

AI-Driven Fronthaul Link Compression in Wireless Communication Systems: Review and Method Design

Keqin Zhang

Abstract—Modern fronthaul links in wireless systems must transport high-dimensional signals under stringent bandwidth and latency constraints, which makes compression indispensable. Traditional strategies—such as compressed sensing, scalar quantization, and fixed-codec pipelines—often rely on restrictive priors, degrade sharply at high compression ratios, and are hard to tune across channels and deployments. Recent progress in Artificial Intelligence (AI) has brought end-to-end learned transforms, vector and hierarchical quantization, and learned entropy models that better exploit the structure of Channel State Information (CSI), precoding matrices, I/Q samples, and LLRs.

This paper first surveys AI-driven compression techniques and then provides a focused analysis of two representative high-compression routes: CSI feedback with end-to-end learning and Resource Block (RB)–granularity precoding optimization combined with compression. Building on these insights, we propose a fronthaul compression strategy tailored to cell-free architectures. The design targets high compression with controlled performance loss, supports RB-level rate adaptation, and enables low-latency inference suitable for centralized cooperative transmission in next-generation networks.

Index Terms—6G; Cell-free massive MIMO; Fronthaul compression; AI; Machine Learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

The architecture of mobile communication networks is evolving toward centralization and intelligence. Cloud Radio Access Networks (C-RAN) improve spectral efficiency and coordinated processing by centralizing baseband processing in a Baseband Unit (BBU), but they rely on high-speed fronthaul link (FL) to connect distributed Remote Radio Units (RRUs) [1], [2]. Especially in massive multiple-input multiple-output (massive MIMO) [3] systems and the forthcoming cell-free massive MIMO (CF-mMIMO) networks [4], each time slot must convey either large-array in-phase/quadrature (I/Q) samples or precoding-matrix data over the FL [5], creating enormous traffic. Without effective compression, fiber FL will be overwhelmed, constraining network scalability.

Legacy fronthaul interfaces such as the Common Public Radio Interface (CPRI) [6] transmit uncompressed time-domain samples at extremely high rates (for example, an 8×8 MIMO signal with 20 MHz bandwidth can require tens of gigabits per second). To curb fronthaul load, the industry has introduced

K. Zhang is with the school of Electrical Information and Communications, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, 430074, Wuhan, Hubei, China (E-mail: Kertsing@hust.edu.cn).

This manuscript is a course assignment for the 2025 AI Summer School at Huazhong University of Science and Technology. Owing to the author's limited knowledge and experience, errors may remain; readers are advised to exercise their own judgment.




Fig. 1: Advanced CF-mMIMO communication system

enhanced CPRI (eCPRI), which reduces traffic via protocol optimization and data compression [7]. However, fixed signal-processing and compression pipelines struggle to balance performance and compression ratio across diverse scenarios [8]. As 5G/6G services impose ever-tighter fronthaul bandwidth and latency requirements, intelligent, adaptive compression has become a research focus [9]. On the one hand, high compression ratios are needed to alleviate bandwidth pressure; on the other, compression distortion must be kept under control so that system metrics—such as bit-error rate and throughput—remain within acceptable limits.

The current landscape of fronthaul compression faces three major challenges:

- 1) Efficient representation of high-dimensional data: channel state information (CSI) matrices in massive MIMO, multi-carrier I/Q symbols in FDMA, and decoder-output log-likelihood ratios (LLRs) are all high-dimensional and highly correlated, calling for compression mechanisms that decorrelate and compactly represent these signals. Traditional per-sample (scalar) quantization fails to exploit inter-sample correlation, limiting compression efficiency.
- 2) Performance impact of compression distortion: Compression is lossy; excessive distortion reduces post-demodulation SINR, increasing BER or lowering capacity. Wireless systems typically require the loss to stay within bounds—for example, at most 0.5 dB SINR degradation and no more than three percent reduction in spectral efficiency—imposing stringent demands on reconstruction accuracy.
- 3) Real-time operation and deployment complexity: Fronthaul volumes are massive under tight latency budgets, so algorithms must be highly efficient. Moreover, RRUs have




Fig. 2: A compression strategy for the FL of the CF-mMIMO system [4]

limited compute, hindering deployment of overly complex models. Balancing compression ratio, reconstruction fidelity, and complexity remains the core challenge.

