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Abstract—This paper considers a SWIPT network in which an access point (AP) serves multiple information decoding receivers (IDRs) and energy harvesting receivers (EHRs) assisted by several dynamically controlled reconfigurable intelligent surfaces (RIS). An energy efficiency (EE) maximization problem is formulated by the joint optimization of the transmit beamforming, artificial noise (AN) covariance, the passive beamforming at the RISs, and the RIS on/off control mechanism. Due to the non-convexity of the problem, semi-definite relaxation (SDR) is utilized to simplify the problem. A practical solution based on alternation optimization is proposed to obtain the suboptimal solution. Furthermore, a low-complexity greedy search method is proposed for the RIS on/off control.

Simulation results show that the EE is significantly enhanced by employing dynamic control of multiple RIS with AN. In addition, the effect of increasing the circuit power and the number of RISs can be harmful to the system-wide EE.

Index terms—Reconfigurable intelligent surfaces, energy efficiency, artificial noise, SWIPT

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of Simultaneous wireless information and power transfer (SWIPT) has been met with explosive interest due to their potential to extend the network lifetime and improve energy efficiency, especially in low-power Internet of Things (IoTs) devices in 5G networks and beyond [1]. SWIPT allows wireless nodes to utilize the RF signal for simultaneous wireless information and power transfer. Furthermore, SWIPT enables wireless nodes to utilize the RF signal for both wireless information transfer (WIT) and wireless power transfer (WPT) simultaneously [2][3]. Conventional SWIPT architectures allow for two different design types: the co-located and separated receiver modules for information decoding (ID) and energy harvesting (EH).

Recently, several 5G technological advancements such as Millimetre-wave (mm-Wave) communications and massive-multiple input-multiple output (mMIMO) technology have been projected to meet a thousand-fold capacity increase and provide ubiquitous wireless connectivity to a variety of devices [4]. However, these advancements exhibit several shortcomings in energy efficiency and hardware cost, and practical implementations may prove very prohibitive. Therefore, a more energy-efficient and cost-effective technology that has emerged to plug the gaps presented by the technologies mentioned above while still offering significant gains is the reconfigurable intelligent surface (RIS), also called the intelligent, reflective surfaces (IRS). A RIS is an artificial structure that can be electronically tuned using integrated electronics and wireless communications [6]. The 2-dimensional surface has many low-cost, reconfigurable passive elements that can independently induce a phase shift on impinging waves. Furthermore, proper tuning of the surface impedances of these elements enables the phase shifts to be adjusted to allow for the coherent addition of the reflected signal from these elements to boost the desired signal at the designated receiver [7]–[10].

The main bane of wireless communication is the open access nature. Therefore, the wireless communication system requires strong security measures at all layers of its protocol stack to combat the risks associated with the open-access attribute. Cryptographic encryptions are often used in higher layers of the protocol stack [10], [11], while security at the physical layer has become equally important. Physical layer security (PLS) exploits the eavesdropper channel state information (CSI) and that of the legitimate parties to provide some form of security and confidentiality [12], [14], [15]. A typical SWIPT system with separated receivers has EHRs with different power sensitivity from the IDRs. As such, the EHRs are deployed closer to the AP while the IDRs are further away. This implies a stronger line-of-sight (LoS) between EHR and AP compared to the IDR. As a result, there could be a degradation in the overall spectral efficiency of the system. Furthermore, there could be a breach of confidentiality of the information received by the IDRs. Therefore, employing a RIS to aid the SWIPT network can significantly enhance the network-wide performance. Several studies have shown the performance enhancements of RIS-aided SWIPT systems over conventional RIS systems. For example, the authors in [16] studied a power minimization problem under the quality of service (QoS) constraints. They showed that the RIS-aided SWIPT system performed better than the conventional SWIPT system. Furthermore, in [4], the authors studied a weighted sum maximization problem for a RIS-aided SWIPT system by jointly optimizing the transmit precoders at the AP and the random phase shifts at the RIS.

