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Abstract—This paper analyzes the effects of realistic relay transceiver structures on the outage probability and throughput of wireless energy harvesting in a two-way decode-and-forward cognitive network. The study carried out under the impact of transceiver hardware impairments. Two power transfer policies; dual-source and single-fixed-source, two bidirectional relaying protocols; multiple access and time division broadcast, and two relay receiver structures; time switching and power splitting, are considered to derive closed-form expressions for the outage and throughput of the network in the context of delay-limited transmission. Numerical results are presented to corroborate our analysis for all possible scenarios of the network. This study facilitates us not only to quantify the degradation of outage probability and throughput of the networks due to transceiver hardware impairments but also to provide practical insight into the effect of power transfer policies, relaying protocols and receiver structures on outage and throughput of the networks. For instance, the system with multiple access broadcast protocol and the power splitting based receiver architecture achieve ceiling throughout higher than that of the transmission rate of source nodes. On the contrary, combination of dual-source energy transfer policy and the time division broadcast protocol are contributed the highest level of limiting factor in terms of transceiver hardware impairments on the network throughput.

Index Terms—Two-way relay, decode-and-forward, cognitive networks, energy harvesting, hardware impairments.

I. INTRODUCTION

As a sustainable solution to uphold the lifetime of energy constrained wireless networks, energy harvesting (EH) technique has recently received significant attention since it meets the requirements of green communications. Besides the traditional renewable energy sources such as solar and wind, radio frequency (RF) signals radiated by ambient transmitters can be identified as a viable new inspiration for energy harvesting. In [1]–[3], wireless nodes acquire energy of RF signals in the surrounding environment to self-power the transmission data. Recently, some important advances of wireless power technologies have largely increased the feasibility of EH in practical wireless applications [4]–[6]. With concurrent developments in the antenna technology and EH circuit designs, wireless energy transfer is recognized as a valuable candidate for future networks.

Cognitive radio is emerging as a means to improve the wireless spectrum utilization [19]. In cognitive radio, secondary users (SUs) are allowed to transmit wireless signals in the same frequency bands that are officially allocated to primary users (PUs). In order to maintain quality-of-service of primary transmission links, the transmit power of SUs should be limited to the maximum interference allowance of PUs. Consequently, this power constraint limits the performance of SUs. In order to tackle the transmit power limitation in cognitive networks, the concept of two-way cognitive relay (TWCR) networks has been proposed in [8], [9] among others. TWCR networks exploit the advantages of two-way relaying protocol and cognitive radio concepts. Also, they are able to overcome transmit power limitations and boost the system performance.

In the previous literature, the TWCR networks were analyzed using the outage probability (OP) and throughput of the systems under perfect transceiver hardware assumption, however this is far from the reality. In [8], a tight approximation of the OP for amplify-and-forward TWCR networks was provided. Closed-form expressions for the OP of TWCR network, in the presence of multiple primary users, were derived in [9].

Cooperative diversity [6], [17] has been proposed as an effective approach to combat the fading effect and enhance channel throughput. In the literature, many research works have been conceived on cooperative relay techniques in cognitive radio for spectrum efficiency enhancement. In [6], [7], the cooperative spectrum sensing techniques are used to enhance the reliability of detecting PUs in cognitive radio, and a
cognitive space-time-frequency coding technique has been presented to adjust its coding structure by adapting itself to the dynamic spectrum environment.

In specific applications such as wireless sensor networks in remote areas, where the power supply unit is difficult to recharge, a self-powered relay node is much preferable. Among various resources that can be converted to power, radio frequency energy is a preferred method in wireless networks. Hence, the relay nodes are able to be powered by the radio signals. However, the relevant research on the OP and throughput of radio frequency energy harvesting (EH) relaying has also assumed perfect hardware (see e.g., [20], [21] and references therein).

In this work, we present a detailed performance analysis of an EH based decode-and-forward (DF) TWCR network (EH-TWCR) in the presence of transceiver imperfections by utilizing the generalized impairment model of [22]. The main contributions of this paper are twofold:

1) We portray the self-powered EF-TWCR networks with two energy transfer policies, two relaying protocols, and two relay receiver structures while keeping the limited transmit power levels. To further explore the benefit on network throughput, we propose different data frame structures for the network with various combination of energy transfer policies, relaying protocols, and relay receiver architecture possible network cases with respect to the balanced comparison.

2) We provide new closed-form expressions for the OP and throughout of the considered networks under the impact of transceiver imperfection. Also, the influence of configuration parameters on network throughput is accounted. Our analysis set useful design guidelines for implementing a suitable protocol for EH-TWCR networks. Based on these results, network designers will be able to predict the maximum level of hardware imperfections that can be tolerated to achieve a predetermined performance.

An outline of the rest of the paper is as follows. Section II describes the system and channel model for the half-duplex TWCR system under consideration. In Section III, Energy harvesting assisted DF-TWCR network is explained. Section IV characterizes the performance analysis of time switching based architecture. Section V discusses the performance analysis of power splitting based architecture. Section VI validates our analytical model and presents some useful results pertaining to system performance metrics followed by the conclusion and future directions in Section VII.

## II. SYSTEM AND CHANNEL MODEL

In this paper, we consider a half-duplex TWCR network as illustrated in Fig. 1. Primary user is the receiver (Rx), while the secondary users consists of two communication nodes A, B and one relay node R. Each node is equipped with a single antenna.

All channels of the cognitive relay network are assumed to be reciprocal and experience quasi-static block Rayleigh fading, whose coefficients are constant over the communication cycle $T$ [21], [25]–[27]. The channel coefficients of the wireless communication links $A \rightarrow R$, $R \rightarrow B$, $A \rightarrow Rx$, $B \rightarrow Rx$ and $R \rightarrow Rx$ are denoted as $h_m$ and $g_n$, where $m \in \{1, 2\}$ and $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ are complex Gaussian distributed random variables with zero mean and variances $\frac{1}{\lambda_m}$ and $\frac{1}{\lambda_n}$, respectively. The additive noise terms $\eta_i$, $i \in \{A, B, Rx\}$, have zero mean and variance $N_0$, $\eta_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, N_0)$. Moreover, it is assumed that there is no line-of-sight transmission link from A to B. In addition, the channel state information of all wireless channels of the two hop information links are assumed to be known at the respective transmitter and receiver, which, for instance, could be obtained through feedback from a given node.