II. RELATED WORKS

Conventional fronthaul compression methods include compressed sensing [10] and vector quantization [11]. Early approaches exploited signal redundancy—for example, leveraging the spectral redundancy of multicarrier Orthogonal Frequency-Division Multiplexing (OFDM) signals to downsample and filter, thereby lowering the sampling rate, and then applying nonuniform quantization to reduce the number of bits. Subsequent work introduced vector quantization, mapping blocks of samples to codebook indices and augmenting this with entropy coding to further boost compression efficiency. Although these methods improve performance to some extent, they still struggle to adapt to the complex, time-varying statistical characteristics of wireless signals [12].

Recent advances in deep learning have opened new avenues for fronthaul compression [13]–[16]. End-to-end neural models can automatically learn task-adaptive compact representations. In CSI feedback, the pioneering CsiNet by Wen et al. employed an autoencoder to compress and return downlink CSI in massive MIMO, substantially reducing overhead [17]. A subsequent wave of Deep Learning (DL) based designs incorporated convolution and attention mechanisms to further improve reconstruction accuracy. Nevertheless, several early DL approaches perform poorly in outdoor deployments at high compression ratios, and most methods optimize proxy errors such as normalized mean-squared error (NMSE) rather than directly constraining system-level performance, leaving their impact on metrics like SINR and throughput insufficiently controlled [18], [19].

Within the C-RAN setting, Qiao et al. propose a learnable linear-transform compressor: each RRU trains a dimension-reduction matrix followed by uniform quantization to shrink both uplink and downlink dimensions [20]. To curb frequent signaling, they further employ meta-learning with a gated recurrent unit (GRU)-based controller to reduce the number of CSI-gradient exchanges between the BBU and RRH, accelerating convergence and improving compression gains [21]. Complementary studies account for fronthaul delay and packet-loss constraints, using deep reinforcement learning to adapt the compression policy on the fly. On another front, Bian et

al. introduce two AI-native CPRI compressors: (i) a nonlinear transform paired with learned-codebook vector quantization and (ii) an entropy-model path that maps network outputs into variable-length bitstreams. They also design weight-sharing models and progressive refinement to suit multi-link operation and memory-constrained deployments. Collectively, these efforts show that DL-based compressors can markedly enhance fronthaul efficiency and robustness, and they have become a focal point of current research.

Despite this progress, important gaps remain. Reconstruction accuracy still degrades at extreme compression [22]; many schemes do not directly optimize wireless-level metrics, leading to noticeable throughput drops; and some models are too heavy to deploy at the RRU. This motivates AI-driven architectures that jointly achieve high compression ratios, low distortion, and low complexity. Against this backdrop, we review two representative trajectories: (A) high-compression CSI feedback [17]; (B) RB-granularity precoding optimization plus compression (RB-WMMSE + TVQ-VAE)—and, building on their insights, propose an improved fronthaul scheme [23].

III. REVIEW OF METHOD A

Method A refers to the work by Yangyang Zhang et al. (IEEE WCL 2021) [17] on deep learning-based CSI compression and quantization for high compression ratios in FDD massive MIMO. The method targets downlink CSI feedback in FDD: the UE compresses the downlink channel matrix and feeds it back to the BS. Noting that conventional compressors suffer pronounced reconstruction degradation in outdoor, large-scale-fading scenarios under aggressive compression, Method A upgrades the CsiNet framework to CsiNet+DNN, substantially improving CSI reconstruction at very high compression ratios while preserving end-to-end learnability.

Concretely, Method A augments the decoder's RefineNet with two fully connected layers to compensate for the limited ability of pure convolution to capture global dependencies and residual structure—particularly advantageous under an extremely narrow bottleneck—and replaces ReLU with Swish to improve trainability and stability in deeper networks by mitigating gradient attenuation and strengthening nonlinearity. These two modifications keep the overall compress-reconstruct paradigm intact yet deliver higher reconstruction quality under high compression and complex outdoor channels, offering a

practical architectural and training path for subsequent DL-based CSI feedback research.

A. Strong Points of Method A

Under aggressive compression, the method attains substantial gains in reconstruction accuracy. Simulation results indicate that, relative to CsiNet plus and compressed sensing baselines, the improved CsiNet architecture yields higher CSI fidelity and lower NMSE in outdoor macrocell scenarios. Even at a compression ratio of 1/32, the model preserves effective CSI reconstruction, whereas CsiNet-based baselines exhibit pronounced degradation. In addition, the method demonstrates robustness to channel-estimation noise: when estimation errors are present, reconstruction accuracy remains high, indicating strong noise resilience suitable for practical wireless environments.

