

Advancing Multi-Connectivity in Satellite-Terrestrial Integrated Networks: Architectures, Challenges, and Applications

Xiangyu Li, and Bodong Shang

Abstract—Multi-connectivity (MC) in satellite-terrestrial integrated networks (STINs), included in 3GPP standards, is regarded as a promising technology for future networks. The significant advantages of MC in improving coverage, communication, and sensing through satellite-terrestrial collaboration have sparked widespread interest. In this article, we first introduce three fundamental deployment architectures of MC systems in STINs, including multi-satellite, single-satellite single-base-station, and multi-satellite multi-base-station configurations. Considering the emerging but still evolving satellite networking, we explore system design challenges such as satellite networking schemes, e.g., cell-free and multi-tier satellite networks. Then, key technical challenges that severely influence the quality of mutual communications, including beamforming, channel estimation, and synchronization, are discussed subsequently. Furthermore, typical applications such as coverage enhancement, traffic offloading, collaborative sensing, and low-altitude communication are demonstrated, followed by a case study comparing coverage performance in MC and single-connectivity (SC) configurations. Several essential future research directions for MC in STINs are presented to facilitate further exploration.

I. INTRODUCTION

Fueled by the increasing demand for high-quality seamless connectivity and the rapid proliferation of data-intensive applications such as video streaming, cloud services, and the Internet of Things (IoT), the evolution of network architectures continues to advance inexorably. Conventional terrestrial networks (TNs) can often be restricted by insufficient infrastructure, particularly in remote and underserved areas. This gives rise to the emergence of multi-connectivity (MC), a solution that enables a devices' simultaneous connections to multiple networks to enhance communication robustness, performance, and resilience [1]. Recently, the next generation of wireless communication systems, that is, the sixth generation (6G), has embarked on the extension of the capabilities and scenarios of the fifth generation (5G) such as network coverage, traffic offloading, integrated sensing and communication, low-altitude economy, etc., to global IoT. By allowing devices to connect to multiple network nodes concurrently, increased coverage, higher data throughput, and improved reliability can be ensured for connections between transmitters and user equipments (UEs). To satisfy this growing demand in wider areas, it is essential to understand the developments in

potential architectures, technical challenges, and potential real-world applications of MC from a system-level perspective.

In recent years, satellite communication (SatCom) is envisioned to be a perfect supplement for TNs in the context of its extensive coverage and efficient multi-cast and broadcast capabilities. However, challenges such as weather sensitivity, the high cost of deployment and maintenance, and deep fading at higher frequencies make it difficult for SatCom systems to independently support global services. Considering the non-negligible role of TNs, satellite-terrestrial integrated networks (STINs) have attracted the attention of standardization institutes, network operators, research fraternities, and related industries [2]. By reaping the benefits of the wide coverage provided by satellites and the high data rates of both networks, STINs act as a prospective paradigm for future networks in providing global coverage and ubiquitous wireless access. Note that if certain satellites or base stations (BSs) become overloaded due to a large number of UEs, their resources are strained, while other satellites or BSs may remain underutilized. This imbalance leads to inefficient use of available network resources.

One promising solution to tackle such a problem is to redistribute the load by incorporating MC in STINs to switch or add UEs to less congested satellites and/or BSs. In this case, while no additional bandwidth is provided, UEs experience greater flexibility in connecting to multiple serving entities in the TN and/or non-terrestrial network (NTN). Obviously, by exploiting MC in STINs, the excess available resources could be utilized more efficiently. Moreover, the interoperability of satellites and TNs can support seamless handover and reduce the probability of handover failure, which will improve the reliability of the connection. In addition, the information interaction among satellites and BSs can be made more efficient so that more dynamic and adaptive space-air-ground resource coordination and optimization can be realized. It is worth mentioning that MC in terrestrial mobile networks was once studied in terms of protocols, data and control in the transport layer and the network layer [3]. The authors in [4] also presented the concept of MC in NTNs, but did not take into account the inherent TNs. An overview of the activities and goals of an ongoing STIN project was provided in [5], without leveraging the advantages offered by MC. It is worth mentioning that none of the above works considered the capabilities and application scenarios in future generation networks. Therefore, in this article we seek to address this gap in existing research.

