**FIGURE 7.** Differential phase-error compensation loop. First state: frequency compensation.

compensation loop works with the estimations obtained from the non-precoded pilots,  $D$  is calculated as the ratio between the round-trip delay  $\tau$  (considering that the UTs-GW loop is closed through the satellite) and the pilots’ repetition interval  $T_p$ .


Considering the stability criterion for digital PLLs with loop delays [39], the loop gain  $K_0$  must satisfy (15) to guarantee the FLL stability. Fig. 8 shows the maximum delay allowed before the loop becomes unstable for a range of loop gains  $K$ ,  $10^{-6} < K < 1$ ,

$$0 < K_0 < 2 \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2(2D+1)}\right). \quad (15)$$

We can calculate the maximum loop delay by knowing the satellite orbit and the UT position. For the GEO case, where



**FIGURE 8.** Maximum delay allowed to guarantee the stability of the compensation loop during the first state: frequency compensation.



**FIGURE 9.** System error response of the frequency compensation loop with gain  $K = 4 \cdot 10^4$ .

the maximum slant range is around 41 127 km,  $D = 3731$ , which leads to a loop gain  $K \leq 4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ . The FLL with loop gain  $K_0 = 4 \cdot 10^{-4}$  will remain stable for any delay  $D \leq 3731$  pilots. Figure 9 shows the error response of the resultant frequency synchronization loop.


## 2) PHASE SYNCHRONIZATION

The ‘fine’ or phase synchronization step is based on a second-order PLL. In this case, the system response is [40]


$$G_{PLL}[z] = \frac{K_{P1}z + (K_{I1} - K_{P1})}{z^{D+1} - 2z^D + z^{z-1} + K_{P1}z + (K_{I1} - K_{P1})} \quad (16)$$

where  $K_{P1}$  and  $K_{I1}$  are the filter loop’s proportional and integral gains, and  $D$  is the loop delay in samples.

The design of the ‘fine’ synchronization step is strongly related to the transfer function of the system  $G_p[z]$ , also



**FIGURE 10.** Comparison of the phase drift of one beam in a 4x4 GEO multibeam satellite system with and without the frequency compensation loop ( $K = 4 \cdot 10^4$ ).



**FIGURE 11.** Frequency domain PI Controller design.


known as the forward-path transfer function. Fig. 11 represents a simplification of the diagram in Fig. 6, where  $G_c[z] = K_{P1} + \frac{K_{I1}}{1-z^{-1}}$  is the transfer function of the PI controller. For the ‘coarse’ synchronization state, the transfer function  $G_p[z]$  contains the response of the NCO and the loop delay in pilots  $D$ ,  $G_p[z] = \frac{z^{-D}}{1-z^{-1}}$ .

The PI controller was designed following the frequency-domain design described in [41]. This procedure calculates the values of  $K_{P1}$  and  $K_{I1}$  considering the desired phase margin (PM) of the compensated system. The PM is a parameter closely linked to the system’s stability. It is defined in [41] as the amount of pure phase delay that can be added before the system becomes unstable.


Theoretically, a system is stable if the PM of the open-loop transfer function of the compensated system is in the interval  $0 \leq \text{PM} \leq 90^\circ$ . Meanwhile, practical implementations aim for a PM between  $45^\circ$  and  $60^\circ$  [42]. However, the exact value is left to the designer’s discretion. Figure 12 shows the parameters of the PI controller obtained with the frequency-domain design method mentioned above. To generate the figure, we used as input the interval  $0 \leq \text{PM} \leq 90^\circ$ .

The left axis in Fig. 12 represents the natural frequency of the second-order loop  $\omega_n = \frac{\sqrt{K_{I1}}}{2\pi T_p}$  while the right axis represents the damping factor  $\zeta = \frac{K_{P1}}{2\sqrt{K_{I1}}}$ . We select these parameters to exploit the similarities of the second step of our compensation loop with a classical second-order PLL. Additionally, the natural frequency and damping factor





**FIGURE 12.** Design of the phase compensation loop as a second-order PLL. Values of  $\omega_n$  (left y-axis) and  $\zeta$  (right y-axis) for the PM of the open-loop transfer function in the interval  $0 \leq \text{PM} \leq 90^\circ$ .




**FIGURE 13.** System error response of the phase compensation loop designed for an open-loop PM =  $35^\circ$  ( $\omega_n = 0.102$  Hz;  $\zeta = 0.751$ ).


parameters offer a more intuitive description of the closed-loop system response. For instance, the natural frequency is directly related to the loop bandwidth, which makes it inversely proportional to the residual phase drift after compensation. This implies that a high value of  $\omega_n$  is desired to decrease the residual phase drift. Additionally, it is well known that the damping factor of second-order PLLs should be in the interval  $0.7 \leq \zeta \leq 1.5$  to guarantee stability. Considering these design criteria, we selected  $\omega_n = 0.102$  Hz and  $\zeta = 0.751$  for a PM =  $35^\circ$ . Fig. 13 shows the error response of the system for these parameters.

Similarly to Fig. 8 for the FLL, we obtained the delay margin of the system for the set of parameters  $10^{-2}$  Hz  $\leq \omega_n \leq 100$  Hz and  $\zeta \in \{0.5, 0.75, 1, 1.5\}$ . This is represented in Fig. 14. This figure suggests that the maximum delay allowed before the loop becomes unstable for the selected parameters ( $\omega_n = 0.102$  Hz;  $\zeta = 0.751$ ) is higher than the previously considered  $D = 3731$  pilots.

Fig. 15 shows the PM of the open-loop system response with parameters ( $\omega_n = 0.102$  Hz;  $\zeta = 0.751$ ) for a loop delay in the interval  $100 < D < 9000$ . As mentioned before,




**FIGURE 14.** Maximum delay allowed to guarantee the stability of the compensation loop during the second state: phase compensation.



**FIGURE 15.** Phase Margin of the open-loop system response with parameters ( $\omega_n = 0.102$  Hz;  $\zeta = 0.751$ ) when the actual delay of the loop is in the interval  $100 \leq D \leq 9000$  pilots. The grey zone represents the values of loop delay that make the loop unstable.

for loops delays below the value used for the design  $D$  the system remains stable. However, this is not always the case when the loop delay is higher than the value considered for the design ( $D = 3731$ ). The grey zone in Fig. 14 represents the loop delay values for which the system is unstable  $D \geq 7700$  pilots.