This work aims to improve the energy efficiency, η, of a multi-RIS-aided SWIPT network where a multiple antenna access point (AP) serves several IDRs and EHRs via one direct channel and multiple RIS channels. It does this while preventing the EHRs from eavesdropping on the transmitted information from the IDRs. To achieve this, we employ a non-linear energy-harvesting model [17] rather than a linear one [16] to characterize the harvested energy more accurately. Furthermore, we aim to maximize the system-wide energy efficiency, η, by jointly optimizing the transmit beamforming vectors, the artificial noise (AN) covariance matrix at the AP and the phase shifts at the RIS.

Index terms—Reconfigurable intelligent surfaces, energy efficiency, artificial noise, SWIPT


II. SYSTEM MODEL

Fig. 1: Diagrammatic representation of the multi-RIS-aided SWIPT

The received signal at the IDR, $k$, is given by

$$ y_k = \left( h_k^H + \sum_{l=1}^{L} b_l g_{l,k}^H \Phi_l H_l \right) x + n_k $$

where $h_k^H \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times 1}$ is the channel vector between the AP and IDR, $k$, $g_{l,k}^H \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$ is the channel vector from the $l$-th RIS to IDR, $k$; therefore $g_l^H = [g_{l,1,k}^H, g_{l,2,k}^H, \ldots, g_{l,K,k}^H]$. Similarly, $H_l \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times M}$ is the channel matrix from the AP to the $l$-th RIS. $\Phi_l = \text{diag}(\phi_l)$ where $\phi_l = [e^{j\theta_{l,1}}, e^{j\theta_{l,2}}, \ldots, e^{j\theta_{l,N}}]^H$ and $\phi = [e^{j\theta_1}, \ldots, e^{j\theta_{1,N}}, \ldots, e^{j\theta_{N,N}}]^H$ where $\theta_{l,n} \in [0, 2\pi]$ is the phase shift of the $n$-th element of the $l$-th RIS. $n_k \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ is the additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) at the $k$-th IDR.

Similarly, the received signal at the $d$-th EHR is given by

$$ y_d = \left( h_d^H + \sum_{l=1}^{L} b_l g_{l,d}^H \Phi_l H_l \right) x + n_d $$

where $h_d^H \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times 1}$ is the channel matrix between the AP and the $d$-th EHR, $g_{l,d}^H \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 1}$ is the channel matrix from the $l$-th RIS to $d$-th EHR, $n_d \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ is the AWGN noise at the $d$-th EHR.

Consequently, the received signal-to-interference-plus-noise-ratio (SINR) at the $k$-th IDR is given by:

$$ \Gamma_k = \frac{||h_k^H v_k||^2}{h_k^H V_o h_k + \sum_{j=k}^{N} ||h_j^H v_j||^2 + \sigma^2} $$

Thus, the achievable rate of the $k$-th IDR

$$ r_k = \log_2 (1 + \Gamma_k) $$

The achievable sum rate of all the $K$ IDRs is given by

$$ R \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{K} \log_2 (1 + \Gamma_k) $$

Additionally, if the $d$-th EHR tries to decode information from its received signals, the receive SINR for eavesdropping on the information of IDR $k$ is given by:

$$ \Gamma_d = \frac{||h_d^H v_k||^2}{h_d^H V_o h_d + \sum_{j=k}^{N} ||h_j^H v_j||^2 + \sigma^2} $$

Also, the harvested power at the $d$-th EHR is given by:

$$ \Lambda_d = \eta_0 \left( \sum_{k=1}^{K} ||v_k^H v_k^H + \text{Tr}(V_o)|| h_d \right) $$

where $\eta_0$ is the energy harvesting efficiency ($\eta_0 = 1$) in this paper. To precisely characterize the harvested energy, we adopt a linear model as in [4],[16],[9].

$$ \Psi = \sum_{d=1}^{D} \Lambda_d $$

Therefore, the total system-wide power requirement is given by

$$ P_T = \vartheta \left( \sum_{k=1}^{K} \|v_k\|^2 + \text{Tr}(V_o) \right) + \left( P_{AP} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} P_k \right) $$

The first term of (10) is the transmit power at the AP, where $\vartheta$ denotes the power amplifier efficiency. The second bracketed term is the circuit power consumption at the AP and the $K$ IDRs, where $P_k$ denotes the circuit power consumption at the $k$-th IDR, while the last term represents the power consumption of all RISs with $P_T$, the power requirement of a single element of the $l$-th RIS.