In order to protect the primary receiver (Rx) from secondary user interference signals, we define $I_P$ as the maximum tolerance interference received at Rx to constrain the transmit powers of SUs. Thus, the peak transmit power is $P_i^* = \frac{I_P}{|g_i|^2}$ where $i \in \{A, B, Rx\}$ and $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. For our analysis, we determine the exponentially distributed random variables $\rho_m = |h_m|^2$, and $\nu_n = |g_n|^2$ for $m \in \{1, 2\}$ and $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, whose means are $\frac{1}{\lambda_m}$ and $\frac{1}{\lambda_n}$, respectively. Finally, following the discussion in previous section, the aggregate impairment level during the information processing (IP) phase is represented by $\kappa_i^2$ where $i \in \{A, B, Rx\}$.

![Fig. 1. An energy harvesting two-way cognitive relay network.](image)

### A. Hardware Impairments’ Model

We have modified the transceiver hardware impairments model originally proposed in [22] to cater for the proposed scheme. It is assumed that the source transmits a signal $x \in \mathbb{C}$ with power $P_x$ over the wireless channel with fading coefficient $h$ to the receiver. The signal experiences AWGN $\eta$. The practical transceiver impairments at the source distort signal $x$ before it is emitted, whilst the imperfect transceiver hardware of the receiver distorts received signal during the reception phase. Each source of distortion can be represented by a different model. Yet, let $\tau_1$, $\tau_2$ be the aggregate distortion affecting the source and destination, respectively. The received signal can be succinctly expressed as

$$y = h(x + \tau_1) + \tau_2 + \eta. \quad (1)$$

As in [23] and [24], $\tau_1 \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \kappa_1^2 P_x)$ and $\tau_2 \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \kappa_2^2 P_x|h|^2)$, where $\kappa_1, \kappa_2$ are the impairment levels at the source and destination transceivers, respectively. Following [23], the distortion powers caused by transceiver impairments...
III. DF-TWCR NETWORKS WITH ENERGY HARVESTING

We describe a EH-TWRC network, where the information exchanged from two source nodes A and B is assisted by a self-powered intermediate node R. The relay R harvests energy from wireless signals that transmitted from A (and B) in the EH phase. Exchanged data from A and B are transmitted to R during the broadcast (BC) phase, and then this data is decoded and re-encoded with a suitable network coding operation before we forward to B and A in the relaying (RL) phase. In this framework, we configure the EH-TWCR network with two EH policies dual-source (DS) and single-fixed-source (SFS) policy, two relaying protocols time division broadcast (TDBC) and multiple access broadcast (MABC) protocol, and two relay receiver structures time switching based (TSB) and power splitting based (PSB) architecture.

We propose a paradigm that duration of the EH, and RL phase are fixed over the network configurations as 2t, and t [sec], respectively, whereas, the duration of BC phase varies due to the network configuration (length 2t or t). Depending on the network configurations, the EH, BC and RL phase are contributed to form a transmission cycle, T. Thereby, the duration T varies corresponding to the network configuration. This paper presents the benefit of each network configuration and offer the balanced comparison on the performance between all possible network configurations. For the sake of convenience, we shorten the description of specific network configuration, for example, the network that is configured with DS energy transfer policy, TDBC relaying protocol, and TSB relay receiver architecture is denominated by DS-TDBC-TSB network. All possible network configurations are explained and analysed in the later parts of this paper.

A. Energy Transfer Policy

During the EH phase, R harvests energy from the RF signals which are transmitted from other nodes in TWCR network. We assume that the transmit powers at A and (or) B to R in the EH phase satisfy the maximum allowable interference$^1$ $P_F$, hence $P_A^{EH} = P_B^{EH} = I_P < \min \left( \frac{P_L}{\nu_1}, \frac{P_L}{\nu_2} \right)$. The collected energy at R is utilized to decode and re-encode data in BC phase and also transmit signal in the RL phase. The amount of harvested power depends on energy transfer policy, the power conversion efficiency of the rectification circuit and the receiver architecture of relay node. The power conversion efficiency is denoted as $\mu$ ($0 < \mu \leq 1$) [25]. Note that hardware impairments are not taken into account during the EH phase as (a) the hardware used for harvesting energy is different from that used in transmitting/receiving data, and (b) any type of hardware imperfections in the EH circuitry is eventually captured by $\mu$. Two energy transfer policies, i.e., DS and SFS policy, are described in the following section.

1) DS Energy Transfer Policy: In the DS energy transfer policy, the relay harvests power from the signals that are transmitted from both A and B during the EH phase.

2) SFS Energy Transfer Policy: In this policy, the relay harvests power from the transmitted signal either A or B which is predetermined before transmission take place. Without loss of generality, the received signal in EH phase at R for the SFS policy is assumed to be transmitted from the fixed node A.

B. Relaying Protocol

In this section, we describe two relaying protocols: the TDBC and MABC. The relay protocols consist of two data transmission phases, i.e., BC and RL phase. The frame structure of the BC phase determines the category of relaying protocol. Note that the decoders and encoders of each node in TWCR network are assumed to be flawless.

1) TDBC Protocol: In the TDBC protocol, the duration of BC phase is divided into two equal time slots (length of durations are equal to half of the BC phase). In the first time slot, A transmits signal to R, whereas B transmits to R in the second time slot. The received data at R is decoded and re-encoded, then it is combined with XOR operation (network coding) before forwarded to B and A in the RL phase.

2) MABC Protocol: In the MABC protocol, R concurrently receives data from both node A and node B via two orthogonal channels in the BC phase. The received data at R is also decoded, re-encoded then combined with XOR operation (network coding) before forwarded to B and A in the RL phase.

C. Relay Receiver Architecture

The architecture of relay receiver determines the strategy that data received from antenna of the relay is feed to its energy harvesting block and data processing block in chronology or concurrence. Therefore, the receiver architecture affects the frame structure and the length of T. In this paper, we consider two structures of relay receiver namely, TSB and PSB architectures [25].

1) TSB Architecture: The TSB architecture is depicted in the Fig. 2. The receiver antenna of the relay is successively connected to the energy harvesting block and the data processing block over time. The incoming data to these blocks is controlled by the timing mechanism. Hence, the EH phase and the BC phase occur in two separated time slots.