Figure 16 is an example of the phase drift of one beam in a 4x4 GEO multibeam satellite system with and without the compensation loop ( $\omega_n = 0.102$  Hz;  $\zeta = 0.751$ ). In this figure, the yellow line represents the drift in the phase of the estimated CSI when the compensation loop is not enabled, the red curve is the phase of the estimated CSI with the compensation loop, and the blue line represents the ideal scenario where there is no phase drift. This simulation was run in MATLAB for a symbol rate  $R_s = 6.5$  Msps.




**FIGURE 16.** Comparison of the phase drift of one beam in a 4x4 GEO multibeam satellite system with and without the phase compensation loop ( $\omega_n = 0.102$  Hz;  $\zeta = 0.751$ ).

### B. COMBINE ESTIMATIONS METHODS

As part of normal precoding of DVB-S2X operations, the UTs send to the GW their estimated thermal noise  $\sigma_i^2$ , with  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ . Using these measurements, and the estimated CSI's amplitude  $|\hat{H}[k]|$  we can define a  $K \times N$  matrix  $\Gamma$  as:

$$\Gamma = \Sigma |\hat{H}[k]|^2 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{|\hat{h}_{11}[k]|^2}{\sigma_1^2} & \frac{|\hat{h}_{12}[k]|^2}{\sigma_1^2} & \dots & \frac{|\hat{h}_{1N}[k]|^2}{\sigma_1^2} \\ \frac{|\hat{h}_{21}[k]|^2}{\sigma_2^2} & \frac{|\hat{h}_{22}[k]|^2}{\sigma_2^2} & \dots & \frac{|\hat{h}_{2N}[k]|^2}{\sigma_2^2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{|\hat{h}_{K1}[k]|^2}{\sigma_K^2} & \frac{|\hat{h}_{K2}[k]|^2}{\sigma_K^2} & \dots & \frac{|\hat{h}_{KN}[k]|^2}{\sigma_K^2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}, \frac{1}{\sigma_2^2}, \dots, \frac{1}{\sigma_K^2})$  is a diagonal matrix containing the thermal noise estimation from each UT.



**FIGURE 17.** Combine estimates block.

From now on, we will refer to  $\Gamma$  as the Weight matrix since we use it as a metric for the accuracy of the interference measurement in  $\Theta[k]$  and  $F[k]$ . For the sake of clarity, we rewrite both matrices as (18) and (19) shown at the bottom of the page.

It is essential to notice that the elements in  $\Theta[k]$  are phase measurements with intrinsic estimation errors. Then, the Combine Estimates block's objective is to provide the most accurate differential phase and frequency estimation vectors  $\theta[k]$  and  $f[k]$  with respect to a reference beam. The resultant combined phase vector  $\theta[k]$  can be expressed as  $\theta[k] = [C_1 + (\phi_1^e[k] - \phi_{RB}^e[k]) \dots 0 \dots C_N + (\phi_N^e[k] - \phi_{RB}^e[k])]$ , where  $C_j \in (-\pi, \pi)$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  are constants related to the channel phase rotation  $\Psi$ . Meanwhile,  $C_j \approx 0$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  in the resultant combined frequency vector  $f[k]$ .

For the explanation of the estimates combination, we will consider as input the matrix  $F[k]$  and as output the vector  $f$ , as it is represented in Fig. 17. The main reason for this selection is that the derivative operation attenuates the effect of  $\Psi$  in  $F[k]$  matrix since  $C_j \approx 0$ . Consequently, combinatorial approaches such as Equal-gains combining and Weighted averages are feasible, which is not the case when using  $\Theta[k]$  as input.

There are two main groups of possible ways to combine phase measurements: by selection or by combination. The

$$\Theta[k] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \theta_{12}[k] & \dots & \theta_{1N}[k] \\ \theta_{21}[k] & 0 & \dots & \theta_{2N}[k] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \theta_{K1}[k] & \theta_{K2}[k] & \dots & \theta_{KN}[k] \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & \psi_{1N} + \phi_N^e[k] - \psi_{11} - \phi_1^e[k] \\ \psi_{21} + \phi_1^e[k] - \psi_{22} - \phi_2^e[k] & \dots & \psi_{2N} + \phi_N^e[k] - \psi_{22} - \phi_2^e[k] \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi_{K1} + \phi_1^e[k] - \psi_{KK} - \phi_K^e[k] & \dots & \psi_{KN} + \phi_N^e[k] - \psi_{KK} - \phi_K^e[k] \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

$$F[k] = \Theta[k] - \Theta[k-1] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & \phi_N^e[k] - \phi_1^e[k] - \phi_N^e[k-1] + \phi_1^e[k-1] \\ \phi_1^e[k] - \phi_2^e[k] - \phi_1^e[k-1] + \phi_2^e[k-1] & \dots & \phi_N^e[k] - \phi_2^e[k] - \phi_N^e[k-1] + \phi_2^e[k-1] \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \phi_1^e[k] - \phi_K^e[k] - \phi_1^e[k-1] + \phi_K^e[k-1] & \dots & \phi_N^e[k] - \phi_K^e[k] - \phi_N^e[k-1] + \phi_K^e[k-1] \end{bmatrix} \quad (19)$$

first case refers to the approaches that select the “best” measurement and discard the rest. In contrast, the second case intends to combine the measurements of a unique physical process obtained from different estimators. Among the most popular combinatorial measurement approaches, we can find Equal-gains combining and Weighted averages. However, in this article, we will analyze only the last one since its superiority has been extensively proven. In addition, we will discuss the basic approach and two other selective approaches.

### 1) BASIC APPROACH

This implies using the estimations from the UT with less thermal noise,

$$(i, j) = \operatorname{argmax}\{\Sigma\}. \quad (20)$$

Since  $\Sigma$  is a diagonal matrix,  $i = j$

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}(i, :), \quad (21)$$

and the Reference beam is the  $i$ -th UT intended beam. Note that this approach does not consider the CSI’s amplitude matrix  $|\hat{\mathbf{H}}[k]|$ .

### 2) BEST RECEIVER APPROACH

The second approach considers that depending on their geographical location, the UTs receive the interference beams with different power. This implies that more accurate estimations can be obtained from the UT that receives more power for the higher number of beams. The goal of this approach is to select that UT and use its phase measurements for the compensation loop.