Consequently, we can define energy efficiency, $\eta$ as

$$ \eta = \frac{R(v_k, V_o, \vartheta, b)}{P_T(v_k, V_o, b)} $$

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Our multi-RIS SWIPT system design aims to maximize the overall energy efficiency subject to several constraints. Such constraints include the transmit power budget, minimum rate and security requirements of the IDRs, energy harvesting requirements of the EHRs, phase shifting restrictions on all the RIS and the ON/OFF basis for the RIS. Mathematically, we can express the optimization problem as:

$$ P1: \max_{\{(v_k, V_o, \vartheta, b)\}} \eta $$
\[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} \| \mathbf{v}_k \|^2 + \text{Tr}(\mathbf{V}_0) \leq P_{\text{max}} \quad (12b) \]

\[ \Gamma_k \geq \Gamma_{\text{min}} \quad \forall k \in K \quad (12c) \]

\[ \Gamma_k \leq \tau_{th} \quad \forall d \in D, k \in K \quad (12d) \]

\[ P_d \geq E_0 \quad \forall d \in D \quad (12e) \]

\[ 0 \leq \theta_{kn} \leq 2\pi \quad \forall l, n \in N \quad (12f) \]

\[ b_1 \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall l \in L \quad (12g) \]

where \( \theta = [\theta_{1,1}, ..., \theta_{1,N}, ..., \theta_{n,n}]^T \) and \( b = [b_1, ..., b_L]^T \).

The \( P_{\text{max}} \) in (12b) denotes the maximum available power at the AP, \( \Gamma_{\text{min}} \) in (12c) is the minimum SINR requirement of each IDR, and \( \tau_{th} \) in (12d) is the SINR threshold requirement for the EHR to successfully decode the information content for the IDRs. If both (12c) and (12d) are satisfied, the minimal requirement for the confidentiality of the IDR’s information is guaranteed. In constraint (12e), \( E_0 \) denotes the minimal energy harvesting requirement at each EHR. The constraint (12g) is simply a binary representation of the ON/OFF mechanism for the RISs. \( \text{P1} \) is intractable since the objective problem is fractional and constraints (12e) to (12g) are non-convex.

\[ R_{\tau} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \log\left( 1 + \frac{\text{Tr} \left( Q \mathbf{G}_k \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{G}_k^H \right)}{\text{Tr} \left( Q \mathbf{G}_k (\mathbf{V}_k) \mathbf{G}_k^H + \sigma^2 \right)} \right) \quad (13) \]

Therefore, we can relax the optimization problem (\( \text{P1} \)) to the formulation below with SDR by dropping the rank one constraint.

\[ \text{P2:} \quad \max \quad \eta \]

\[ \text{s.t.} \quad V_k, V_0, Q_{\text{new}} \geq 0 \quad \forall k, w = 1, ..., W + 1 \quad (14a) \]

\[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{V}_k) + \text{Tr}(\mathbf{V}_0) \leq P_{\text{max}} \quad (14b) \]

\[ \frac{\text{Tr} \left( Q \mathbf{G}_k \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{G}_k^H \right)}{\text{Tr} \left( Q \mathbf{G}_k \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{G}_k^H + \sigma^2 \right)} \geq 1 \quad (14d) \]

\[ \frac{\text{Tr} \left( Q \mathbf{G}_d \mathbf{V}_d \mathbf{G}_d^H \right)}{\text{Tr} \left( Q \mathbf{G}_d \mathbf{V}_d \mathbf{G}_d^H + \sigma^2 \right)} \leq \tau_{th} \quad (14e) \]

\[ \text{Tr} \left( Q \mathbf{G}_d \left( \sum_{k=1}^{K} V_k + V_0 \right) \mathbf{G}_d^H \right) \geq Z^{-1}(p_d) \quad (14f) \]