2) PSB Architecture: The PSB architecture is depicted in the Fig. 3. The receive antenna of the relay is connected to both energy harvesting block and data processing block. Therefore, the received data at the relay antenna is shared with these blocks. $\epsilon$ is defined as power sharing fraction ($0 < \epsilon < 1$). Due to this receiver structure, the EH phase and the BC phase may concurrently occur in a given time slot, the transmission cycle can therefore be shortened, thereof. This is a benefit offered by the PSB architecture over the TSB architecture.

$^1$ The minimal RF input power required for sensor node operation was found to be $-18$ dBm (15.8 $\mu$W). Using a 6 dBm receive antenna, the most sensitive RF harvester was shown to operate at a distance of several kilometers from a 1 MW UHF television broadcast tower, and over 200 m from a cellular base transceiver station [28].
A. DS Policy - TDBC Protocol

In this configuration, the network utilizes the DS policy - TDBC protocol - TSB architecture. The data frame structure of the communication cycle $T$ is shown in Fig. 4. The relay $R$ harvests energy from transmitted signals from both $A$ and $B$ in the EH phase. Then, $R$ consequently receive the transmit data from $A$ and $B$ in the first and the second time slot of the BC phase. Later, $R$ forwards the re-encoded signal to both $A$ and $B$ in the RL phase. Thus, the duration of $T$ is $5t$ [sec]. The acquired energy at $R$ is parametrized as

$$E_R = \mu \left( P^A_{EH} |h_1|^2 + P^B_{EH} |h_2|^2 \right) 2t = \mu \bar{I}_P (\rho_1 + \rho_2) 2t. \tag{3}$$

![Fig. 4. Data frame structure of the DS-TDBC-TSB network.](image)

1) Transmit Power in the RL Phase: In order to determine the end-to-end SNDR, we need the information of transmit energy of the relay in the RL phase. The harvested energy in the EH phase is used for decoding, re-encoding signals in the BC phase as well as forwarding data in the RL phase. We assume that the total harvested energy at $R$ in the EH phase is distributed equally to the total duration of the BC phase and the RL phase. Thus, from (3), the transmit power at $R$ in the RL phase is

$$P_R = \frac{E_R}{3t} = \frac{\mu \bar{I}_P 2t}{3t} (\rho_1 + \rho_2) = \Upsilon_1 (\rho_1 + \rho_2), \tag{4}$$

where $\Upsilon_1 = \frac{2}{3} \mu \bar{I}_P$.

2) End-to-End SNDR: In the BC phase, the information transfers in different time slots from $A$ and $B$ to $R$, hence, the instantaneous SNDR at either $R$ of the link $A \rightarrow R$ and $B \rightarrow R$ or at $A$ (or at $B$) of the link $R \rightarrow A$ (or the link $R \rightarrow B$) in the RL phase, respectively, are independent and statistically similar. Without loss of generality, only the communication link $A \rightarrow R \rightarrow B$ is investigated herein. We assume that $A$ transmits data with the peak power $\frac{P_A}{\nu_1}$. Then, the SNDR at $R$ of the $A \rightarrow R$ link is given by

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{P_A}{N_0 |h_1|^2} + P^B_{EH} |h_2|^2 = \frac{\bar{\gamma} \rho_1}{\kappa_R^2 \rho_1 + \nu_1}, \tag{5}$$

where $\bar{\gamma} \triangleq \frac{P_A}{N_0}$. In the RL phase, $R$ forwards the received data from the previous two time slots to $A$ and $B$ with the transmit power equals to $\frac{P_B}{\nu_2}$. $P_R$ is given in (4). Then, the SNDR at $B$ of the link $R \rightarrow B$ is given by

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{\bar{T}_1 (\rho_1 + \rho_2)}{\bar{T}_1 \kappa_B^2 (\rho_1 + \rho_2) + \nu_2}, \tag{6}$$

where $\bar{T}_1 = \frac{P_B}{N_0}$. The end-to-end SNDR of the wireless link $A \rightarrow R \rightarrow B$ of is then obtained as

$$\gamma = \min(\gamma_1, \gamma_2). \tag{7}$$

3) Outage Performance Analysis: Denote that $F(\cdot)$ and $f(\cdot)$ are the cumulative distributed function (CDF) and the probability distributed function (PDF) of a random variable (RV), respectively. In (5) and (6), $\rho_1$ appears as a common RV in both $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$, therefore the CDF of $\gamma$, $F_\gamma(\gamma)$, in (7) can be expressed as

$$F_\gamma(\gamma) = \int_0^\infty \left[ F_{\gamma_1 x}(\gamma) + F_{\gamma_2 |\rho_1}(\gamma) \right] f_{\rho_1}(x) dx. \tag{8}$$

The following propositions will enable us to analytically evaluate (8).

**Proposition 1.** The CDF of $\gamma_1$ conditioned on $\rho_1$ is given by

$$F_{\gamma_1 |\rho_1}(\gamma) = \exp \left( -\frac{\bar{\gamma} (1 - \kappa_R^2 \gamma)}{\omega_1 \gamma} \rho_1 \right). \tag{9}$$

**Proof:** From the definition of the CDF of a RV, we have

$$F_{\gamma_1 |\rho_1}(\gamma) = \Pr \left[ \frac{\bar{\gamma} \rho_1}{\kappa_R^2 \rho_1 + \nu_1} \leq \gamma \right] = 1 - F_{\nu_1} \left( \frac{\bar{\gamma} (1 - \kappa_R^2 \gamma)}{\gamma} \rho_1 \right).$$

This result leads directly to (9).