From a modeling perspective, the approach is technically well-founded. By combining residual connections with deep fully connected layers and adopting the Swish activation, it enhances representational capacity and trainability, thereby broadening the design space for CSI compression networks and informing subsequent designs. From an application standpoint, the method directly addresses the heavy CSI feedback burden in Frequency Division Duplexing (FDD) systems; in 5G/6G large-antenna FDD deployments, reducing feedback overhead is of clear practical value, underscoring the engineering relevance of the approach.

B. Weak Points of Method A

Despite its strong performance, the method has several limitations. An obvious problem is the high complexity of the model. To attain stronger reconstruction capability, the CsiNet-based design introduces deeper convolutional stacks together with a deep fully connected module on the decoder side, which substantially increases parameter count and computational cost; subsequent evaluations generally indicate that, while accuracy improves, compute and memory usage also rise, and deployment overhead is higher than lightweight Transformer-based designs—posing challenges for resource-constrained UEs.

Second, end-to-end quantization optimization is insufficient. Although quantization is employed, the training pipeline does not explicitly address the non-differentiability of the quantizer or systematically optimize quantization noise. Prior studies show that differentiable approximations (e.g., μ -law) or explicit quantization-error compensation modules can enhance feedback performance. By contrast, the scheme resembles a largely post-hoc quantization step, which may hurt reconstruction accuracy when the feedback bit budget is tight.

Finally, generalization and system-level objectives require strengthening. While the network performs well in outdoor macrocell scenarios, its effectiveness across different channel models (e.g., indoor, millimeter-wave) and antenna scales still needs verification. Because training is distribution-specific, robustness depends on the coverage of the training set, and distribution shift can degrade reconstruction quality. In addition, optimization focuses primarily on proxy metrics such as NMSE, without directly incorporating downstream performance after precoding—such as rate loss ΔR and post-processing

SINR—into the training and evaluation loop. Although reductions in NMSE often correlate with throughput gains, the lack of explicit constraints on system-level metrics can lead to misalignment between training objectives and end performance.

C. Detailed Analysis of Method A

Method A entails nontrivial computational and deployment cost. The deeper decoder with stacked convolutions and fully connected layers markedly increases parameter count and multiply-accumulate operations, which raises memory footprint, inference latency, and energy consumption. Such overhead can be prohibitive for resource-constrained UEs and tight real-time fronthaul budgets. Moreover, the design does not natively include complexity control (e.g., structured pruning or distillation) nor quantization-aware training throughout, so the accuracy-latency-bit-width trade-off at deployment may be suboptimal when feedback bits are limited.

The approach is also strongly data dependent, and its generalization is not guaranteed. Training is tailored to a specific channel distribution; under distribution shift—across scenarios (indoor, mmWave), antenna scales, mobility patterns, or hardware impairments—the reconstruction quality can degrade unless the model is retrained or adapted. In addition, the optimization focuses on proxy errors such as NMSE rather than directly constraining system-level objectives (e.g., post-precoding SINR or rate loss ΔR), so improvements in the training metric may not consistently translate to downlink throughput gains. Overall, the method's sensitivity to the training data and limited cross-scenario robustness remain important limitations alongside its computational footprint.

IV. REVIEW OF METHOD B

Method B (Z. Chen *et al.*, 2024; published in IEEE TNSE 2025) [23] addresses fronthaul compression for the cell-free architecture. The central idea is to optimize and compress downlink precoding at the *Resource Block (RB)* granularity so as to reduce the fronthaul load from the *Central Processing Unit (CPU)* to distributed *Access Points (APs)*. In cell-free systems, the CPU computes joint precoders across all APs for each user, and each AP must obtain its corresponding precoding vectors. If precoders are designed per subcarrier and transmitted individually, the resulting fronthaul payload becomes prohibitive.