First, we calculate the “total weight” for each UT as  $q_k = \sum_{n=1}^N \left( \frac{|\hat{h}_{kn}[k]|^2}{\sigma_k^2} \right)$ , where  $\frac{|\hat{h}_{kn}[k]|^2}{\sigma_k^2}$  are the elements of matrix  $\Gamma$ . In a vector form  $\mathbf{q} = [q_1 \cdots q_k \cdots q_K]$  is a vector that contains a metric of the quality of the UTs. Notice that this approach requires making zero the main diagonal of  $\Gamma$  to remove the influence of the intended beam.

Then, the reference beam is the intended beam for the receiver  $i = \operatorname{argmax}\{\mathbf{q}\}$  and the output vector is

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}(i, :). \quad (22)$$

The Best receiver approach is very similar to the Basic approach since all the measurements are obtained from a single UT. However, as can be seen in (18), choosing a different UT can improve the accuracy of the phase estimations. Another interesting fact about this approach is that it is possible to know in advance which may be the “Best receiver” by knowing the UTs’ location and the footprint of the beams.

### 3) BEST ESTIMATION APPROACH

The Best estimation approach explores the idea that there is no need to use the measurements from only one UT. The phase difference between two beams is estimated in the intended receiver of each of them. Then, the Best estimation

### Algorithm 1 Best Estimation Algorithm

---

```

procedure BESTEST( $F, \Gamma$ )
   $[Nu, Nt] \leftarrow \text{size}(F)$ 
  for  $j = 1 : Nt$  do
    for  $i = 1 : Nu$  do
      if  $j \neq i$  then
        if  $\Gamma(j, i) > \Gamma(i, j)$  then
           $\text{weight}(j, i) \leftarrow \Gamma(j, i)$ 
           $\text{phBestEst}(j, i) \leftarrow F(j, i)$ 
        else
           $\text{weight}(j, i) \leftarrow \Gamma(i, j)$ 
           $\text{phBestEst}(j, i) \leftarrow -1 * F(i, j)$ 
        end if
      end if
    end for
  end for
   $\text{rowSum} \leftarrow \text{sum}(\text{weight})$  ▷ Sum by row
   $\text{refBeam} \leftarrow \text{index}(\text{max}(\text{rowSum}))$ 
   $\text{combinedEst} \leftarrow \text{wrapToPi}(\text{phBestEst}(\text{refBeam}))$ 
  return ( $\text{combinedEst}, \text{refBeam}$ )
end procedure

```

---

approach compares the weight of both estimations to select the more accurate measurement.

The algorithm takes two input arguments: the estimated CFO  $F$  and the Weight matrix  $\Gamma$ . Basically, it iterates over each beam ( $j$ ) and UT ( $i$ ) pair to calculate the weights and select the best estimates. This loop performs the following steps:

- Check Conditions: The algorithm compares the weights of the current pair of estimations ( $\Gamma(i, j)$  and  $\Gamma(j, i)$ ). If  $\Gamma(i, j)$  is greater, it selects the weight and value of the  $i$ th UT measurement, ( $\Gamma(i, j)$  and  $F(i, j)$ ). Otherwise, it selects the weight and the negated phase value of the  $j$ th UT measurement ( $\Gamma(j, i)$  and  $-1F(i, j)$ ).
- Update the recorded Weight and Phase arrays: The algorithm updates the *weight* and *phBestEst* arrays with the selected weight and phase values.

Then, the algorithm identifies the reference beam by summing the weights for each beam in *weight* and selecting the one with the maximum sum. Finally, it selects in *phBestEst* the measurements relative to the reference beam. The pseudocode for this algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1.


### 4) WEIGHTED AVERAGE APPROACH

The Weighted average approach combines all the measurements from all the UTs using the values in  $\Gamma$  as weights. This method selects as RB the beam received by the highest number of UTs. Formally, the beam  $i = \operatorname{argmax}\{\mathbf{q}\}$  is the RB, where  $\mathbf{q}$  is a  $1 \times N$  vector of elements

$$q_n = \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \frac{|\hat{h}_{kn}[k]|^2}{\sigma_k^2} \right\}. \quad (23)$$

The elements  $f_n$ ,  $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  of the resultant frequency estimation vector  $\mathbf{f}$  are calculated as follows:

$$f_n = \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{\gamma_{kn}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \gamma_{kn}} (F(k, n) - F(k, RB)) \right), \quad (24)$$



**FIGURE 18.** Frequency combination.

where  $\gamma_{kn} = \sqrt{\frac{|\hat{h}_{kRB}|^2 |\hat{h}_{kn}|^2}{\sigma_k^2 (|\hat{h}_{kRB}|^2 + |\hat{h}_{kn}|^2)}}$  is a metric for the accuracy of the differential estimation between beams  $n$  and  $RB$  measured at the  $k$ -th UT. It is worth noting that  $\gamma_{kn}$  is obtained as a combination of the weights  $\frac{|\hat{h}_{kn}[k]|^2}{\sigma_k^2}$  and  $\frac{|\hat{h}_{kRB}[k]|^2}{\sigma_k^2}$  from (17) for the measurements  $F(k, n)$  and  $F(k, RB)$  respectively.


#### 5) COMPARISON OF THE COMBINATION APPROACHES

Figure 18 represents the mean absolute error (MAE) of the different combination approaches. The MAE is calculated as the average of the absolute difference between the actual value  $\alpha$ , and the result of the combination  $\hat{\alpha}_i$ , as it is described in (25),

$$MAE = 20 \log \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\alpha - \hat{\alpha}_i| \right). \quad (25)$$

The curves in Fig. 18 were generated by Monte Carlo simulations of the phase drift estimation and combination in a  $4 \times 4$  system. The objective of our experiment is to compare the accuracy of the combination approaches described before. To that end, a phase drift vector  $\alpha$  was added to the pilots and transmitted through a randomly generated channel. At the UTs, the CSI's phase estimates were combined using the four approaches to calculate the MAE of each of them. The experiments were run for a set of energy per bit to noise power spectral density ratio  $EsNo \in \{-10, \dots, 25\}$ . This parameter only refers to the intended beam and doesn't consider the interference power.

The phase drift vector  $\alpha = [\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_4]^T$  had four independent elements  $\alpha_n$  uniformly distributed with values  $\alpha_n \in (-\pi; \pi)$ . The transmitted pilots were predefined orthogonal Walsh-Hadamard sequences of 32 BPSK-modulated symbols, and the channel matrix was independently generated for each simulation as a  $4 \times 4$  complex random matrix. The UTs performed the correlation between the received signal and the expected Walsh-Hadamard sequences to obtain the CSI estimation. Then, we calculated the frequency drift between



**FIGURE 19.** SDR-based MIMO end-to-end satellite emulator.

consecutive pilots using (12) and applied the combination approaches described before. The MAE between the resultant vectors after combination  $\hat{\alpha}$ , and the original phase drift  $\alpha$  were averaged over 10 thousand independent iterations and represented in Fig. 18.