**Proposition 2.** The CDF of $\gamma_2$ conditioned on $\rho_1$ is given by

$$F_{\gamma_2 |\rho_1}(\gamma) = \frac{\omega_2}{\lambda_2^2 C_1} \exp \left( \frac{\rho_1}{\lambda_2} \right) \exp \left( \frac{\omega_2}{\lambda_2^2 C_1} \right) E_{1} \left( \frac{\omega_2}{\lambda_2^2 C_1} \right), \tag{10}$$

where $C_1 \triangleq \frac{\bar{T}_1 (1 - \kappa_R^2 \gamma)}{\gamma}$, and $E_1(x) = \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-t}}{t} dt$ is the exponential integral function.
Proof: By the definition of CDF of a RV, we have
\[
F_{\gamma_{2}|\gamma_{1}}(\gamma) = \Pr \left[ \frac{T_{1}(\rho_{1} + \rho_{2})}{r_{1}^{n_{2}} + \rho_{1} + \rho_{2} + y_{2}^{n_{2}}} \leq \gamma \right] = 1 - \int_{0}^{\infty} F_{X}(C_{1}y) f_{Y|\rho_{1}}(y) dy
\]
where \( X \triangleq \frac{\omega_{2}}{a_{2} + \omega_{2}} \) and \( Y \triangleq \rho_{1} + \rho_{2} \). It is apparent that \( F_{X}(x) = 1 - \frac{\omega_{2}}{a_{2} + \omega_{2}} x \) and \( f_{Y|\rho_{1}}(y) = \frac{1}{a_{2}} \exp \left( -\frac{y\rho_{1}}{a_{2}} \right) \). Substituting these results into (11), we obtain
\[
F_{\gamma_{2}|\gamma_{1}}(\gamma) = \int_{0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\omega_{2}}{\omega_{2} + \lambda_{2}y} \right) \frac{1}{\lambda_{2}} \exp \left( -\frac{y - \rho_{1}}{\lambda_{2}} \right) dy.
\]
(12)
After some algebraic manipulations and using [29, Eq. (3.352.4)], we can obtain the result shown in (10).

Using the previous theorems, (8) is recast as
\[
F_{\gamma}(\gamma) = I_{1} + I_{2} - I_{3},
\]
(13)
where we can define from Proposition 1 and Proposition 2:
\[
I_{1} = \frac{\omega_{1}\gamma}{\omega_{1}\gamma + \lambda_{1}\gamma(1 - \kappa_{R}^{2})},
\]
\[
I_{2} = C_{2} \frac{\lambda_{2}}{\lambda_{1} + \lambda_{2}}, \quad C_{2} \triangleq \frac{\omega_{2}}{\lambda_{2}^{2}} \exp \left( \frac{\omega_{2}}{\lambda_{2}^{2}} \right) E_{1} \left( \frac{\omega_{2}}{\lambda_{2}^{2}} \right),
\]
\[
I_{3} = C_{2} \frac{\lambda_{2}\omega_{1}}{\lambda_{1}\lambda_{2}\gamma(1 - \kappa_{R}^{2})} + \omega_{1}(\lambda_{1} + \lambda_{2}).
\]
Gathering the previous results together, the OP at nodes A and B at a specific SNDR threshold (\( \gamma_{1} \)) of the networks is given in (14) and (15), respectively.
\[
OP_{A}(\gamma_{1}) = \frac{\omega_{3}\gamma_{1}}{\omega_{3}\gamma_{1} + \lambda_{1}\gamma(1 - \kappa_{R}^{2})} + \frac{\omega_{2}}{\lambda_{1}^{2}} C_{1} \exp \left( \frac{\omega_{2}}{\lambda_{1}^{2}} C_{1} \right),
\]
\[
E_{1} \left( \frac{\omega_{2}}{\lambda_{1}^{2}} C_{1} \right) \left[ \frac{\lambda_{1}}{\lambda_{2} + \lambda_{1}} - \frac{\lambda_{1}\omega_{1}}{\lambda_{2}\lambda_{1}(1 - \kappa_{R}^{2})} + \omega_{1}\gamma_{1}(\lambda_{2} + \lambda_{1}) \right].
\]
\[
OP_{B}(\gamma_{1}) = \frac{\omega_{1}\gamma_{1}}{\omega_{1}\gamma_{1} + \lambda_{1}\gamma(1 - \kappa_{R}^{2})} + \frac{\omega_{2}}{\lambda_{2}^{2}} C_{1} \exp \left( \frac{\omega_{2}}{\lambda_{2}^{2}} C_{2} \right),
\]
\[
E_{1} \left( \frac{\omega_{2}}{\lambda_{2}^{2}} C_{1} \right) \left[ \frac{\lambda_{2}}{\lambda_{2} + \lambda_{1}} - \frac{\lambda_{2}\omega_{1}}{\lambda_{2}\lambda_{1}(1 - \kappa_{R}^{2})} + \omega_{1}\gamma_{1}(\lambda_{1} + \lambda_{2}) \right].
\]
Outage probability of the DS-TDBC-TSB networks is the sum of the OP of the link \( A \to R \to B \) and the OP of the link \( B \to R \to A \). It is obtained as
\[
OP(\gamma_{1}) = OP_{A}(\gamma_{1}) + OP_{B}(\gamma_{1}),
\]
where \( OP_{A}(\gamma_{1}) \) and \( OP_{B}(\gamma_{1}) \) are the OP at A and B, given in 14 and 15, respectively.

4) Throughput analysis: We assume that the sources transmit information to the destinations at a fixed communication rate. We can now analyze the network throughput in the context of delay-limited transmission. The transmission rates \( R_{A} \) and \( R_{B} \) of the TWCR networks are given as \( R_{A} = \log_{2}(1 + \gamma_{A}) \) and \( R_{B} = \log_{2}(1 + \gamma_{B}) \) [bits/s/Hz], respectively, where \( \gamma_{A} \) and \( \gamma_{B} \) are the corresponding threshold SNDRs. The network throughput is measured as the sum of the throughput of each wireless link at a given transmit rate. Hence, the network throughput, \( T \), in this network configuration is determined as
\[
T = \frac{t}{5} \left[ R_{A}(1 - OP_{A}(\gamma_{A})) + R_{B}(1 - OP_{B}(\gamma_{B})) \right],
\]
where \( OP_{A}(\gamma_{A}) \) and \( OP_{B}(\gamma_{B}) \) are the OPs at A and B, respectively. By substituting the OPs at A and B from (14) and (15) into (17), the exact expression of the network throughput is obtained.