\section*{PROPOSED SOLUTION}

Given the multiuser nature of the system, there is bound to be inter-user interference. Considering the multivariate optimization problem, we propose a low-complexity algorithm based on alternating optimization for the beamforming vectors, the phase shifts and the RIS on/off vector. The solution to (\( \text{P1} \)) will take a 3-pronged approach in which we will start by keeping both the RIS’ phase shifts and on/off vectors fixed and then solve for the beamforming vectors. Secondly, keeping the RIS on/off vector fixed with the obtained beamforming vectors, we will solve for the optimization for the phase shifts. Finally, we will utilize the optimized beamforming vectors and the phase shifters to solve for the RIS ON/OFF vector. However, before applying this 3-pronged approach, we will use semi-definite relaxation to handle the non-convexity of (12).

\section*{i. Proposed SDR Approach}

To effectively solve \( \text{P1} \), we need to transform the expression \( \sum_{l=1}^{k} b_l g_l^H \Phi_l H_l \). We can define \((\phi_l)_n = (e^{j\phi_l})_n\); \( \Phi_l = [\phi_{l1}, \phi_{l2}, ..., \phi_{ln}]^T \) and \( \Phi = [\phi_{11}, ..., \phi_{1N}, ..., \phi_{n1}, ..., \phi_{nN}]^T \) with \( b = [b_1, ..., b_L]^T \).\( \forall l, n \in N \). Also, we recall that \( H = \left[H_{1,1}, ..., H_{1,L} \right]^T \in C^{N \times L \times M} \) and \( \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{H} \) to cater for the RIS status. Furthermore, we define the vector \( g_k = [g_{k1}, g_{k2}, ..., g_{kn}]_{k \in K} \in C^{N \times 1} \). Let \( \mathbf{G}_k = \text{diag}[g_k^H \mathbf{H}] \).

We will define new variables: \( \mathbf{\phi} = [\phi; 1], \mathbf{\phi}_k = [\phi_k; h_k^H] \) and \( \mathbf{\phi}_d = [\phi_d; h_d^H] \). We also set \( \mathbf{v}_k \mathbf{v}_k^H = V_k \) satisfying \( V_k \geq 0 \) and \( \text{rank}(V_k) = 1 \). In the same vein, we set \( \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{\phi} \mathbf{\phi}^H \) satisfying \( Q \geq 0 \) and \( \text{rank}(Q) = 1 \). To represent all the phase shifts for all the RIS, we assume that \( \mathbf{\hat{W}} = L \times N \), and to cater for the ON/OFF status of the RIS, we assume \( \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{\hat{W}} \). Also, we let \( \mathbf{\bar{V}} = V_0 + \sum_{j \neq k}^{K} V_j \). Thus, we can rewrite the sum rate as

\[ R_{\tau} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \log\left( 1 + \frac{\text{Tr} \left( Q \mathbf{G}_k V_k \mathbf{G}_k^H \right)}{\text{Tr} \left( Q \mathbf{G}_k (\mathbf{V}_k) \mathbf{G}_k^H + \sigma^2 \right)} \right) \]

where \( \mathbf{\phi}_k \) is an auxiliary variable and \( \mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{\phi}_k \mathbf{\phi}_k^H \). Thus, we can redefine the set of constraints in (16) as follows:

\[ S_k \leq e^{\alpha_k} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_k \leq e^{\beta_k} \quad \forall k \in K \quad (17a) \]

\[ \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_k V_k) \geq e^{\alpha_k} (e^{\beta_k} + \sigma^2) \quad (17b) \]

where \( \alpha_k \) and \( \beta_k \) are auxiliary variables.

