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Abstract—In this paper, an analytical framework is developed for the performance analysis of three transmit antenna selection (TAS) strategies for dual-hop multiple-input multiple-output channel-assisted amplify-and-forward (CA-AF) relay networks over Rayleigh fading. The cumulative distribution function of a lower bound of the end-to-end signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the optimal TAS strategy is derived and used to obtain the upper bounds of the outage probability and the average symbol error rate (SER). The exact moment generating functions (MGFs) of the end-to-end SNR of two suboptimal TAS strategies are also derived for the ideal CA-AF MIMO relay networks. These MGFs are then used to present accurate and efficient closed-form approximations to evaluate the outage probability and average SER. Numerical and Monte-Carlo simulation results are provided to analyze the performance of the system and to verify the accuracy of our analytical framework.

I. INTRODUCTION

Multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) enabled wireless terminals significantly improve the performance of cooperative relay networks [1]. Transmit antenna selection (TAS) and maximum ratio combining (MRC) can be used effectively to enhance the benefits of such networks [2]. For example, [3]–[6] have investigated these techniques as suboptimal yet simple and efficient beamforming techniques for dual-hop cooperative MIMO relay networks. In this paper, an analytical framework is developed to analyze the performance of MIMO amplify-and-forward (AF) relay networks with TAS over Rayleigh fading.

Prior related research: In [3], the optimal signal-to-noise ratio (SNR)-based TAS strategy (TASopt) is proposed for dual-hop MIMO AF cooperative relay networks. It is also shown that TASopt achieves the full diversity order available in the MIMO relay channel. However, the search complexity of TASopt strategy is relatively high. As a remedy, reference [4] proposes two suboptimal yet low-complexity TAS strategies (TASsub-opt1 and TASsub-opt2) for the same network. Although the performance of these TAS strategies is presented by using Monte-Carlo simulations, no analytical expressions are developed in [4].

The other studies which take into account TAS for dual-hop MIMO relaying are [5] and [6]. In [6], the performance of a dual-hop AF relay network with a MIMO-enabled source-destination pair and a single-antenna relay is analyzed. In this analysis, the source-to-relay (S → R) and relay-to-destination (R → D) transmissions take the forms of TAS and MRC, respectively. In [5], three TAS strategies, which are optimal in terms of the outage probability, are developed for MIMO decode-and-forward relaying.

Motivation and our contribution: Although reference [3] derives the diversity order of TASopt, no closed-form expressions for other performance metrics are derived. However, it compares the average bit error rate (BER) of the binary phase shift keying (BPSK) for TASopt with several MIMO AF beamforming strategies by using Monte-Carlo simulations. Furthermore, in [4], the performance of the TASsub-opt1 and TASsub-opt2 is not investigated analytically. Instead, the system performance is evaluated in terms of the outage capacity using Monte-Carlo simulations. These gaps in the performance analysis of TAS strategies for MIMO AF relay networks motivated our development of the analytical framework.

In this paper, the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of a lower bound of the end-to-end SNR is derived and used to obtain the upper bounds for the outage probability and the average symbol error rate (SER) of TASopt. The moment generating functions (MGFs) of the end-to-end SNRs for TASsub-opt1 and TASsub-opt2 are derived as well. Moreover, accurate approximations, which are based on the MGFs, are presented to evaluate the outage probability and the average SER of TASsub-opt1 and TASsub-opt2. In order to obtain valuable insights, the diversity order of the three TAS strategies is summarized. Numerical and Monte-Carlo simulation results are also provided to analyze the performance and to verify the accuracy of our analytical framework.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section II presents the system and the channel model. Section III summarizes the three TAS strategies. In Section IV, the performance analysis is presented. Section V contains the numerical and simulation results. Section VI concludes the paper.

Notations: \( K_v(z) \) is the Modified Bessel function of the second kind of order \( \nu \) [7, Eq. (8.407.1)]. \( zF_1(\alpha, \beta; \gamma; z) \) is the Gauss Hypergeometric function [7, Eq. (9.14.1)]. \( \mathbb{R}(z) \) denotes the real part of \( z \). \( \| Z \|_F \) denotes the Frobenius norm of \( Z \). \( n \sim \mathcal{C}\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) \) denotes that \( n \) is a circular symmetric complex Gaussian distributed random variable with mean \( \mu \) and variance \( \sigma^2 \).

II. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider the dual-hop cooperative relay network with MIMO enabled source (\( S \)), relay (\( R \)) and destination (\( D \)) having \( N_s \), \( N_r \), and \( N_d \) antennas, respectively (Fig. 1). All terminals operate in the half-duplex mode, and cooperation takes place in two time-slots. Perfect channel state information (CSI) is assumed at \( R \) and \( D \). Further, the feedback channels for TAS at \( S \) and \( R \) are assumed to be perfect. The channel matrix from
Fig. 1. TAS for MIMO AF relay networks: System Model.

terminal X to terminal Y, where \( X \in \{ S, R \}, Y \in \{ R, D \} \), and \( X \neq Y \), is denoted by \( \mathbf{H}_{XY} \). The elements of \( \mathbf{H}_{XY} \) are independent and identically distributed as \( h_{ij}^{XY} \sim CN(0, 1) \). The channel vector from the \( j \)-th transmit antenna at \( X \) to \( Y \) is denoted by \( \mathbf{h}_{XY} \). Zero mean additive white Gaussian noise is assumed at each receiver.

In the first time-slot, \( S \) broadcasts to \( R \) and \( D \) by selecting a single transmit antenna, and \( R \) receives the signal by using MRC. Here, we consider an ideal channel-assisted amplify-and-forward (CA-AF) relay with a gain \( G = \frac{1}{\| \mathbf{h}_{SR} \|^2} \). In the second time-slot, \( R \) amplifies and forwards the received signal to \( D \) again by selecting a single transmit antenna. Then \( D \) combines the two signals received in the two time-slots by applying the optimal receiver filter in the minimum mean-square error (MMSE) sense [3], [4]. Under this system model, the post-processing end-to-end SNR at \( D \) when \( S \) and \( R \) use the \( i \)-th and the \( k \)-th transmit antennas is given by

\[
\gamma_{eq}^{(i,k)} = \frac{\gamma_{SD}^{(i)}}{\gamma_{SD}^{(i)} + \gamma_{SR}^{(i)}},
\]

where \( \gamma_{SD}^{(i)} = \gamma_0 \| \mathbf{h}_{SD}^{(i)} \|^2 \), \( \gamma_{SR}^{(i)} = \gamma_1 \| \mathbf{h}_{SR}^{(i)} \|^2 \), and \( \gamma_{RD}^{(i)} = \gamma_2 \| \mathbf{h}_{RD}^{(i)} \|^2 \) are the equivalent instantaneous SNRs, and \( \gamma_0, \gamma_1, \) and \( \gamma_2 \) are the average SNRs of the \( S \rightarrow D \), \( S \rightarrow R \), and \( R \rightarrow D \) channels, respectively.

III. TRANSMIT ANTENNA SELECTION (TAS) STRATEGIES

For the sake of completeness, this section summarizes the optimal TAS and two suboptimal TAS strategies for the AF MIMO relaying proposed in [3] and [4], respectively.

A. Optimal TAS for AF MIMO relaying (TAS-opt)

The end-to-end SNR \( \gamma_{eq}^{(i,k)} \) for AF MIMO relaying (1) can be maximized by the TAS at \( S \) and \( R \) as follows [3]: In (1), for fixed \( \gamma_{SD}^{(i)} \) and \( \gamma_{SR}^{(i)} \), \( \gamma_{eq}^{(i,k)} \) is maximized when \( \gamma_{RD}^{(i)} \) is maximized; i.e., the TAS at \( R \) is independent of the TAS at \( S \). In TAS-opt, the antenna indices \( I \) and \( K \) are selected as

\[
K = \arg\max_{1 \leq k \leq N_x} \left( \frac{\gamma_{RD}^{(k)}}{\gamma_{SD}^{(k)}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad I = \arg\max_{1 \leq i \leq N_s} \left( \frac{\gamma_{eq}^{(i,k)}}{\gamma_{eq}^{(i,k)}} \right).
\]