As illustrated in Fig. 18, all the combination approaches considering (17) outperform the Basic approach with a constant ratio over the  $EsNo$  set of values. Numerically, the accuracy improvement of each approach with respect to the basic one is: 4.4% for the Best estimation approach, 1.2% for the Best receiver approach and 17.5% for the Weighted average approach.

#### IV. HARDWARE TEST-BED IMPLEMENTATION

For the experimental validation, we employ the in-house developed MIMO end-to-end satellite emulator based on SDR platforms. The proposed architecture consists of a multichannel GW with precoding capabilities, a MIMO satellite channel emulator (ChEm), a set of independent UTs, and a return-link emulator.

In general terms, the demonstrator can be described as follows. The GW subsystem generates the data packets according to the extension of the Digital Video Broadcasting - Satellite second generation (DVB-S2X) standard, using Superframe Format II structure, and applies the selected precoding method: zero-forcing (ZF), MMSE, or MMSE per-antenna power-constrained (MMSE PAC). The ChEm replicates the whole forward link chain, from the intermediate frequency (IF) input of the gateway block up-converter, toward the low-noise block down-converter IF output at the UT. It emulates the impairments present in the GW, the payload, the downlink channel, and the UTs. The UT subsystems implement the synchronization and decoding features in the DVB-S2X compliant receivers and perform the CSI estimation. Finally, the return-link emulator allows each UT to send its estimated CSI to the GW.

The GW, ChEm, and UT subsystems are being implemented using a set of SDR platforms, specifically the USRP-2944R from National Instruments, as depicted in Fig. 19. The physical interfaces of the channel emulator with the gateway and the user terminals are provided by the interconnection of the 50- $\Omega$  ports of the SDRs, employing


**FIGURE 20.** Block diagram of the Two-state model implementation.

**FIGURE 21.** Hardware implementation of the two-state model.

IF modulated signals. The SDR platforms in the GW and the ChEm are synchronized with the same clock reference. This eliminates any timing misalignment due to their LOs, allowing precise control of the time mismatch according to the implemented impairment models.

All system components have been successfully tested considering a GEO satellite scenario [31], [43], [44]. This includes the use of implementations of the GW and UTs subsystems in the precoding validation over a live GEO link [31]. The test-bed is upgraded by including the two-state phase noise model at the ChEm and the PI controller and combine estimations blocks at the GW. The following subsections will describe the implementation of these blocks.

### A. TWO-STATE PHASE NOISE MODEL IMPLEMENTATION

Figure 20 represents the block diagram of the two-state model hardware implementation. The model requires as input two independent zero-mean Gaussian random vectors with unitary variance,  $p_1[k]$  and  $p_2[k]$ . Inputs  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  represent the standard deviation of  $p_1[k]$  and  $p_2[k]$  respectively.

The diagram in Fig. 20 was implemented as an intellectual property block using Vivado HLS. Figure 21 shows the hardware implementation of the Phase Noise Generator block. In the figure, the two pseudo-random generators provide  $p_1[k]$  and  $p_2[k]$ , and the values of  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are defined at the user interface. The inputs  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are obtained from the desired phase noise mask using Algorithm 2.


The target phase noise mask, in logarithmic scale, can be described by the parameters:  $h_{-2}$  for the  $-20$  dB/dec slope

### Algorithm 2 Calculate Variance Algorithm

```

procedure VAR_CALC( $A_\phi, f_\phi, f_s$ )
 $h_4 \leftarrow 10^{A_\phi/10} * (2\pi f_\phi)^4$ 
 $h_2 \leftarrow 10^{A_\phi/10} * (2\pi f_\phi)^2$ 
 $q_1 \leftarrow h_2/2$ 
 $q_2 \leftarrow 2\pi^2 h_4$ 
 $\sigma_1 \leftarrow q_1/f_s + q_2/(3f_s^3)$ 
 $\sigma_2 \leftarrow q_2/f_s$ 
return ( $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$ )
end procedure

```


**FIGURE 22.** PI controller block.

and  $h_{-4}$  for the  $-40$  dB/dec slope:

$$S_\phi(f) = 10 \log \left( \frac{h_{-4}}{f^4} + \frac{h_{-2}}{f^2} \right). \quad (26)$$

Additionally, the PSD obtained from the two-state model can be described by the coordinate pair  $(f_\phi; A_\phi)$  where both regions ( $\alpha = 4$  and  $\alpha = 2$ ) intercept. Hereafter this point  $(f_\phi; A_\phi)$  will be used to identify the phase noise masks. For instance,  $(10 \text{ Hz}; -75 \text{ dBc/Hz})$  refers to the two-state PSD with a  $-40$  dB/dec slope region for  $f < 10 \text{ Hz}$  and  $-20$  dB/dec slope region for  $f > 10 \text{ Hz}$ ;  $S_\phi(10) = -75 \text{ dBc/Hz}$  as shown in Fig. 3.

The Phase Noise Generator block was integrated with the MIMO end-to-end satellite emulator presented in [45] as part of the ChEm's universal software radio peripherals (USRP). This allows including the phase noise for the LOs in the uplink and the downlink independently.

### B. PI CONTROLLER IMPLEMENTATION

The PI controller was implemented as an intellectual property block using Vivado HLS. Figure 22 shows the resultant block in LABVIEW. As can be appreciated, it has two main inputs:  $\gamma$  and  $f_{ed}$ . The first one is an array with the values of the proportional  $K_P$  and integral  $K_I$  gains. The second input,  $f_{ed}$ , is the differential frequency or phase used to calculate the output  $f_{nco}$ , which is the compensation phase calculated by the PI controller. Four block instances were connected in the GW's USRP, where the compensation calculated by the PI controller is applied to the superframe data streams by NCO-mixer blocks.

### C. COMBINE ESTIMATIONS IMPLEMENTATION

The Combine Estimations block was implemented as a switch-case structure in the GW's Host PC. A drop-down menu at the user interface shown in Fig. 24 allows




FIGURE 23. Combine estimations: Best Receiver approach implementation.