The work first develops an RB-level precoding optimization algorithm. The compression-aware design is cast as a stochastic, nonconvex program that jointly optimizes the precoder while controlling capacity loss induced by subsequent compression. Through analysis, the authors show that the RB-optimal precoding matrix lies in the column space of the corresponding RB frequency-domain channel, i.e., the precoding vectors can be expressed as linear combinations of subcarrier-wise channel responses within the RB. Leveraging this structure, an RB-level *Weighted Minimum Mean Square Error (RB-WMMSE)* procedure is derived to iteratively compute the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) stationary solution per RB, with frequency-dependent weights to maximize the global sum rate. Building on the optimized precoders, the compression subproblem is addressed

using a Transformer-based *vector-quantized variational autoencoder* (TVQ-VAE) architecture : a Transformer encoder extracts global dependencies across antennas and frequencies, the bottleneck performs vector quantization via a learned codebook to enable bit-level representation, and a decoder reconstructs the precoding matrix. The variational formulation enables training by maximizing the evidence lower bound, and an entropy model with an autoregressive probability estimator plus arithmetic coding maps codewords to near-optimally compressed bitstreams, improving fronthaul efficiency relative to convolutional or fully connected autoencoder baselines.

A. Strong Points of Method B

Method B introduces an innovation that fuses optimization theory with deep learning for cell-free fronthaul compression and exhibits several advantages. First, it markedly reduces fronthaul overhead while keeping performance loss controlled. By operating at the RB level, the fronthaul payload after compression is reduced by orders of magnitude relative to per-subcarrier transmission; aided by the optimization step, the network sum rate is largely maintained or even improved. Simulations show that, compared with conventional RB-wise precoding without distortion modeling, RB-WMMSE achieves up to a 101% increase in sum rate; even when compression error is included, combining RB-WMMSE with TVQ-VAE yields up to a 106% gain over standard autoencoder-based compression without the optimization stage. These results indicate net performance gains at high compression ratios: with proper design, compression does not induce severe degradation and may yield improvements due to optimized precoding. Second, the approach is technically novel, being among the first to integrate a Transformer with a VQ-VAE for matrix compression in the fronthaul setting, thereby surpassing conventional autoencoders in representational power and compression efficiency.

Third, the scheme is tailored to the characteristics of cell-free systems. RB-level processing aligns with frequency-selective channels where adjacent subcarriers exhibit correlation, and the Transformer encoder is well-suited to model complex dependencies across antennas and RBs, which explains its superiority over generic methods. Fourth, the architecture is naturally compatible with Cloud-RAN and cell-free deployments: precoding and compression are executed centrally, and each AP only decodes its local precoding vectors, imposing minimal additional requirements on AP hardware and facilitating distributed rollout. Finally, by using sum rate as a system-level objective directly within the optimization, the scheme ensures practical utility; in contrast to methods that optimize solely for reconstruction error, it targets end performance, which is an important direction for future AI-based compression.

B. Weak Points of Method B

Although Method B demonstrates strong performance, several practical limitations merit attention. First, the algorithmic complexity is nontrivial. RB-WMMSE requires iterative optimization whose cost scales with the numbers of users and APs; TVQ-VAE embeds a Transformer and a vector-quantization codebook, and its inference entails self-attention computation and probabilistic (entropy) coding, leading to notable compute

and memory overheads. In large-scale cell-free networks, executing full optimization and deep compression every frame may challenge real-time constraints. Mitigations include lengthening the precoder update period (e.g., updating every few frames) and exploiting parallel hardware acceleration for Transformer inference.

Second, issues of model training and generalization arise. TVQ-VAE typically requires extensive offline training on representative data and joint optimization of the VAE and the codebook; the trained model depends on channel statistics and network scale, so changes in AP/user counts or antenna configurations may necessitate retraining or codebook retuning. Moreover, as sequence length grows (e.g., when matrices are flattened), Transformer training can be constrained by memory and data requirements. Third, latency and synchronization must be considered: Method B assumes global CSI at the CPU for precoding and subsequent compression, yet CSI estimation, feedback, and computation incur delay, which can reduce precoding efficacy under high mobility. Fourth, implementation complexity increases relative to traditional pipelines: APs must host a VAE decoder, and the central unit must run deep inference together with WMMSE, potentially requiring ASIC/FPGA accelerators as current baseband stacks lack mature support for such models. Finally, the scheme is tailored to downlink precoding; extending it to uplink (e.g., AP-side compression of received signals to the CPU) would require redesign to reflect uplink data characteristics.