B. Sub-optimal TAS for AF MIMO relaying

The search complexity of TAS-opt is considerably high since the transmit antenna at \( S \) (i.e., antenna index \( I \) in (2)) should be searched to maximize \( \gamma_{eq}^{(i,k)} \) by taking into account the both \( S \rightarrow R \) and \( S \rightarrow D \) SNRs. Reference [4] proposes two suboptimal TAS strategies, which provide a better tradeoff between the search complexity and the performance, as follows:

- TAS-sub-opt-\( s \): TAS is used at \( S \) and \( R \) separately to maximize the SNR of the \( S \rightarrow D \) and \( R \rightarrow D \) channels, respectively.
  \[
  I = \arg\max_{1 \leq i \leq N_s} \left( \gamma_{SD}^{(i)} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad K = \arg\max_{1 \leq k \leq N_x} \left( \gamma_{RD}^{(k)} \right). \tag{3}
  \]

- TAS-sub-opt-\( d \): TAS is used at \( S \) and \( R \) separately to maximize the SNR of the \( S \rightarrow R \) and \( R \rightarrow D \) channels, respectively.
  \[
  I = \arg\max_{1 \leq i \leq N_s} \left( \gamma_{SR}^{(i)} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad K = \arg\max_{1 \leq k \leq N_x} \left( \gamma_{RD}^{(k)} \right). \tag{4}
  \]

IV. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

This section presents the performance analyses of three TAS strategies (2), (3) and (4).

A. Statistical characterization of the end-to-end SNR

1) The CDF of the end-to-end SNR for TAS-opt: Let \( \gamma_{eq}^{opt} \) denote the the end-to-end SNR at \( D \) for TAS-opt. The CDF of the lower bound for \( \gamma_{eq}^{opt} \) is given by

\[
F_{\gamma_{eq}^{opt}}(x) = \left[ 1 - \sum_{a=1}^{N_s} \sum_{b=0}^{N_r} \sum_{p=0}^{N_s} \sum_{q=0}^{N_r} \sum_{l=0}^{N_s} \frac{\beta_{a,N_s}^{(N_s-1)} \beta_{b,N_r}^{(N_r-1)} \Gamma(N_d)}{(p+1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \gamma_0^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right] \times \sum_{m=0}^{N_s} \sum_{n=0}^{N_r} \left[ \frac{\beta_{m,m,N_s} \beta_{n,n,N_r} \cdot x^{\frac{N_d-1}{\gamma_0}} \exp \left( -\frac{m \lambda}{\gamma_0} \right) }{\gamma_0} \right], \tag{5}
\]

where \( \lambda = \frac{a+1}{\gamma_1} \), \( \beta_k,N,L \) is the coefficient of the expansion of \( \left[ \sum_{a=0}^{L-1} \frac{a^{N_d-1}}{\gamma_1} \right] = \sum_{k=0}^{N_d-1} \beta_k,N,L \left( \frac{x}{\gamma_1} \right)^k \), and \( N_d \) is given by [8, Eq. (44)]

\[
\beta_{k,N,L} = \sum_{i=k-L+1}^{k} \beta_i (N_i-1) \Gamma((N_i-1)(L-1)) \tag{6}
\]

The proof can be found in [9].

2) The MGF of the end-to-end SNR for TAS-sub-opt-s: Let \( \gamma_{eq}^{sub-opt-s} \) denote the the end-to-end SNR at \( D \) for TAS-sub-opt-s. The MGF of \( \gamma_{eq}^{sub-opt-s} \) is given by

\[
M_{\gamma_{eq}^{sub-opt-s}}(s) = M_{\gamma_{SR}^{sub-opt-s}}(s) M_{\gamma_{RD}^{sub-opt-s}}(s), \tag{7}
\]

where \( M_{\gamma_{SR}^{sub-opt-s}}(s) \) and \( M_{\gamma_{RD}^{sub-opt-s}}(s) \) are the MGFs of the SNRs of the relayed path and the direct path. They are given by

\[
M_{\gamma_{SR}^{sub-opt-s}}(s) = \sum_{a=0}^{N_s} \frac{(N_a b+N_r-1)}{\gamma_1^{N_a b+N_r-1} \Gamma(N_r)} \times \sum_{l=0}^{N_r} \frac{\beta_{a,a,N_s} \cdot \Gamma(N_r)}{\gamma_1^{N_r}} \times s \pi\nu,\psi,\omega \tag{8}
\]

\[
\]
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Theorem can be found in [9].