Without loss of generality, we can equate the lower bound of the left-hand side of the two expressions in (17a) to the first-order Taylor series expansion at any feasible point \((\alpha_k, \beta_k)\) such that \( e^{\alpha_k} \geq e^{\alpha_k} + e^{\alpha_k} (\alpha_k - \alpha_0) \) and \( e^{\beta_k} \geq e^{\beta_k} + e^{\beta_k} (\beta_k - \beta_0) \). Thus, given the above approximation in (17a & b) as well as Taylor’s series expansions, we can obtain a lower bound solution to \( \text{P3} \) by solving the following:

\[ \text{P4:} \quad \max \quad \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left( \log(1 + S_k) \right) \quad (18a) \]

\[ \text{s.t.} \quad (15b), (15c), (17a), V_k, V_0 \geq 0, \quad \forall k \quad (18b) \]

\[ f_0(\alpha_k) \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{V}_k) \quad \forall k \quad (18c) \]

\[ f_0(\beta_k) \geq S_k \quad \forall k \quad (18d) \]
where \( f_0(\alpha_k) \equiv e^{\alpha_0} + e^{\alpha_0}(\alpha_k - \alpha_0) \) and \( f_0(\beta_k) \equiv e^{\beta_0} + e^{\beta_0}(\beta_k - \beta_0) \).

Given that the numerator of the objective function in P4 is concave while the denominator is convex, we can employ the Dinkelbach method [15] to solve the problem in polynomial time. The Dinkelbach method guarantees that we obtain the globally optimal solution of P4 if and only if \( \lambda \) is the unique zeroth solution to the function in the following problem:

\[
\begin{align}
\max_{\{(V_k)_{k=1}^K, \lambda\}} & \quad \frac{\lambda}{f_0(\lambda)} \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad (14a-c), (18c), (18d), \quad V_k^0 \geq 0, \quad \forall k
\end{align}
\]

where \( f_0(\lambda) = \sum_{k=1}^K (1 + S_k) - \lambda \left( P_T \left( (V_k^0, V_0^0) \right) \right) \)

Algorithm 1 below describes the Dinkelbach method to solve P4, which we can solve using convex solvers such as CVX [19]. By algorithm I, we can solve the optimization problem P3 using successive convex approximation (SCA) by iteratively solving P4 with \( \{\alpha_0, \beta_0\} \) until the difference between successive iterations is below a tolerance value, \( \epsilon \).

**Algorithm I: Solution to P4**

1. **Initialize**: Set initial values for \( \alpha_k \) and \( \beta_k \) to \( \alpha_0(0) \) and \( \beta_0(0) \) respectively. Set \( \lambda(0) = 0, \epsilon = \) small tolerance value and iteration count, \( i = 0 \).
2. **Repeat**
3. **Solve** \( (19) \) with \( \lambda(i) \) and \( \{\alpha_0(i), \beta_0(i)\} \) to obtain \( V_k^{0(i)}, V_0^{0(i)} \) and \( f_0(\lambda(i)) \).
4. Set \( \lambda(i+1) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K (1 + S_k)}{\sum_{k=1}^K \left( P_T \left( (V_k^{0(i)}, V_0^{0(i)}) \right) \right)} \).
5. \( i \leftarrow i + 1 \)
6. **Until** \( \| \lambda(i) - \lambda(i-1) \| \leq \epsilon \)
7. **Output**: The optimal \( V_k^* = V_k^{0(i)} \) and \( V_0^* = V_0^{0(i)} \)

### iii. Phase Optimization with fixed \( \{(V_k), V_0\} \)

To optimize the phase shift, we will keep the obtained \( \{(V_k), V_0\} \) fixed. Thus, the optimization problem (P2) reduces to

\[
\begin{align}
P5: \max_{\{\phi_k, \omega_k\}} & \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \log_2 (1 + \rho_k) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad (1b) - (1c) \quad (20a)
\end{align}
\]

\[
\begin{align}
Q_{ww} = 1 & \quad \forall w = 1, ..., W + 1 \\
\Gamma_k \geq \rho_k & \quad \forall k
\end{align}
\]

where \( \rho_k \) are auxiliary variables.