C. Detailed Analysis of Method B

The RB-WMMSE stage requires iterative updates whose cost grows with the number of users K , the aggregate number of AP antennas M , and the RB count $|G|$; per-iteration matrix factorizations/inversions and inter-RB weighting introduce a superlinear scaling that stresses real-time budgets in large cell-free deployments. The TVQ-VAE stage further incurs Transformer self-attention complexity $\mathcal{O}(L^2)$ with sequence length L (e.g., the flattened precoding matrix tokens), nontrivial codebook memory for vector quantization, and serial latency from autoregressive entropy coding. End-to-end, meeting tight fronthaul deadlines every frame can be challenging; amortized updates (e.g., updating every few frames) mitigate load but reduce tracking fidelity under mobility. Centralized execution also makes performance sensitive to CSI staleness and fronthaul jitter.

The learned compressor is trained offline and is tied to the channel statistics, array geometry, and network scale seen during training; domain shift across scenarios (indoor vs. outdoor, sub-6 GHz vs. mmWave), mobility patterns, hardware impairments, or changes in K , M , and $|G|$ can degrade reconstruction unless the model and its codebook are retuned. The mismatch between the compression-error model assumed in RB-WMMSE and the actual error induced by the learned quantizer may bias the optimization, and variable-length bitstreams are fragile to packet loss without joint rate-control and error-protection design. Finally, embedding deep models (Transformer, VQ-VAE) into the baseband pipeline raises implementation complexity (memory footprint, accelerator requirements) and may limit portability across heterogeneous radio platforms.




Fig. 3: The FL compression strategy based on AI model proposed in this article

V. PROPOSED METHOD OF THIS PAPER

A. Overall Design

Building on the above, an end-to-end neural compression framework for efficient FL compression of downlink precoding matrices (PMs) in C-RAN method is proposed in this paper. The framework comprises an analysis transform, quantization and coding, an optional entropy model, and a synthesis transform. The input is a set of frequency-domain PMs over multiple RBs (complex entries split into real and imaginary channels); the output is a compact, reconstructible codeword sequence. Trained end-to-end, this framework supports RB-granular, flexible compression with low inference latency, matching the centralized cooperative transmission requirements of 6G cell-free deployments.

B. End-to-End Neural Framework for Precoding Compression

a) Learnable Analysis Transform: We use an analysis transform to extract features and reduce the dimensionality of the precoding matrices (PMs). RB-wise PMs are stacked as $\tilde{\mathbf{V}} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times 2N_t}$ by splitting real and imaginary parts, and the encoder maps them to a latent

$$\mathbf{z} = f_\theta(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}. \quad (1)$$

Residual CNN blocks describe local structure, while a lightweight self-attention layer captures long-range dependence. The second dimension is decimated after several blocks, e.g.,

$$D \times 2N_t \rightarrow D \times N_t \rightarrow D \times \frac{N_t}{2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T \times d, \quad (2)$$

so the latent is compact yet informative across RBs. The module is easy to tune: depth, width, number of attention heads, and the downsampling ratio can be adjusted to meet a chosen complexity or compression budget.

b) Vector Quantization and Hierarchical Quantization:

The latent is discretized by learnable vector quantization (VQ) with codebook $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{e}_k\}_{k=1}^K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Each token \mathbf{z}_i is mapped to its nearest codeword,

$$c_i = \arg \min_k \|\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{e}_k\|_2^2, \quad \hat{\mathbf{z}} = [\mathbf{e}_{c_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{c_T}]. \quad (3)$$

To support adaptive bitrate, we use L refinement stages with residual updates:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}^{(0)} &= \mathbf{z}, & \mathbf{c}^{(l)} &= Q^{(l)}(\mathbf{r}^{(l)}), & \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{(l)} &= \mathcal{E}^{(l)}(\mathbf{c}^{(l)}), \\ \mathbf{r}^{(l+1)} &= \mathbf{r}^{(l)} - \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{(l)}, & \hat{\mathbf{z}} &= \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \hat{\mathbf{r}}^{(l)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Training follows the VQ-VAE straight-through scheme with codebook and commitment terms.

c) Entropy Modeling: An optional entropy model assigns probabilities to the indices c_i (possibly with context), enabling near-entropy coding. The expected code length is

$$\mathbb{E}[L] \approx - \sum_i \log_2 p_\phi(c_i | \text{ctx}_i) \triangleq H(C), \quad (5)$$

$$R_{\text{total}} = \frac{H(C)}{T} + \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} R_l, \quad (6)$$

A fronthaul budget is enforced by activating a subset of refinement stages or by tuning the rate weight so that $R_{\text{total}} \leq B_{\text{fh}}$.