3) The MGF of the end-to-end SNR for TASsub-opt: Let\( \gamma_{eq}^{sub-opt} \) denote the the end-to-end SNR at \( D \) for TASsub-opt. The MGF of \( \gamma_{eq}^{sub-opt} \) is then given by

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\gamma_{eq}^{sub-opt}}(s) = \mathcal{M}_{\gamma_{SIDS}^{sub-opt}}(s) \mathcal{M}_{\gamma_{sub-opt}^{eq}}(s), \quad \text{where (10)}
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\gamma_{eq}^{sub-opt}}(s) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}_{\gamma_{SIDS}^{sub-opt}}(s) \mathcal{M}_{\gamma_{sub-opt}^{eq}}(s)}
\]

where \( \mu = N_r + b + q + 1, \nu = c - q + 1, \psi = s + \frac{a + b + r}{\tau_2} \) and \( \omega = 2\sqrt{\frac{a + 1}{\tau_2}} \) and

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\gamma_{sub-opt}^{eq}}(s) = (1 + \bar{\gamma}_{eq} s)^{N_d}. \quad \text{(12)}
\]

The proof can be found in [9].

B. Outage probability

The outage probability \( P_{out} \) is the probability that the instantaneous end-to-end SNR \( \gamma_{eq} \) falls below a threshold \( \gamma_{th} \); \( P_{out} = \Pr(\gamma_{eq} \leq \gamma_{th}) = \gamma_{eq}^{\gamma_{th}} \), where \( F_{\gamma_{eq}}(\gamma_{th}) \) denotes the CDF of \( \gamma_{eq} \) evaluated at \( \gamma_{th} \). An upper bound of \( P_{out} \) for TASopt can readily be obtained by using (5). Further, \( P_{out} \) for TASsub-opt1 and TASsub-opt2 can be accurately computed by using (10), [11]

\[
P_{out}^{sub-opt} = \frac{N_p}{5\gamma_{th}} \Psi_5 \left( \frac{2N_p}{5\gamma_{th}} \right) \exp \left( \frac{2N_p}{5} \right) + \frac{2}{5\gamma_{th}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_p} \Re \{ \Psi(s) \}, \quad \text{where (13)}
\]

\[
\Psi(s) = \mathcal{M}_{\gamma_{eq}^{sub-opt}}(s)|s, \theta_k = \frac{2k}{N_p}, \Psi(s) = 
\]

\[
\Psi_5(s) = \frac{2\Psi(s)}{5\gamma_{th} \sec \theta_k}, \quad \Psi_6(s) = \frac{2\Psi(s)}{5\gamma_{th} \sec \theta_k}, \quad \Psi_7(s) = \frac{2\Psi(s)}{5\gamma_{th} \sec \theta_k}.
\]

C. Average symbol error rate

The conditional error probability (CEP) of the coherent binary phase shift keying (BPSK) and M-ary pulse amplitude modulation (PAM) can be expressed as \( P_{c}^{\gamma} = \alpha Q(\sqrt{\beta \gamma}) \), where \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are modulation-dependent constants. The average SER can be derived by integrating CEP \( P_{c}^{\gamma} \) over the PDF of the SNR \( \gamma_{eq} \). Thus, an upper bound for the average SER of TASopt can be derived by substituting (5) into \( P_{c}^{\gamma} \)

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{a + b + 1}{\tau_2}} \bar{\gamma}_{eq} s^{N_d}.
\]

\[\text{TABLE I}
\]

D. Diversity Order

TASopt has been shown to provide the maximum achievable diversity order \( G_d \) of cooperative MIMO AF relay networks; \( G_d^{TASopt} = N_s N_d + N_r \min(N_s, N_d) \) [3]. The \( G_d \) of dual-hop MIMO relaying without considering the direct transmission is governed by the minimum \( G_d \) available in each hop; \( G_d = \min(G_{dR}, G_{dD}) \) [14]. By following this result, \( G_d \) of TASsub-opt1 and TASsub-opt2 can be written as

\[
G_d^{TASsub-opt1} = N_s N_d + N_r \quad \text{and} \quad G_d^{TASsub-opt2} = N_s N_d + N_r \min(N_s, N_d).
\]