B. SFS Policy - TDBC Protocol

In this subsection, the network is configured with SFS policy, TDBC protocol, and utilizes TSB receiver architecture. The data frame structure of the transmission cycle \( T \) is similar to the one of DS-TDBC-TSB network that was shown in Fig. 4. The only different is R harvests energy from the signal that is transmitted from A only. The energy harvested at R is then given by
\[
E_{H} = \mu P_{A}^{\bar{E}H}\left| h_{1} \right|^{2} = \mu T_{P}^{2}t = \frac{\bar{\gamma}T_{P}^{2}t}{3\mu}.
\]
(18)
1) Transmit Power in the RL Phase: Similarly, we assume that the entire harvested energy at \( R \) in the EH phase is distributed equally to the total duration of BC phase and RL phase. Thus, from (18), the transmit power at \( R \) in the RL phase equals to
\[
P_{R} = \frac{E_{H}}{3\mu} = \frac{\bar{\gamma}T_{P}^{2}t}{3\mu} \frac{1}{\rho_{1}} = \frac{\tilde{\gamma}T_{P}^{2}t}{3\mu}.
\]
(19)
2) End-to-End SNDR: As the transmit power at \( R \) is harvested from A, the SNDR of the link \( A \to R \to B \) is different from the SNDR of the link \( B \to R \to A \). Similarly, we assumed that A and B transmit data with peak power \( \frac{P_{1}}{\rho_{1}} \) and \( \frac{P_{2}}{\rho_{2}} \), respectively. The transmit power at \( R \) in the RL phase equals to \( \frac{P_{1}}{\rho_{1}} \), \( P_{R} \) of the harvested energy at \( R \) that is given in (19). The SNDRs at \( R \) and \( B \) of the link \( A \to R \to B \) are given respectively by
\[
\gamma_{1,ARB} = \frac{\gamma_{1,ARB}}{\gamma_{R}^{2}\rho_{1}},
\]
\[
\gamma_{2,ARB} = \frac{\gamma_{2,ARB}}{\gamma_{R}^{2}\rho_{2} + \rho_{2}},
\]
Therefore, the end-to-end SNDR at \( B \) can be obtained as
\[
\gamma_{B} = \min(\gamma_{1,ARB}, \gamma_{2,ARB}).
\]
(22)
Consider the link \( B \to R \to A \) now, the SNDRs at \( R \) and \( A \) are respectively given by
\[
\gamma_{1,BRA} = \frac{\gamma_{1,BRA}}{\gamma_{R}^{2}\rho_{1} + \rho_{1}},
\]
\[
\gamma_{2,BRA} = \frac{\gamma_{2,BRA}}{\gamma_{R}^{2}\rho_{1} + \rho_{2}},
\]
Likewise, the end-to-end SNDR at \( A \) is calculated as
\[
\gamma_{A} = \min(\gamma_{1,BRA}, \gamma_{2,BRA}).
\]
3) Outage Performance Analysis: It can be seen that $\rho_1$ appears as a common RV in both $\gamma_{1,ARB}$ and $\gamma_{2,ARB}$ as given in (20) and (21), respectively. Hence, the end-to-end CDF $\gamma_B$ needs to be computed as follows:

$$F_{\gamma_B}(\gamma) = \int_0^\infty \left[ F_{\gamma_{1,ARB}}(\rho_1)(\gamma) + F_{\gamma_{2,ARB}}(\rho_1)(\gamma) \right] d\rho_1(x) \, dx.$$  

(26)

The following proposition will enable us to evaluate (26).

**Proposition 3.** The CDF of $\gamma_{2,ARB}$ conditioned on $\rho_1$ is given by

$$F_{\gamma_{2,ARB}|\rho_1}(\gamma) = \frac{\omega_2 \gamma}{\omega_2 \gamma + (1 - k_2^2 \gamma)} F_1(\alpha_2 \rho_1).$$  

(27)

Proof: From the definition of the CDF of a RV, we have

$$F_{\gamma_{2,ARB}|\rho_1}(\gamma) = \Pr\left[ \frac{\bar{\gamma}_1(\rho_1 \rho_2)}{F_1(\alpha_2 \rho_2 + \nu_2)} \gamma < \gamma \right] = 1 - \int_0^\gamma F_{\nu_2}\left(\frac{\bar{\gamma}_1(1 - k_2^2 \gamma) \rho_1 x}{\gamma}\right) \, dx.$$  

By substituting CDF and PDF of the exponential RV $\rho_2$ into the above equation, the CDF of $\gamma_{2,ARB}$ conditioned on $\rho_1$ can be obtained as in (27).

The CDF of $\gamma_{1,ARB}$ conditioned on $\rho_1$ can be obtained with the help of Proposition 1. In particular, we can readily show that

$$F_{\gamma_{1,ARB}|\rho_1}(\gamma) = \exp\left(\frac{-\bar{\gamma}(1 - k_2^2 \gamma) \rho_1}{\omega_1 \gamma}\right).$$  

(28)

The end-to-end CDF of $\gamma_B$ is derived by substituting (26) with (27) and (28), hence CDF of $F_{\gamma_B}(\gamma)$ can be obtained as

$$F_{\gamma_B}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{\lambda_1 C_3} + \frac{1}{\lambda_1 C_1} \exp\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1 C_1}\right) E_1\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1 C_1}\right)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\lambda_1 C_1} \exp\left(\frac{C_3}{\lambda_1 C_1}\right) E_1\left(\frac{C_3}{\lambda_1 C_1}\right),$$  

(29)

where $C_3 \triangleq \frac{\bar{\gamma} \lambda_2 (1 - k_2^2 \gamma + \omega_1 \gamma)}{\gamma}$. Now we derive the CDF of $\gamma_A$ as provided in (25). We first notice that $\gamma_{1,BRA}$ and $\gamma_{2,BRA}$ are two mutually independent RVs as shown in (23) and (24), respectively. Thus, the CDF of $\gamma_A$ can be expressed as

$$F_{\gamma_A}(\gamma) = F_{\gamma_{1,BRA}}(\gamma) + F_{\gamma_{2,BRA}}(\gamma) - F_{\gamma_{1,BRA}}(\gamma) F_{\gamma_{2,BRA}}(\gamma).$$  

(30)

The CDF of $\gamma_{1,BRA}$ is found based on Proposition 3, while the CDF of $\gamma_{2,BRA}$ is derived with the help of Proposition 2. In particular, we have

$$F_{\gamma_{1,BRA}}(\gamma) = \frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma^2 + \gamma^2_2 (1 - k_2^2 \gamma^2)},$$  