Consequently, we can transform the P5 to

\[
\begin{align}
P6: \max_{\{\phi_k, \omega_k\}} & \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \log_2 (1 + \rho_k) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad (1b) - (1c) \quad (21a)
\end{align}
\]

\[
\begin{align}
Q_{ww} = 1 & \quad \forall w = 1, ..., W + 1 \\
\Gamma_k \geq \rho_k & \quad \forall k
\end{align}
\]

\[
\begin{align}
f_0(\mu_k) \equiv e^{\mu_0} + e^{\mu_0}(\mu_k - \mu_0) & \quad \geq e^{\mu_0} + e^{\mu_0}(\mu_k - \mu_0) \geq \rho_k \forall k \quad (21d)
\end{align}
\]

\[
\begin{align}
f_0(\omega_k) \equiv e^{\omega_0} + e^{\omega_0}(\omega_k - \omega_0) & \quad \geq \rho_k \forall k \quad (21f)
\end{align}
\]

where \( X_k = G_k V_k \tilde{G}_k \) and \( Y_k = G_k \left( V_k \right) \tilde{G}_k \).

\( \mu_k \) and \( \omega_k \) are auxiliary variables with \( \{\mu_0, \omega_0\} \) denoting any set of feasible points: \( f_0(\mu_k) \) and \( f_0(\omega_k) \) are the lower-bounded expressions of the first-order Taylor’s expansion of the functions, \( e^{\mu_k} \) and \( e^{\omega_k} \) at feasible point \( (\mu_0, \omega_0) \).

P6 is convex and can be solved using any convex solvers. Similarly, we can quickly solve the optimization problem P5 by employing SCA and iteratively solving P6 with the feasible point at \( (\mu_0, \omega_0) \) until the difference between successive approximations is below a certain threshold.

### iv. RIS on/off vector optimization

Having obtained the beamforming and phase shift vectors \( \{(V_k), V_0\} \), and \( \phi \), and applying them to the optimization problem (11), the equation reduces to a non-linear optimization problem (NLOP) with respect to the RIS on/off vector, \( b \). Unfortunately, this makes obtaining a globally optimal solution in polynomial time increasingly tricky, given that the problem is generally NP-hard. To effectively solve the NLOP, we draw inspiration from [16] to propose a low-complex greedy algorithm such that we aim to obtain a feasible solution to the system-wide energy efficiency optimization problem P2 by turning off one RIS at a time.

Each time a feasible solution is obtained, it is compared to the previous solution until we find a solution that ultimately improves the energy efficiency. Algorithm II defines this scenario in full detail.

**Algorithm II: Greedy Algorithm for RIS ON/OFF Optimization**

1. **Let** \( L \) be the set of all RISs and initialize RIS status \( b = [b_1, ..., b_L] \) with \( b_1 = 1 \forall i \in L \)
2. **Initialize** a subset \( C \) (initially empty) for only RISs, \( \rightarrow C \in L \)
3. Solve P1 and find the solution to the objective function in the optimization problem (12), and denote the solution by \( \eta_0 \)
4. **while** \( C \) is not empty: 
   - **for** each \( i \in C \): 
     - Construct a RIS ON/OFF solution sequence as follows: set \( b_1 = 0, b_i = 1, b_j = 0 \forall i \in C \)
   - **Feasibility check:**
     - If the RIS ON/OFF solution sequence is feasible, compute the objective function in (12) as \( \eta_1 \)
     - Otherwise, set \( \eta_1 = 0 \)
5. **end for**
6. **end if**
7. **Compare** \( \eta_1 \) and \( \eta_0 \) and find \( x = \arg \max_{j \in C} \eta_j \)
8. **break**
9. **else**
10. **Break and jump to step (13)**
11. **end if**
12. **end while**
13. **Output**: \( b_1 = 1, b_m = 0 \forall i \in C \) and \( \forall m \in L \setminus C \)

Hence, the AO algorithm is summarized in Algorithm III.