In Table I, the \( G_d \) of each TAS strategy is presented for several special cases to obtain valuable insights. It shows that when \( N_s = 1 \), \( G_d \) is the same for all three strategies. Moreover, if the destination is equipped with one antenna \( (N_d = 1) \), then TASopt and TASsub-opt2 provide the same diversity order. Thus, TASsub-opt1 is a better choice than the
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Fig. 2. The outage probability of TASopt strategy for AF MIMO relay networks. $d_1 = \frac{2dSD}{3}$, $d_2 = \frac{2dSD}{3}$ and $\eta = 2.5$.

highly complex TASopt whenever $N_d = 1$. When the number of antennas at each node is the same, the $G_d$ provided by the both TASsub-opt and TASsub-opt2 is identical. In practice, the direct channel may be fully unavailable due to heavy shadowing. In this case, the diversity orders of the three strategies are given by $G_d^{\text{TASopt}} = G_d^{\text{TASsub-opt2}} = N_r \min (N_s, N_d)$ and $G_d^{\text{TASsub-opt1}} = N_r$. Thus, TASsub-opt is a better choice than the others since it always provides better $G_d$ than TASsub-opt2, and the same $G_d$ as in TASopt.

**Remark IV.1:** In dual-hop MIMO AF relaying, when the direct path is not taken into account, the optimal TAS strategy is to select the antenna indices $I$ and $K$ at $S$ and $R$ to maximize the SNRs of $S \rightarrow R$ and $R \rightarrow D$ channels; $I = \arg \max_{1 \leq i \leq N_s} \left( \gamma_i^{SR} \right)$ and $K = \arg \max_{1 \leq k \leq N_r} \left( \gamma_k^{RD} \right)$. Thus, the CDF of the end-to-end SNR $\gamma_{eq}^\text{opt}$ of the optimal TAS for dual-hop MIMO AF relaying, when the direct path is ignored, is given by (see [9] for the proof)

$$F_{\gamma_{eq}^\text{opt}}(x) = \sum_{p=1}^{N_r} \sum_{q=0}^{N_s-1} \sum_{a=0}^{N_s-1} \sum_{b=0}^{N_r} \sum_{c=0}^{N_r} \frac{2N_s(N_r)}{\Gamma(N_r)} \times \left( \frac{N_s}{a-1} \right) \left( \frac{N_r+q+b-1}{c} \right) \left( \frac{a+1}{1+\frac{a+1}{\gamma_1}} \right) \left( \frac{N_r+a+b+c-1}{1+\frac{a+1}{\gamma_1}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \right) \times p \frac{c+q+1}{x} \left( N_s+b+q \right) \exp(-\delta x) K_{c-q+1}(\epsilon x),$$

where $\delta = \frac{a+1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{p}{\gamma_2}$ and $\epsilon = 2 \sqrt{\frac{p(a+1)}{\gamma_1 \gamma_2}}$. The corresponding MGF of $\gamma_{eq}^\text{opt}$ is given by (11). Further, the average SER is given by

$$P_e = \frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2\pi}} \sum_{p=1}^{N_s} \sum_{q=0}^{N_s-1} \sum_{a=0}^{N_s-1} \sum_{b=0}^{N_r} \sum_{c=0}^{N_r} \frac{2N_s(N_r)}{\Gamma(N_r)} \times \left( \frac{N_s}{a} \right) \left( \frac{N_r+q+b-1}{c} \right) \left( \frac{a+1}{1+\frac{a+1}{\gamma_1}} \right) \left( \frac{N_r+a+b+c-1}{1+\frac{a+1}{\gamma_1}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \right) \times \frac{c+q+1}{(a+1)^{c+q+1}} \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \frac{1}{\gamma_2}.$$

where $\mu = N_r+b+q+1/2$, $\nu = l-q+1$, and $\psi = \frac{\beta}{2} + \frac{a+1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{p}{\gamma_2}$.