(31)

$$F_{\gamma_{2,BRA}}(\gamma) = \frac{\omega_2}{\omega_2 C_4} \exp\left(\frac{\omega_2}{\omega^2 C_4}\right) E_1\left(\frac{\omega_2}{\omega^2 C_4}\right),$$  

(32)

where $C_4 \triangleq \frac{\bar{\gamma}(1 - k_2^2 \gamma)}{\gamma}$. The CDF of $\gamma_A$ is obtained by inserting (31) and (32) into (30). Consequently, the OP at $A$ and $B$ under the specified SNDR threshold ($\gamma_t$) of the network are respectively given in (33)–(34).

$$OP_A(\gamma_t) = \frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma^2 + \gamma^2_2 (1 - k_2^2 \gamma^2)} + \frac{\omega_2}{C_1^2} \exp\left(\frac{\omega_2}{C_2^2}\right)$$

$$\times E_1\left(\frac{\omega_2}{\omega^2 C_4}\right) \left[ 1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma^2 + \gamma^2_2 (1 - k_2^2 \gamma^2)} \right].$$  

(33)

$$OP_B(\gamma_t) = \frac{1}{\lambda_1 C_3} + \frac{1}{\lambda_1 C_1} \exp\left(\frac{C_3}{\lambda_1 C_1}\right) E_1\left(\frac{C_3}{\lambda_1 C_1}\right).$$  

(34)

The OP of TWCR network with SFS policy, TDBC protocol and TSB architecture at a specific SNDR threshold is the sum of the OPs of the link $A \rightarrow R \rightarrow B$ and the OP of the link $B \rightarrow R \rightarrow A$, such that

$$OP(\gamma_t) = OP_A(\gamma_t) + OP_B(\gamma_t),$$  

(35)

where $OP_A(\gamma_t)$ and $OP_B(\gamma_t)$ are the OPs at $A$ and $B$ given in (33) and (34), respectively.

4) Throughput Analysis: Similar to Section IV-A4, the network throughput with delay limited transmission is obtained as (17) in which $OP_A(\gamma_t)$ and $OP_B(\gamma_t)$ denote the OPs at $A$ and $B$ corresponding to the transmission rate $R_A$ and $R_B$ from (33) and (34).

### C. DS Policy - MABC Protocol

In this configuration, the network utilizes the DS policy and the MABC protocol while the TSB architecture is implemented in the relay receiver. The data frame structure of the transmission cycle $T$ is shown in Fig. 5. First, $R$ collects energy from transmitted signals from both $A$ and $B$ in the EH phase. Similarly, the harvested energy at $R$ is given as in (3). Then, $A$ and $B$ simultaneously transmit to $R$ in the BC phase. Later, $R$ forwards the received signals to both $A$ and $B$ in the RL phase. In this case, the duration of the BC phase is $t$ [sec]. As the transmission rate from $A$ and $B$ is similar to the previous network configuration, therefore, it needs only $t$ [sec] to simultaneously transmit data from $A$ and $B$ to $R$. The duration of $T$ of this configuration is $4t$ [sec]. The transmit power at $R$ in the RL phase is parameterized as

$$P_R = \frac{\bar{E}_H}{2t} = \frac{\mu \bar{I}_p t}{2t} (\rho_1 + \rho_2) = \Upsilon_2 (\rho_1 + \rho_2),$$  

(36)

where $\Upsilon_2 = \mu \bar{I}_p$. As the direct communication link between $A$ and $B$ is not considered in this paper, the SNDRs at $A$ and $B$ in this network configuration are statistically similar to the SNDRs of the DS-TDBC-TSB networks which derived in Section IV-A. Therefore, the OP of the DS-MABC-TSB

---

**Fig. 5.** Data frame structure of the DS-MABC-TSB network.
networks can be evaluated by following a similar line of reasoning as in Section IV-A with the only difference pertaining to the replacement of $\bar{\Upsilon}_1$ with $\bar{\Upsilon}_2 = \frac{\bar{\Upsilon}_1}{N_0}$. Moreover, the throughput of the DS-MABC-TSB networks can be calculated as in (17) by appropriate scaling with $\frac{1}{3}$ because the length of one communication cycle of this configuration is $4t$ [s]. It is characterized as

$$T = \frac{1}{4} \left[ R_A(1 - OP_A(\gamma_A)) + R_B(1 - OP_B(\gamma_B)) \right].$$  

(37)

D. SFS Policy - MABC Protocol

In this content, the network is configured with the SFS policy, the MABC protocol while the TSB architecture is implemented in the relay receiver. The data frame structure of the transmission cycle is similar to the one was shown in Fig. 5. However, the relay $R$ only collects energy from the transmitted signal from $A$ in the EH phase. As a result, the transmit power at the relay in the RL phase is expressed as

$$P_R = \frac{E_H}{2t} = \frac{\mu I_P 2t}{2t} \rho_1 = \tilde{\Upsilon}_2 \rho_1.$$

(38)

Likewise, the end-to-end SNDRs of the SFS-MABC-TSB networks is statistically similar to those in Section IV-B2. Thus, we can derive the CDF of the end-to-end SNDRs by (33) and (34) with substituting $\bar{\Upsilon}_2$ for $\bar{\Upsilon}_1$. In the same manner, we can characterize the network OP and throughput by the similar method in Section IV-C where $OP_A(\gamma_A)$ and $OP_B(\gamma_A)$ are the OPs at $A$ and $B$ also given in (33) and (34), respectively.

V. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS: PSB ARCHITECTURE

In this section, the relay receiver is implemented with the PSB architecture. In this PSB receiver architecture, the EH phase and the BC phase occur simultaneously, the relay always harvests energy from the wireless signals that are transmitted from both nodes $A$ and $B$ of the network. Therefore, only the DS energy transfer policy is consider for the network that utilizes the PSB relay receiver structure. We now elaborate the impact of transceiver impairments on the OP and throughput of the EH-TWCR networks with PSB policy for different relaying protocols. We note that the power sharing fraction is $\varepsilon$ ($0 < \varepsilon < 1$).