### v. Computational complexity

The number of iterations of the AO process in algorithm VI determines the computational complexity of the multiuser system. We can denote this number by \( N_{iter} \). The computational complexity of the solution at hand is drawn from the complexity of solving three (3) sub-problems, which we will discuss in batches. The first batch consists of the complexity of (15) when the RIS on/off vector is fixed. From algorithm I, we can observe an outer loop SCA and an inner
loop, which adopts the Dinkelbach method for solving $\mathbf{P}_3$. We adopt the interior point method (IPM) to solve (19) at each iteration. We can define the number of iterations of the outer loop as $N_{iter}^{(SCA_1)}$ and the inner loop as $N_{iter}^{(P1)}$. Also, as defined in [17], the complexity of solving a constrained optimization problem is dependent on the number of optimization variables and the constraints. Thus, the complexity of solving (19) is in the order $O_4 = O((K+1)M + y (y + (K+1)M^2 + x_i^2))$, where $x_1 = O(KM^2)$ and $y = (KW + 4K + D + 1)$.

Similarly, we can define the number of iterations for solving SCA in $\mathbf{P}_5$ as $N_{iter}^{(SCA_2)}$. At each iteration, the complexity of solving the convex problem $\mathbf{P}_6$ is given by $O_5 = O((W + 1)Z (X_i^2 (Z + (W + 1)^2) + X_i (Z + (W + 1)^3 + x_i^2)))$, where $X_i = O(W^2 K)$ and $Z = (SK + D + W + 2)$. Also, the complexity of the RIS on/off optimization is given by $O_3 = O(W^2 K)$ with $N_{iter}^{(g)}$ iterations. Thus, the overall complexity of the alternating optimization algorithm is given by $O_{4,5} = O(N_{iter}^{(SCA_1)} N_{iter}^{(SCA_2)} O_3 + N_{iter}^{(g)} O_5) + O_{iter}^{(SCA_2)}$.

Thus, the implication is that the proposed algorithm has polynomial time computational complexity.

**ALGORITHM III: OVERALL SOLUTION FOR P1**

1. Initialize ($([V_5], [V_6], [V_7], [V_8])$, $[\phi_0], [b_0]$). Set iteration number $i = 0$
2. Repeat
3. Given $([V_5], [V_6], [V_8])$, $[\phi_0], [b_0]$, solve the optimization problem given in (15) using algorithm IV to obtain $([V_5], [V_6], [V_8])$.
4. Given $([V_5], [V_6], [V_8])$, $[\phi_0], [b_0]$, solve the optimization problem given in (21) by using SCA to obtain $[\phi_0]
5. Given $([V_5], [V_6], [V_7], [V_8])$, $[\phi_0], [b_0]$, optimize the RIS on/off vector using algorithm V to obtain $[b_0]$
6. Set $i = i + 1$
7. Until the objective value of (13) converges

**Fig. 2: Multi-RIS-aided SWIPT setup**

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

This section evaluates the performance of the proposed multi-RIS (MRIS) algorithm. We consider $(1000 \times 1000)m^2$ square area with a 4-antenna AP located at its centre. The AP is circularly surrounded by $L$ number of RISs, each located at polar coordinates given by $[(cos(2\pi L^{-1}), sin(2\pi L^{-1})) \times 100] + [500, 500]$. The energy harvesting receivers are randomly placed within a $2500m^2$ square space centred at $(600, 500)$ while the IDRs are further away, randomly distributed within a $2500m^2$ square space centred at $(950, 550)$. The AP is assumed to transmit at maximum power. We also assume that the AP-EHR and AP-IDR links experience Rayleigh fading while AP-RISs, RISs-IDR links experience Rician fading with a Rician factor, 4. All simulations were averaged over 500 independent channel realizations. Other system parameters are selected as follows: $K=5$, $D = 5$, $\sigma^2 = -174dBm/Hz$, power amplifier efficiency, $\theta = 0.8$, circuit power of each RIS element, $P_s = 10dBm$, $\tau_{th} = 0dB$, $\tau_{min} = 5dB$, $E_0 = -25dBm$. We simulate three other schemes for performance comparisons: (a) **Upper bound**: In this scheme, the energy efficiency is obtained from the relaxed problem in P2 by applying semi-definite relaxation; (b) **Without AN**: This scheme eliminates the AN transmitted alongside the transmit signal; (c) **Without RIS**: This scheme eliminates the cascaded AP-RIS and RIS-EDR links. Only the direct AP-IDR links are considered. Further comparisons are made to ascertain the performance enhancements of a multi-RIS system with a conventional single RIS and no RIS system.