**V. NUMERICAL RESULTS**

This section verifies our analysis through Monte-Carlo simulations. To capture the effect of network geometry, the average SNR of the $i$-th hop is modeled by $\gamma_i^{SR} = \bar{\gamma}_0 \left( \frac{dSD}{d_i} \right)^\eta$, where $\bar{\gamma}_0$ and $\eta$ are the average SNR of direct path and path-loss exponent. Parameters $d_{SD}$ and $d_i$ are defined as the distance between the source-destination pair and distance between the nodes in the two hop.

Fig. 2 compares the exact and the closed-form upper bound (5) for the outage probability of TASopt. The exact outage probability is plotted by using Monte-Carlo simulations. This figure shows the tightness of our bound for different antenna configurations at $S$, $R$ and $D$. Our upper bound is approximately 1 dB within the exact in the useful SNRs and provides accurate insights about the important system parameters such as the diversity order.

Similarly in Fig. 3, the closed-form upper bound for the average BER of BPSK for TASopt is compared for different antenna configurations at $S$, $R$ and $D$. As our BER bound too is always exact within 1 dB, it may be useful as a benchmark for MIMO dual-hop AF relay network designing.

Fig. 4 compares the average BER of BPSK of the three TAS strategies and also shows the impact of different antenna configurations on the average BER. The exact average BER of TASopt is evaluated by using Monte-Carlo simulation; while those of TASsub-opt1 are computed by using (15) with $R_{N_r} = 10$. Further, the average BER of a relay network with single-antenna nodes (i.e., $N_s = N_r = N_d = 1$) is also plotted as a benchmark to illustrate the performance gain obtained by TAS for AF MIMO relaying. TASsub-opt1 always performs better than TASsub-opt2 for the given antenna set-ups. TASsub-opt2 performs approximately similarly to TASopt in terms of BER when $D$ is equipped with a single-antenna. TASsub-opt1 is thus a better choice than the highly complex TASopt for networks with $N_d = 1$; while TASsub-opt2 performs considerably poorer than the other two schemes. The exact
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agreement between the Monte-Carlo simulation points and the analytical results verify the accuracy of our closed-form average BER approximations.

Similarly, Fig. 5 shows the outage probability of the three TAS strategies for different antenna set-ups. The exact outage probability of $\text{TAS}_{\text{opt}}$ is computed again using Monte-Carlo simulations; while those of $\text{TAS}_{\text{sub-opt}}_1$ and $\text{TAS}_{\text{sub-opt}}_2$ are obtained using (13) with $R_{\text{SNR}} = 20$. Fig. 5 shows the impact of number of antennas at $D$ on the outage probability for a fixed number of antennas at $S$ and $R$. As expected, the $\text{TAS}_{\text{opt}}$ outperforms the other TAS strategies at the expense of higher search complexity for antenna indices. Whenever, $S$ is equipped with a single-antenna, the performance of the three TAS strategies is identical. This insight thus shows that any of the three strategies can effectively be used for $S \rightarrow R \rightarrow D$ up-link, where $S$ is usually a mobile device equipped with a single-antenna due to power and space constrains. Similarly, $\text{TAS}_{\text{sub-opt}}_1$ can be used instead of $\text{TAS}_{\text{opt}}$ for $D \rightarrow R \rightarrow S$ down-link as both of them provide the same diversity order whenever $N_D = 1$. The Monte-Carlo simulation results agree well with our closed-form outage probability approximation verifying its accuracy.

VI. CONCLUSION

An analytical framework was developed for the performance analysis of three TAS strategies for dual-hop MIMO CA-AF relay networks. The CDF of a lower bound of the end-to-end SNR was derived and used to obtain the upper bounds of the outage probability and the average SER for $\text{TAS}_{\text{opt}}$. The exact MGFs of the end-to-end SNR of $\text{TAS}_{\text{sub-opt}}_1$ and $\text{TAS}_{\text{sub-opt}}_2$ were derived for the ideal CA-AF MIMO relay networks. Closed-form approximations were also presented to evaluate the outage probability and the average SER accurately. The diversity orders of TAS strategies were summarized to get valuable insights. Monte-Carlo simulations were provided to validate the accuracy of our analytical developments. The numerical results show that significant performance gains can be achieved using TAS in MIMO AF relaying. Our analytical framework may be used to obtain valuable insights into the designing MIMO AF relay networks with TAS.
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