FIGURE 24. Combine estimations: Graphic user interface to select the combination approach.

TABLE 1. Combine estimations’s user interface naming equivalence.

	Parameter	Name in Fig. 24
Input Matrices	CFO ( $F[k]$ )	est_CFO
	differential phase ( $\Theta[k]$ )	est_DiffPhase
Weights	amplitude of the CSI ( $ \hat{H}[k] ^2$ )	Weight Matrix
	UTs’ noise variance $[\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \dots, \sigma_K^2]$	Noise_var
Output Vectors	CFO ( $f[k]$ )	Combined CFO
	differential phase ( $\theta[k]$ )	Combined DiffPhase

selecting the desired approach. Table 1 represents the naming equivalence between the user interface in Fig. 24 and the rest of this article. We added the option of manually setting the reference beam in addition to the previously described methods: basic approach, best receiver, best estimation, and weighted average. Due to their simplicity, the Basic approach and the Best Receiver methods were implemented using LABVIEW’s blocks. However, for the Best Estimation and the Weighted Average cases, the Interface for MATLAB functionality allowed us to run the MATLAB functions from LABVIEW. Fig. 23 shows the implementation of the Best Receiver Combine estimation approach. In this figure, the inputs are represented in orange, while the outputs are in green.

To validate the hardware implementation of this block, we showcase the input matrices  $F[k]$  and  $\Theta[k]$ , as well as the output vectors  $f[k]$  and  $\theta[k]$ , in the graphic user interface (see Fig. 24). The user interface also presents the amplitude




FIGURE 25. Frequency and phase drift with LOs phase noise at the uplink and downlink: a) Ideal case without LOs’ phase noise, b) Phase noise only in the uplink, c) Phase noise only in the downlink.


of the CSI estimation  $|\hat{H}[k]|^2$  and the noise variance measured by the UTs. Using these displayed parameters, the Combine Estimations algorithm computes the Weight matrix as defined in (17). Subsequently, we calculate the resultant vectors for each input matrix across all proposed approaches. For instance, Fig. 24 shows one example using the Basic approach. In this case, the UT with less noise is the UT 2 since the minimum value of the UT’s noise variance is 0.008099. As can be seen in the figure, the output differential phase vector  $[119.371, 61.865, 0, -86.0963]$  and the output carrier frequency offset (CFO) vector  $[0.081097, 13.4486, 0, 0.212494]$  are the third row of the corresponding input matrices. Notably, the results obtained using the hardware block, the MATLAB algorithm, and our calculations align consistently in all instances.

## V. EXPERIMENTAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In this section, we evaluate the impact of the phase noise and the proposed solution on the performance of a multibeam satellite system. To that end, we set the MIMO end-to-end satellite test-bed to emulate a  $4 \times 4$  precoding-enabled GEO satellite system.

As a first experiment, we set the phase noise mask ( $-75$  dBc/Hz @ 10 Hz) in Fig. 3 for the LOs in the uplink and the downlink independently. Fig. 25 shows the differential frequency and phase for beam 1 measured at the UT 0. These are the differential frequency and phase measurements between beams 0 and 1. In the figure, we included the ideal case, where the LOs do not have phase noise, as a comparison baseline. Note that unlike the downlink case (c)), the phase noise in the uplink channel (b) does affect the system performance.

The second experiment was designed to validate the design of the phase compensation loop. In this case, we set the phase noise mask (10 Hz;  $-75$  dBc/Hz) in the uplink and analyzed the differential frequency and phase between beams 0 and 1 measured at UT 0. The results of this



**FIGURE 26.** Frequency and phase drift during the phase synchronization: a) Phase noise in the uplink channel, phase compensation loop disabled, b) Phase compensation loop enabled, working in the first state (frequency synchronization), phase noise only in the uplink channel, c) Phase compensation loop enabled, working in the second state (phase synchronization), phase noise only in the uplink channel.


experiment are shown in Fig. 26. As can be appreciated in the figure, the first state of the proposed compensation loop reduces the frequency drift below 1 Hz. However, this is insufficient to keep the differential phase stable, see Fig. 26 b). Finally, the differential phase is compensated when the phase synchronization state is enabled Fig. 26 c).

In addition, Fig. 27 illustrates the impact of the compensation loop on system performance. Specifically, the received symbols and signal-to-noise-plus-interference ratio (SNIR) of UT 1 are presented with and without precoding for two scenarios: a) when the compensation loop is disabled and b) when enabled. As depicted in Fig. 27a, disabling the compensation loop results in no increase in received SNIR with the precoding technique. However, in Fig. 27b, with the compensation loop enabled, the precoding technique significantly enhances the received SNIR by at least 10 dB.

These experiments highlight the main contributions of our article: the proposed synchronization algorithm, or an equivalent, is essential for practical implementations of the precoding techniques. Without synchronizing the phases of the transmitted beams, the performance benefits promised by precoding techniques remain unattainable. The primary challenge in implementing our solution in multibeam satellite systems lies in the need for periodic feedback from the UTs to the GW. While this requirement is also present in implementing precoding, our solution demands more data and more frequent feedback than traditional precoding methods. A potential resolution to this challenge could involve selecting which UTs should report their phase estimations, considering the combine estimation approaches discussed in this article.

## VI. CONCLUSION

This article contains the design and implementation of the phase compensation loop required to enable the



**FIGURE 27.** Received symbols and UT's SNIR: a) with the compensation loop disabled, b) with the compensation loop enabled.

precoding technique in GEO scenarios. One key strength of the proposed solution is its simplicity, requiring only small modifications to the previously considered precoding implementations—specifically, incorporating a phase compensation loop at the GW. The compensation loop proposed in this article is based on PI controllers, widely used in industrial control systems for their proven effectiveness.

Moreover, the article introduces various approaches for combining the phase and frequency measurements from the UTs and assesses their performance using MATLAB simulations. The choice of the combine estimates algorithm is expected to influence the practical implementation of the proposed synchronization algorithm, potentially reducing the amount of feedback data needed for the compensation loop. Subsequent research should extensively investigate the trade-offs among achievable accuracy, algorithm complexity, and

the volume of feedback data for the combined estimation methods. Additionally, it is worth noting that the combination approaches explored in this article represent straightforward and well-known cases. Future research may explore more complex algorithms such as the methods used in multisensor data fusion [25], [26], [27], [28], [29].