A. DS Policy - TDBC Protocol

In this configuration, the network utilizes the DS policy and the TDBC protocol. Data frame structure of the transmission cycle is shown in Fig. 6. The relay simultaneously harvests energy and collects data from the wireless signals that are transmitted from $A$ and $B$ consecutively in $2t$ [s] duration. Hence, duration of $T$ is $3t$ [sec]. The acquired energy at the relay node is parametrized as

$$E_H = \varepsilon \left( P_A^{EH} |h_1|^2 + P_B^{EH} |h_2|^2 \right) t = \varepsilon \mu I_P (\rho_1 + \rho_2) t.$$  

(39)

1) Transmit Power in the RL Phase: The harvested energy is used to power the relay in the current transmission cycle RL phase and the consecutive transmission cycle BC phase. Same as before, we assume that the total harvested energy at $R$ is distributed equally. Thus, from (39), the transmit power in the RL phase equals to

$$P_R = \frac{\varepsilon \mu I_P (\rho_1 + \rho_2) t}{3t} = \Upsilon_3 (\rho_1 + \rho_2),$$

(40)

where $\Upsilon_3 = \frac{1}{3} \varepsilon \mu I_P$.

2) End-to-End SNDR: Similar to the Section IV-A, only the end-to-end SNDR of the link $A \rightarrow R \rightarrow B$ will be considered. We assume that $A$ transmits data with the peak power $\frac{I_P}{\gamma_0}$ in the BC phase, the receiver power of the incoming signal to the data processing block is $\frac{I_P}{\gamma_0 \rho_1 \rho_2}$. The SNDR at $R$ of the $A \rightarrow R$ wireless link in the first time slot of the BC phase is given by

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{(1 - \varepsilon) I_P |h_1|^2}{(1 - \varepsilon) I_P \kappa_1^2 |h_1|^2 + |g_1|^2} = \frac{\tilde{\gamma} \rho_1}{\gamma_0^2 \rho_1 + \nu_1},$$

(41)

where $\tilde{\gamma} = \frac{(1 - \varepsilon) I_P}{\gamma_0 \rho_2}$. In the RL phase, $R$ forwards the received data from the previous two time slots to $A$ and $B$ with the transmit power of $\frac{\mu \tilde{\Upsilon}_1}{2t}$, where $P_R$ is given in (40). Then, the SNDR at $B$ of the communication link $R \rightarrow B$ is given by

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{\tilde{\Upsilon}_3 (\rho_1 + \rho_2)}{\tilde{\Upsilon}_3 \kappa_2^2 (\rho_1 + \rho_2) + \frac{\nu_2}{\rho_2}},$$

(42)

where $\tilde{\Upsilon}_3 = \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_0}$. The end-to-end SNDR of the wireless link $A \rightarrow R \rightarrow B$ of the cognitive DF network with DS energy transfer, TDBC protocol and PSB relay receiver architecture is then given as

$$\gamma = \min(\gamma_1, \gamma_2).$$

(43)

3) Outage Performance and Throughput Analysis: From (41) and (42), it implies that the end-to-end SNDRs of the networks in this case study have identical distribution with the end-to-end SNDRs of the networks in Section IV-A. Hence, the OP of the networks can be characterized as

$$OP(\gamma_i) = OP_A(\gamma_i) + OP_B(\gamma_i),$$

(44)

where $OP_A(\gamma_i)$ and $OP_B(\gamma_i)$ are the outage probabilities at $A$ and $B$, given in (14) and (15), respectively, with the only difference pertaining to the replacement of $\bar{\Upsilon}_1$ with $\bar{\Upsilon}_3$ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ with $\tilde{\gamma}$. Likewise, the throughput of the networks can be obtained as

$$T = \frac{1}{3} \left[ R_A(1 - OP_A(\gamma_A)) + R_B(1 - OP_B(\gamma_B)) \right].$$

(45)

Fig. 6. Data frame structure of the DS-TDBC-PSB network.
corroborated, the network utilizes the DS policy and the MABC protocol. The data frame structure of the transmission cycle is shown in Fig. 7. Due to the assumption that the relay harvests energy from the fix EH duration length, 2t. Therefore, R simultaneously harvests energy and collects data from the wireless signals that are transmitted in turn form A and B in 2t [sec]. Hence, duration of T is 3t [sec]. The acquired energy at the relay node is parametrized as

\[ E_H = \varepsilon \mu \left( P_A^{EH} |h_1|^2 + P_B^{EH} |h_2|^2 \right) 2t = \varepsilon \mu I_P (\rho_1 + \rho_2) 2t. \]  

(46)

The harvested energy is used to power the relay in the current transmission cycle RL phase and the BC phase of the next communication cycle. Thus, from (46), the transmit power in the RL phase is given as

\[ P_R = \frac{\varepsilon \mu I_P (\rho_1 + \rho_2) 2t}{3t} = \gamma_4 (\rho_1 + \rho_2), \]  

(47)

where \( \gamma_4 = \frac{2}{3} \varepsilon \mu I_P \). The OP of the DF TWCR network in this configuration can be evaluated by following a similar line of reasoning as Section IV-A with the only difference pertaining to the replacement of \( \gamma_1 \) with \( \gamma_4 = \frac{\gamma_4}{\gamma_1} \) and \( \gamma_4 \) with \( \gamma_4 \). Moreover, the network throughput of the DS policy, MABC protocol, TSB architecture network can be calculated as in (45).

\[ \text{OP at A (or at B) of DS-TSB network with respect to } I_{P/N_0} \text{ (dB)} \]

Fig. 7. Data frame structure of the DS-MABC-PSB network.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, a set of numerical results for the OP and throughput of the DS TWCR networks with different energy transfer policies, relaying protocols and receiver architectures are presented. The network nodes are arranged in Cartesian coordinates where node A is located at the origin. We consider the case where coordinates of relay R, node B and Rx are (0.4, 0), (1, 0) and (0.8, 0.8), respectively. The relation between transmitted and received power with distance \( d \) is given by the decaying path loss model \( d^{-2} \). The fixed transmission rates \( R_A \) and \( R_B \) are chosen to be 2 [bits/s/Hz] to acquire the OP and delay-limited network throughput. Furthermore, the hardware impairment in the range \([0, 0.175]\) are examined, which resemble the maximum tolerable error vector magnitudes (EVMs) of 3GPP LTE requirements. For the sake of clarity, we assume that \( \kappa_2^A = \kappa_2^B = \kappa_2^R = \kappa_2^2 \), the energy conversion efficiency is taken as \( \mu = 0.8 \) and the power sharing fraction is set to \( \varepsilon = 0.5 \), unless otherwise stated. We note that all the equation in this paper are also applicable for the ideal transceiver, \( \kappa_2^2 = 0 \).
the impact of transceiver impairment, we experience an approximate 2.5 dB loss in the SNR while maintaining the OP at nodes $A$ and $B$ when the impairment level $\kappa^2$ increases from 0 to 0.175 for the TSB network with all scenarios of energy transfer policies and relaying protocols.