d) Decoder: The decoder mirrors the encoder: it performs codebook lookups to recover the latent $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ and then applies a synthesis network with upsampling and inverse attention/convolution to reconstruct the PMs,

$$\hat{\mathbf{V}} = g_\psi(\hat{\mathbf{z}}). \quad (7)$$

Reconstruction fidelity is measured by the mean-squared error for an $M \times N$ matrix,

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{V}} - \mathbf{V}\|_F^2}{MN}, \quad (8)$$




Fig. 4: Documents of Sionna

and training minimizes a closed-loop rate–distortion objective

$$\mathcal{L} = D_{\text{MSE}} + \lambda R_{\text{total}} + \gamma \mathcal{L}_{\text{VQ}}, \quad (9)$$

with optional system alignment (e.g., adding a term that penalizes the loss of downlink sum-rate). This ties analysis, quantization, entropy coding, and synthesis to the final communication performance while respecting the fronthaul budget.

C. Dataset Collection

The AI compression module is trained on a precoding dataset generated with *Sionna*, NVIDIA’s open-source 6G physical-layer simulator [24]. *Sionna* supports end-to-end differentiable modeling and GPU acceleration across multiple devices, enabling large-scale parallel generation of independent channels. It implements a broad set of propagation models from *3GPP TR 38.901*, including *Tapped Delay Line (TDL)* and *Clustered Delay Line (CDL)* profiles for urban macro/micro and rural macro scenarios, and can output frequency-domain responses at the RB-granularity. In this work, we simulate directly in the frequency domain by defining an OFDM resource grid and extracting per-RB channel matrices.

As a representative cell-free configuration, we consider a carrier at 3.5 GHz, delay spread of 800 ns, and a 20-path CDL channel. Multiple *Distributed Units (DUs)* and user terminals are deployed; each DU employs a dual-polarized 8×16 antenna panel communicating with users under frequency-selective fading. Using *Sionna*, we generate large numbers of independent channel impulse responses and, for each realization, compute RB-wise downlink precoders via the WMMSE algorithm, thereby constructing a “large-scale MIMO precoding-matrix” dataset for training. GPU acceleration is used throughout the pipeline (IFFT/FFT, channel generation, and precoding), allowing rapid dataset construction while preserving simulation fidelity.

VI. DISCUSSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

This paper first reviews fronthaul compression for C-RAN and CF-mMIMO. The line of research has moved from classical tools—compressed sensing and vector quantization—to learned schemes such as the CsiNet family, attention-based encoders,

and entropy–model–driven coders. We organize the literature by data type (CSI, PMs, I/Q samples, and LLRs) and by evaluation axes: compression ratio, reconstruction error, system-level performance, algorithmic complexity, and ease of deployment. Two representative paths are contrasted: (i) a CSI-feedback track that targets very high compression; and (ii) an RB-level precoding track that couples optimization with compression. A common trend is toward communication-aware training objectives, RB-granular processing that exploits frequency selectivity, and layered quantization with entropy coding that approaches the entropy bound.

Building on these observations, we develop an end-to-end neural fronthaul compressor. A learnable analysis transform reduces PM dimensionality and extracts structure using residual CNN blocks for local patterns and a lightweight self-attention module for long-range dependence. Vector quantization produces discrete indices; a base–refinement hierarchy yields an adaptive bitstream. An optional entropy model further compresses the index within its entropy value range. A synthetic decoder reconstructs the PM (pre-encoding matrix). Training uses the MSE term, and may include system-level objectives such as the total downlink rate and the EVM. This design operates at the RB level, supports flexible bit rate control, and is optimized for low inference latency for centralized cooperative transmission suitable for the 6G environment.