The hardware implementation of the compensation loop and the combination of phase measurements were described, along with the implementation of the two-state phase noise model. These blocks were integrated into the in-house developed MIMO end-to-end satellite emulator based on SDR platforms to validate the proposed closed-loop synchronization method's performance. The hardware experimentation validates the viability of the proposed solution for real-world scenarios. The primary challenge in implementing this solution within an actual multibeam satellite system lies in the periodic transmission of measurements from the UTs to the GW. Moreover, this work can be extended by considering other combinatorial approaches for the Combine Estimations block. In this regard, exploring methods proposed for multisensor data fusion in wireless sensor networks could be beneficial.

In summary, the successful implementation of our phase compensation loop, grounded in PI controllers, demonstrates the proposed solution's simplicity and adaptability and underscores its robust performance in real-world scenarios. The comprehensive validation through hardware experimentation and integration into the MIMO satellite emulator showcases the practical effectiveness of our closed-loop synchronization method, paving the way for enhanced GEO multibeam satellite systems.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CCBY4.0) license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission. (Opinions, interpretations, recommendations, and conclusions presented in this paper are those of the authors and are not necessarily endorsed by the European Space Agency).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Lin et al., "SLNR-based secure energy efficient beamforming in multibeam satellite systems," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 2085–2088, Apr. 2023.
- [2] M. Á. Vázquez et al., "Precoding in multibeam satellite communications: Present and future challenges," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 88–95, Dec. 2016.
- [3] V. Joroughi, M. Á. Vázquez, and A. I. Perez-Neira, "Generalized multicast multibeam precoding for satellite communications," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 952–966, Feb. 2017.
- [4] E. Lagunas, A. Pérez-Neira, M. Martínez, M. A. Lagunas, M. A. Vázquez, and B. Ottersten, "Precoding with received-interference power control for multibeam satellite communication systems," *Front. Space Technol.*, vol. 2, pp. 1–12, May 2021.
- [5] M. A. Albreem, A. H. A. Habbash, A. M. Abu-Hudrouss, and S. S. Ikki, "Overview of precoding techniques for massive MIMO," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 60764–60801, 2021.
- [6] O. Haliloglu, J. Sadreddini, and P. Frenger, "Interference-aware distributed precoding in coherent large-scale distributed MIMO," in *Proc. IEEE Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps)*, 2021, pp. 1–6.

- [7] O. Kodheli et al., "Satellite communications in the new space era: A survey and future challenges," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 70–109, 1st Quart., 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08811>
- [8] L. M. Marrero, J. C. M. Duncan, J. Querol, S. Chatzinotas, A. Camps, and B. Ottersten, "A design strategy for phase synchronization in Precoding-enabled DVB-S2X user terminals," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, 2021, pp. 1–7.
- [9] P. Savazzi and A. Vizziello, "Carrier synchronization in distributed MIMO satellite links," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Wireless Space Extreme Environ. (WiSEE)*, 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [10] G. Jin et al., "An advanced phase synchronization scheme for LT-1," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1735–1746, Mar. 2020.
- [11] L. Belostotski, T. Landecker, and D. Routledge, "A technique for microwave ranging and remote phase synchronization," *IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas.*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 551–559, Jun. 2002. [Online]. Available: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/1017727/>
- [12] H. Yan, S. Hanna, K. Balke, R. Gupta, and D. Cabric, "Software defined radio implementation of carrier and timing synchronization for distributed arrays," in *Proc. IEEE Aerosp. Conf.*, 2018, pp. 1–12. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02098>
- [13] L. M. Marrero, A. Haqiqatnejad, J. C. M. Duncan, S. Chatzinotas, and B. Ottersten, "Multiuser-MISO Precoding under channel phase uncertainty in satellite communication systems," *IEEE Open J. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 4, pp. 127–148, Nov. 2022.
- [14] J. Rutman, "Characterization of phase and frequency instabilities in precision frequency sources: Fifteen years of progress," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 66, no. 9, pp. 1048–1075, Sep. 1978.
- [15] A. Gharanjik, M. R. Bhavani Shankar, P. D. Arapoglou, M. Bengtsson, and B. Ottersten, "Robust precoding design for multibeam downlink satellite channel with phase uncertainty," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust. Speech Signal Process. (ICASSP)*, 2015, pp. 3083–3087.
- [16] G. Taricco, "Linear Precoding methods for multi-beam broadband satellite systems," in *Proc. Eur. Wireless 20th Eur. Wireless Conf.*, 2014, pp. 1–6.
- [17] M. U. Aminu, J. Lehtomäki, and M. Juntti, "Beamforming and transceiver optimization with phase noise for mmWave and THz bands," in *Proc. 16th Int. Symp. Wireless Commun. Syst. (ISWCS)*, Oulu, Finland, 2019, pp. 692–696.
- [18] A. Chorti and M. Brookes, "A spectral model for RF oscillators with power-law phase noise," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Reg. Papers*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 1989–1999, Sep. 2006.
- [19] J. McNeill, S. Razavi, K. Vedula, and D. Richard Brown, "Experimental characterization and modeling of low-cost oscillators for improved carrier phase synchronization," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Instrum. Meas. Technol. Conf. (I2MTC)*, Turin, Italy, 2017, pp. 1–6. [Online]. Available: [http://spinlab.wpi.edu/pubs/McNeill\\_{\\_}I2MCT\\_{\\_}2017.pdf](http://spinlab.wpi.edu/pubs/McNeill_{_}I2MCT_{_}2017.pdf)
- [20] L. Galleani, "A tutorial on the two-state model of the atomic clock noise," *Metrologia*, vol. 45, no. 6, p. S175, 2008.
- [21] F. Lavancier and P. Rochet, "A general procedure to combine estimators," *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.*, vol. 94, pp. 175–192, Feb. 2016, doi: [10.1016/j.csda.2015.08.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2015.08.001).
- [22] H. Liu, S. Fang, and J. Jianhua, "An improved weighted fusion algorithm of multi-sensor," *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [23] T. Yücek and H. Arslan, "A survey of spectrum sensing algorithms for cognitive radio applications," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 116–130, 1st Quart., 2009.
- [24] C. M. Dharmapuri and B. V. R. Reddy, "Performance analysis of different fusion rules for cooperative spectrum sensing in cognitive radio communication," in *Proc. 17th INDIACom; 10th Int. Conf. Comput. Sustain. Glob. Develop., (INDIACom)*, Bharati Vidyapeeth, New Delhi, 2023, pp. 1061–1064.
- [25] Y. Zhang, A. Xiong, Y. Xiao, and Z. Chen, "A new combination method based on pearson coefficient and information entropy for multi-sensor data fusion," *Inf. Softw. Technol.*, vol. 161, Sep. 2023, Art. no. 107248. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950584923001027>
- [26] M. K. Al-Sharman, B. J. Emran, M. A. Jaradat, H. Najjaran, R. Al-Husari, and Y. Zweiri, "Precision landing using an adaptive fuzzy multi-sensor data fusion architecture," *Appl. Soft Comput.*, vol. 69, pp. 149–164, Aug. 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1568494618302163>