The corroboration of OP analytical results of the PSB network with the SFS energy transfer policy and the TDBC/MABC relaying protocol can be obtained similarly. However, those results are not be plotted to avoid duplication and to maintain the clarity.

**B. Achieved Throughput**

Fig. 11 illustrates throughput of the DF TWCR network with respect to $\frac{I_p}{N_0}$ in [0, 40] (dB) for six configurations of the networks with different energy transfer policies, relaying protocols and relay receiver structures that are considered in this work. The obtained results corresponding to the specific hardware impairment level, $\kappa^2 = 0.1275$. It can be seen that the DS-MABC-PSB networks is offered highest throughput among all other network configurations. On the other end, the SFS-TDBC-TSB networks provides the smallest throughput. This phenomenon can be attributed to the fact that DS policy provides more energy to transmit data in the RL phase than the SFS policy, and also the transmission cycle in the MABC-PSB network is the shortest whereas it is the longest in TDBC-TSB network. The networks utilizes MABC protocol and PSB receiver architecture outperform the TDBC-TSB networks in term of throughput because the benefit of data frame structure duration. However, MABC relaying protocol is more sophisticated to implement since the relay receives signals from $A$ and $B$ in one time slot.

Interestingly, the MABC-PSB network can achieve throughput higher than the transmission rate of each source node while the network with other combinations of relaying protocols and receiver architecture can only provide throughput less than the transmission rate of each source node. In the low SNR regime, $\frac{I_p}{N_0} < 10$ [dB], throughput of the DS-TDBC-PSB networks outperform only the SFS-TDBC-TSB networks. In the high $\frac{I_p}{N_0} > 35$ [dB] regime where system OP approaches to zero, the ceiling throughputs of each combined policies, protocols, and receiver architecture are established. In our simulation scenario with the fixed transmission rate $R_A = R_B = 2$ [bits/s/Hz], the ceiling throughput of the MABC-PSB network and the TDBC-TSB networks are 2.67 and 0.8 [bits/s/Hz], respectively. This fact can be explained by the advantages of transmit power and the length of transmission data frame as above and a notation of the reception rate at the relay is sum of the transmission rate of two source nodes.

**C. The Impact of Transceiver Impairments ($\kappa^2$)**

Fig. 12 illustrates the throughput of network with respects to hardware impairment levels, $\kappa^2 \in [0, 0.175]$. As shown in Fig. 12, the throughput decreases as $\kappa^2$ increases from 0 to 0.18 for the network with TSB receiver structure. This trend is observed for the networks with all possible configurations. In the context of delay limit transmission, the decrement in
throughput for the network with MABC protocol is more noticeable than the network with TDBC protocol. The impact of hardware impairment on throughput of network with the SFS policy is more remarkable than the network with DS policy. These observations suggest that the network utilizing MABC protocol or the SFS policy is more sensitive to transceiver hardware impairment on the network throughput. A similar conclusion is made for the throughput of networks with DS policy.

The received signal powers at the data processing block still decreases as \( \varepsilon \) increases from 0 to 1 for all cases. The throughput of SFS networks approaches to the ceiling throughput as \( \mu \) increases slower than the network with DS protocol. This is because the transmit power in the RL phase of the SFS networks is smaller than that of the DS networks, therefore the low quality EH circuitry impact the throughput of networks with the SFS policy more than the networks with DS policy.

### D. The Effect of Energy Conversion Efficiency (\( \mu \))

Fig. 14–15 illustrate the delay limit throughput respects to the energy conversion efficiency, \( \mu \in [0, 1] \) for different network configurations. It can be seen that the throughput increases from 0 to ceiling throughput as \( \mu \) increases from 0 to 1 for all cases. The throughput of SFS networks approaches to the ceiling throughput as \( \mu \) increases slower than the network with DS protocol. This is because the transmit power in the RL phase of the SFS networks is smaller than that of the DS networks, therefore the low quality EH circuitry impact the throughput of networks with the SFS policy more than the networks with DS policy.

### E. The Effect of Power Sharing Factor (\( \varepsilon \))

Fig. 16 shows the effect of power sharing factor \( \varepsilon \) to the network throughput of the PSB network. The throughput increase as \( \varepsilon \) rises from 0 to the optimal value of \( \varepsilon \), but it decreases as \( \varepsilon \) increases from the optimal value to 1. It can be explained based on the harvested power in the EH phase and the power of received signal in the BC phase. When \( \varepsilon \) is smaller than the optimal value, the harvested power increase while the received signal power is decreased as \( \varepsilon \) increases. The received signal powers at the data processing block still higher than the level that is required to decode the signal correctly. Thus, the network throughput increases. However,
when $\varepsilon$ is larger than the optimum value, the harvested energy still increases but the power of incoming signal to the data processing is lower than the required level, hence, the transmit signal is recovered improperly at the relay. Eventually, the throughput of the network decreases.

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper investigated the OP and throughput of EH-TWCR networks. Our analysis provided insight and understanding into self-powered TWCR relaying scheme based on DF. For instance, it was found that DS-MABC-PSB provides the best throughput albeit at the expense of implementation complexity, whereas SFS-TDBC-TSB offers a simpler solution with a lower throughput. On the other hand, a network with the SFS policy and MABC protocol is more sensitive to hardware impairments than with DS policy and TDBC protocol. In addition, we also confirmed that the transceiver impairments substantially deteriorate the OP and throughput. The system performance degradation has been quantified as a function of the level of hardware impairments. Ideally, these results can be used to select hardware of appropriate quality to meet the predetermined OP and throughput requirements for future EH-TWCR networks.
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