**Fig. 3** illustrates the average energy efficiency against the number of reflective elements per RIS for the different schemes, including our proposed MRIS design. Upon examination, we see that as the number of reflective elements increases per RIS, the energy efficiency increases and then gradually decreases with more reflective elements. The reason for such a behaviour is that in the initial phase, with a few reflective elements in each RIS, the active beamforming gain from the AP and reflecting beamforming gain of the RISs’ phase shifts improve the spectral efficiency. This implies that the system-wide sum rate is enhanced. This significant sum rate overshadows the system-wide energy consumption, leading to increased energy efficiency. When the number of reflective elements in each RIS is relatively large, the information rate is enhanced but at the cost of increased energy consumption at the RISs. The plot shows that our proposed scheme posts similar energy efficiency performance as the upper bound and better performance than the other two schemes. The improved energy efficiency in our proposed system on the ‘without AN’ scheme is due to the EHRs compromising the information rate. Our scheme effectively applies the AN as energy beams for the EHRs. Moreover, the ‘without AN’ scheme outperforms the design without RIS; Hence, this provides an indication that an optimized RIS-assisted network enhances the performance of an AN-assisted network.

**Fig. 4** depicts the energy efficiency versus the number of transmit antennas at the AP for different Pmax. The figure shows that energy efficiency increases rapidly for a small number of transmit antennas at the AP. Still, this increase becomes slower for a more significant number of transmit antennas at the AP. A high number of transmit antennas at the AP results in high power consumption, which depletes the slope of an increase in energy efficiency. Also, the energy efficiency increases with an increase in the maximum transmit power of the AP for a given number of transmit antennas at the AP. Fig. 5 presents a comparison of the energy efficiency obtained for the different schemes against the $P_c$ (Recall that, from section II, $P_c$ is the sum of the circuit power at the AP and the IDRs, which is incremental with the number of IDRs and antennas at the AP). We observe a negative slope in the figure because of the effect of total circuit power on energy efficiency. The energy efficiency decreases as a result of increasing circuit power. Our proposed scheme outperforms the single RIS $(L=1)$ scheme and other schemes...
while it approaches the performance posted by the upper bound. This is consistent with the result obtained in Fig. 3. Lastly, Fig. 6 shows the average energy efficiency as a function of the number of RIS (\(N=4\) for each RIS) for different maximum power levels at the AP. From the figure, we see that as \(L\) increases, there is a gradual increment in the average energy efficiency due to the RISs on the system-wide information rate. However, as the \(L\) becomes relatively large, the energy efficiency slowly decreases due to the energy consumption costs associated with the large number of RIS. Thus, we observe that the larger the maximum power at the AP is, the better the energy efficiency performance.

Furthermore, multiple RIS deployed at different points can seemingly improve the energy efficiency of a SWIPT network over a single RIS or no RIS at all. Moreover, applying AN in the system improves its energy efficiency and security.
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VI. CONCLUSION

This paper studied the energy efficiency of a secure distributed multi-RIS-aided SWIPT network. The non-convexity of the energy efficiency problem was overcome by applying SDR and tackling the resultant problem with AO to obtain an effective solution. Simulation results show the positive effect of RISs on the system’s energy efficiency.