- [27] L. A. Zadeh, "A note on Z-numbers," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 181, no. 14, pp. 2923–2932, 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0020025511001046>
- [28] Y. Deng, "D numbers: Theory and applications," *J. Inf. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 9, pp. 2421–2428, 2012.
- [29] Y. Tian, X. Mi, L. Liu, and B. Kang, "A new soft likelihood function based on D numbers in handling uncertain information," *Int. J. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 2333–2349, 2020.
- [30] K. U. Storek, R. T. Schwarz, and A. Knopp, "Multi-satellite multi-user MIMO precoding: Testbed and field trial," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. (ICC)*, 2020, pp. 1–7.
- [31] J. Krivochiza et al., "End-to-end precoding validation over a live GEO satellite forward link," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 41556–41564, 2023.
- [32] M. Li and M. Diao, "Cooperative spectrum sensing algorithm based on majority decision fusion," in *Proc. 2nd Int. Conf. Instrum. Meas., Comput., Commun. Control (IMCCC)*, 2012, pp. 952–956.
- [33] R. Agarwal, N. Srivastava, and H. Katiyar, "Energy detection of unknown signals over rayleigh fading channel for EGC and SSC diversity combining techniques," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Emerg. Trends Electr., Electron. Sustain. Energy Syst. (ICETEESES)*, 2016, pp. 116–119.
- [34] A. P. Theeksha and S. Srikanth, "Performance analysis and mode selection of SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO in 802.11ac," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Recent Trends Inf. Technol. (ICRITIT)*, 2013, pp. 732–737.
- [35] D. M. Pozar, *Microwave Engineering*, 4th ed. Danvers, MA, Essex: Wiley, 2012.
- [36] I. Standards, *IEEE Std 1139-2008 (Revision of IEEE Std 1139-1999) IEEE Standard Definitions of Physical Quantities for Fundamental Frequency and Time Metrology—Random Instabilities*, IEEE Standard 1139-2008 (Revision of IEEE Std 1139-1999), Feb. 27, 2009.
- [37] D. Ricketts and J. A. McNeill, *The Designer's Guide to Jitter in Ring Oscillators*. Boston, MA, USA: Springer, 2009.
- [38] C. Zucca and P. Tavella, "The clock model and its relationship with the Allan and related variances," *IEEE Trans. Ultrason., Ferroelectr. Freq. Control*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 289–296, Feb. 2005. [Online]. Available: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/1406554/>
- [39] F. Ling, "Digital frequency-locked loop," in *Synchronization in Digital Communication Systems*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2017, pp. 193–270.
- [40] U. Mengali and A. N. D'Andrea, *Synchronization Techniques for Digital Receivers* (Applications of Communications Theory 1075407). New York, NY, USA: Plenum Press, 1997.
- [41] F. Golnaraghi, *Design of Control Systems*. New York, NY, USA: Wiley, 2010.
- [42] J. W. M. Bergmans, "Effect of loop delay on phase margin of first-order and second-order control loops," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. II, Exp. Briefs*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 621–625, Oct. 2005.
- [43] J. Duncan, J. Krivochiza, S. Andrenacci, S. Chatzinotas, and B. Ottersten, "Hardware demonstration of precoded communications in multi-beam UHTS systems," in *Proc. 36th Int. Commun. Satell. Syst. Conf. (ICSSC)*, 2018, pp. 1–5.
- [44] N. Maturo et al., "Demonstrator of Precoding technique for a multi-beams satellite system," in *Proc. 8th Int. Workshop Tracking, Telem. Command Syst. Space Appl. (TTC)*, 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [45] J. Duncan et al., "Hardware precoding demonstration in multibeam UHTS communications under realistic payload characteristics," in *Proc. ICSSC*, 2019, pp. 1–17.




**LIZ MARTINEZ MARRERO** (Member, IEEE) was born in Havana, Cuba, in 1989. She received the M.Sc. degree in telecommunications and telematics from the Technological University of Havana, Cuba, in 2018. She is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree with the Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability, and Trust, University of Luxembourg.

Her research interests include digital signal processing for wireless communications, focusing on the physical layer, satellite communications, and carrier synchronization for distributed systems. During the 37th International Communications Satellite Systems Conference 2019, she received the Best Student Paper Award.



**JUAN CARLOS MERLANO DUNCAN** (Senior Member, IEEE) received the Diploma degree in electrical engineering from the Universidad del Norte, Barranquilla, Colombia, in 2004, and the M.Sc. and Ph.D. Diploma (Cum Laude) degrees from the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC), Barcelona, Spain, in 2009 and 2012, respectively.

At UPC, he was responsible for the design and implementation of a radar system known as SABRINA, which was the first ground-based bistatic radar receiver using space-borne platforms, such as ERS-2, ENVISAT, and TerraSAR-X as opportunity transmitters (C and X bands). He was also in charge of the implementation of a ground-based array of transmitters, which was able to monitor land subsidence with subwavelength precision. These two implementations involved FPGA design, embedded programming, and analog RF/Microwave design. In 2013, he joined the Institute National de la Recherche Scientifique, Montreal, Canada, as a Research Assistant in the design and implementation of cognitive radio networks employing software development and FPGA programming. He joined the University of Luxembourg in 2016, where he currently works as a Research Scientist with COMMLAB Laboratory working on SDR implementation of satellite and terrestrial communication systems and passive remote sensing systems. His research interests are wireless communications, remote sensing, distributed systems, frequency distribution and carrier synchronization systems, software-defined radios, and embedded systems.