This method still has limitations. The computation and latency must be strictly managed: attention and entropy encoding will increase the CPU load, while the codebook storage combined with the nearest neighbor search will introduce additional overhead. Performance may depend on channel statistics, antenna/user scale, and the staleness of channel state information, which affects generalization ability. Variable-length bit streams also require joint rate control and error prevention mechanisms.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Wu, Z. Zhang, Y. Hong, and Y. Wen, “Cloud radio access network (C-RAN): a primer,” *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 35–41, 2015.
- [2] Mamta Agiwal, Abhishek Roy, and Navrati Saxena, “Next generation 5g wireless networks: A comprehensive survey,” *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 1617–1655, 2016.
- [3] J.N. Laneman, D.N.C. Tse, and G.W. Wornell, “Cooperative diversity in wireless networks: Efficient protocols and outage behavior,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3062–3080, 2004.
- [4] Keqin Zhang, Zhiwei Chen, Kai Cai, Litao Yan, and Xiaohu Ge, “A novel precoding matrix quantization approach for radio stripe architecture of cell-free massive mimo communication systems,” in *GLOBECOM 2024 - 2024 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, 2024, pp. 4058–4063.
- [5] Sherif Adeshina Busari, Kazi Mohammed Saidul Huq, Shahid Mumtaz, Linglong Dai, and Jonathan Rodriguez, “Millimeter-wave massive mimo communication for future wireless systems: A survey,” *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 836–869, 2018.
- [6] A. De la Oliva, J.-A. Hernandez, D. Larrabeti, and A. Azcorra, “An overview of the CPRI specification and its application to C-RAN-based LTE scenarios,” *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 152–159, 2016.
- [7] B. Guo, W. Cao, A. Tao, and D. Samardzija, “LTE/LTE-A signal compression on the CPRI interface,” *Bell Labs Tech. J.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 117–133, 2013.
- [8] Sven Jacobsson, Giuseppe Durisi, Mikael Coldrey, Tom Goldstein, and Christoph Studer, “Quantized Precoding for Massive MU-MIMO,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 65, no. 11, pp. 4670–4684, Nov. 2017.
- [9] J. Max, “Quantizing for minimum distortion,” vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 7–12.
- [10] D.L. Donoho, “Compressed sensing,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1289–1306, 2006.

- [11] Yasaman Khorsandmanesh, Emil Björnson, and Joakim Jaldén, “Optimized Precoding for MU-MIMO With Fronthaul Quantization,” vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 7102–7115.
- [12] Yasaman Khorsandmanesh, Emil Björnson, and Joakim Jaldén, “Quantization-Aware Precoding For Mu-Mimo With Limited-Capacity Fronthaul,” in *ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. pp. 5378–5382, IEEE.
- [13] Song Han, Huizi Mao, and William J. Dally, “Deep Compression: Compressing Deep Neural Networks with Pruning, Trained Quantization and Huffman Coding,” .
- [14] Maojun Zhang, Jiabao Gao, and Caijun Zhong, “A Deep Learning-Based Framework for Low Complexity Multiuser MIMO Precoding Design,” vol. 21, no. 12, pp. 11193–11206.
- [15] Jun Chen, Yong Fang, Ashish Khisti, Ayfer Özgür, and Nir Shlezinger, “Information Compression in the AI Era: Recent Advances and Future Challenges,” pp. 1–1.
- [16] Hao Jiang, Mingyao Cui, Derrick Wing Kwan Ng, and Linglong Dai, “Accurate Channel Prediction Based on Transformer: Making Mobility Negligible,” vol. 40, no. 9, pp. 2717–2732.
- [17] Yangyang Zhang, Xichang Zhang, and Yi Liu, “Deep Learning Based CSI Compression and Quantization With High Compression Ratios in FDD Massive MIMO Systems,” vol. 10, no. 10, pp. 2101–2105.
- [18] Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling, “Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes,” .
- [19] Huan Liu, George Zhang, Jun Chen, and Ashish Khisti, “Cross-Domain Lossy Compression as Entropy Constrained Optimal Transport,” vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 513–527.
- [20] Chenghong Bian, Yulin Shao, and Deniz Gunduz, “Towards AI-Native Fronthaul: Neural Compression for NextG Cloud RAN,” .
- [21] Ruihua Qiao, Tao Jiang, and Wei Yu, “Meta-Learning-Based Fronthaul Compression for Cloud Radio Access Networks,” vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 11015–11029.
- [22] Azadeh Tabeshnezhad, A. Lee Swindlehurst, and Tommy Svensson, “Reduced Complexity Precoding for One-Bit Signaling,” vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 1967–1971.
- [23] Zhiwei Chen, Kai Cai, Junliang Ye, Qiang Li, and Xiaohu Ge, “Resource Block-Granularity Precoding Optimization and Compression for Cell-Free Mobile Networks,” pp. 1–14.
- [24] Jakob Hoydis, Sebastian Cammerer, Fayçal Ait Aoudia, Avinash Vem, Nikolaus Binder, Guillermo Marcus, and Alexander Keller, “Sionna: An Open-Source Library for Next-Generation Physical Layer Research,” .