**JORGE LUIS GONZÁLEZ** (Member, IEEE) received the B.S. (with Hons.), M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in telecommunications and electronics from the Technological University of Havana (CUJAE), Cuba, in 2006, 2009 and 2018, respectively. He is with the Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust, University of Luxembourg. From September 2006 to July 2019, he was as Lecturer and a Researcher with the Research Center on Microelectronics (CIME), CUJAE. He visited the Seville Institute of Microelectronics (IMSE-CNM), Spain, in 2010, 2011, and 2012, and the Group of Microelectronics of the Federal University of Itajuba, Brazil, in 2013. His research interests include RF/analog circuits, embedded systems, and wireless and satellite communications.



**JEVGENIJ KRIVOCHIZA** (Member, IEEE) received the B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees in electronic engineering in telecommunications physics and electronics from the Faculty of Physics, Vilnius University in 2011 and 2013, respectively, and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from the Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability, and Trust, University of Luxembourg in 2020, where he is currently a Research Associate. He works on digital signal processor (DSP) algorithms for SDR platforms for advanced precoding and

beamforming techniques in next-generation satellite communications. His main research topics are coming from development for FPGA silicon, software-defined radios, digital signal processing, precoding, interference mitigation, DVB-S2X, DVB-S2, and LTE systems.



**SYMEON CHATZINOTAS** (Fellow, IEEE) received the M.Eng. degree in telecommunications from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece, in 2003, and the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in electronic engineering from the University of Surrey, Surrey, U.K., in 2006 and 2009, respectively.

He is currently a Full Professor, a Chief Scientist I, and the Head of the Research Group SIGCOM with the Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust, University of


Luxembourg. In parallel, he is an Adjunct Professor with the Department of Electronic Systems, Norwegian University of Science and Technology and a Collaborating Scholar with the Institute of Informatics and Telecommunications, National Center for Scientific Research “Demokritos.” In the past, he has lectured as a Visiting Professor with the University of Parma, Italy, and contributed to numerous research and development projects for the Institute of Telematics and Informatics, Center of Research and Technology Hellas and the Mobile Communications Research Group, Center of Communication Systems Research, University of Surrey. He has authored more than 700 technical papers in refereed international journals, conferences, and scientific books.

Prof. Chatzinotas has received numerous awards and recognitions, including the IEEE Fellowship and an IEEE Distinguished Contributions Award. He is currently on the editorial board of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON COMMUNICATIONS, IEEE OPEN JOURNAL OF VEHICULAR TECHNOLOGY, and the *International Journal of Satellite Communications and Networking*.



**BJÖRN OTTERSTEN** (Fellow, IEEE) received the M.S. degree in electrical engineering and applied physics from Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden, in 1986, and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA, in 1990. He has held research positions with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Linköping University; the Information Systems Laboratory, Stanford University; the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven, Belgium; and the University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg. From

1996 to 1997, he was the Director of Research with ArrayComm, Inc., a start-up in San Jose, CA, USA, based on his patented technology. In 1991, he was appointed as a Professor of Signal Processing with the Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Stockholm, Sweden, where has been the Head of the Department for Signals, Sensors, and Systems. He has been the Dean of the School of Electrical Engineering, KTH. He is currently the Director for the Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust, University of Luxembourg. He is a recipient of the IEEE Signal Processing Society Technical Achievement Award, the EURASIP Group Technical Achievement Award, and the European Research Council Advanced Research Grant Twice. He has coauthored journal papers that received the IEEE Signal Processing Society Best Paper Award in 1993, 2001, 2006, 2013, and 2019, and nine IEEE conference papers best paper awards. He has been a Board Member of IEEE Signal Processing Society, the Swedish Research Council and currently serves of the boards of EURASIP and the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research. He has served as the Editor in Chief of EURASIP Signal Processing, and acted on the editorial boards of IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON SIGNAL PROCESSING, *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, IEEE OPEN JOURNAL FOR SIGNAL PROCESSING, *EURASIP Journal of Advances in Signal Processing*, and *Foundations and Trends in Signal Processing*. He is a Fellow of EURASIP.



**ADRIANO CAMPS** (Fellow, IEEE) joined the Electromagnetics and Photonics Engineering Group, Department of Signal Theory and Communications, UPC as an Assistant Professor in 1993, an Associate Professor in 1997, and has been a Full Professor since 2007. In 1999, he was on sabbatical leave with the Microwave Remote Sensing Laboratory, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. He is the Scientific Coordinator of the CommSensLab Research Center (María de Maeztu Excellence Research unit 2016–2020) with the

Department of Signal Theory and Communications. Within CommSensLab, he co-leads the Remote Sensing Lab, and leads the UPC NanoSat Lab. He is the PI of the first four UPC nano-satellites: 3Cat-1, 3Cat-2, 3Cat-4, and FSSCat, a tandem mission formed by two 6U CubeSats. FFSCAT is the first mission contributing to the Copernicus System based on CubeSats and it has produced for the first time using CubeSats scientific quality soil moisture, sea ice extent, concentration and thickness, and sea salinity maps in the Arctic. His publication record includes over 245 papers in peer-reviewed journals, nine book chapters and the book Emery and Camps, *Introduction to Satellite Remote Sensing. Atmosphere, Ocean, Land and Cryosphere Applications*, (Elsevier, 2017, 860 pages), and more than 485 conference presentations. According to Google Scholar/Scopus his H-index is 56 / 44, and his publications have received more than 12933/8816 citations. He holds 12 patents, and has advised 27 Ph.D. Thesis students (+ 8 on-going), and more than 150 final project and M.Eng. Theses. His research interests are focused in: 1) microwave remote sensing, with special emphasis in microwave radiometry by aperture synthesis (Ph.D. Thesis was about the MIRAS instrument which became the single payload of ESA’s SMOS mission), 2) remote sensing using signals of opportunity (GNSS-R), 3) radio frequency interference detection and mitigation, and 4) nanosatellites as a tool to test innovative remote sensors. He has participated in all Technical Committee Programs of the International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS) since 2000, was the Chair of uCal 2001, the Technical Program Committee Co-Chair of IGARSS 2007, the Co-Chair of GNSS-R ‘10, the General Co-Chair of IGARSS 2020, the 6th FFSS Workshop, and is a member of the organizing committee of the ESA 4th Symposium on Space Educational Activities. He was an Associate Editor of *Radio Science*, and the IEEE GEOSCIENCE AND REMOTE SENSING LETTERS, and he is an Associate Editor of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON GEOSCIENCE AND REMOTE SENSING, and has been a guest editor of several special issues. He was the President-Founder of the IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Society Chapter at Spain, and the President of the IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Society from 2017 to 2018.