Xiangyu Li is with Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China and Eastern Institute for Advanced Study, Eastern Institute of Technology, Ningbo, China.

Bodong Shang (corresponding author) is with Eastern Institute for Advanced Study, Eastern Institute of Technology, Ningbo, China.

Advancing Multi-Connectivity in Satellite-Terrestrial Integrated Networks: Architectures, Challenges, and Applications					
Deployment Architectures	System Design Challenges		Potential Solutions	Typical Applications	Future Research Directions
Multi-satellite: • Available satellites are coordinated by the CPU on a CCS. The OISLs can support the mutual communications between satellites.	Satellite networking: lay a solid foundation for STINs	Cell-free satellite network: centralized/scalable cell-free massive MIMO structure providing concurrent services	Traditional/Advanced tools for exploration: • Stochastic geometry • Optimization • Game theory • Learning-based design	Coverage enhancement: - Satellites provide add-on coverage by establishing extra service links. Traffic offloading: - UEs flexibly shift their offloading links from BS to satellite, or from satellite to BS.	Interference management: - Balance desired signal and interference signal by jointly optimizing beamforming, power allocation, user association, etc. Massive access technique: - Manage concurrent links and design SIC technique, considering load balancing, user clustering, and handover times.
		Multi-tier satellite network: complementary of advantages among LEO/MEO/GEO satellites			
Single-satellite single-base-station: • Four connection modes: scheduled by: both a satellite and a BS; only a BS; only a satellite; neither. • Handover and mode shift happen with the change of time.	Channel estimation: • Doppler shifts & propagation delays • High velocity and altitude of satellites	Synchronization: • Long propagation delays between two satellites, and between satellites and UEs	Pilot-based estimation: • Allocate pilot number to reduce pilot contamination	Spectrum sharing policy: - Allocate shared & reserved spectrum to obtain optimal system performance.	
Multi-satellite multi-base-station: • Design a CCS with CPU in NTN for satellite cooperation & a CPU in TN for BS/APs cooperation • Coordination of NTN CPU & TN CPU for scheduling satellites/BSs			OISLs among satellites • GNSS, CP, and coarse symbol-level synchronization • SSB for space-ground links		

Comparative analysis: (1) In [3], MC was introduced in terrestrial networks with regard to protocols, data, and control in the transport layer and network layer, while the non-terrestrial parts were ignored. (2) The concept of MC in NTNs was presented in [4], but did not integrate the function of MC with TNs. (3) The authors in [5] provided an overview of an STIN project, but did not mention how to take full advantage of MC. The above works all touch upon the potential of MC, but their analysis is not comprehensive enough for exploring potential applications of MC in STINs and thus necessitates additional research.

FIGURE 1. An overview of MC in STINs.

Although MC in STINs is expected to offer potential benefits, several questions remain to be answered.

- Q1: What will be the basic architectures for deployment when the MC is integrated into current networks?
- Q2: What will be the challenges to the system design of MC in STINs from a system-level perspective?
- Q3: What will be the real-world applications that MC will have in STINs for future communication systems?

This article first provides an overview of MC in STINs in Fig. 1. The main contributions are summarized as follows.

- We present three deployment architectures for MC when integrating satellite networks into current TNs. Importantly, we provide a comprehensive introduction to these architectures, detailing their characteristics and differences in user pairing and scheduling in each architecture.
- We investigate critical challenges in designing the MC system in STINs from a wireless networking perspective. Specifically, we elaborate on the challenges in the establishment of satellite networks, the use of transmission strategies, the application of channel estimation techniques, and the execution of synchronization operations.
- We propose four typical applications of MC in current and future networks, including coverage enhancement, traffic offloading, collaborative sensing, and low-altitude communication. Then, a case study is conducted to show the improvement in coverage when applying MC compared to single-connectivity networks.

Finally, the article concludes with a discussion on future research directions for exploring additional technical opportunities of MC in STINs.

II. DEPLOYMENT ARCHITECTURES

Conventionally, with only one BS deployed, the traffic in the cell range can be extremely heavy due to the increasing demands for service and the growing number of UEs. This can lead to reduced bandwidth for served UEs and increased inter-cell and intra-cell interference. In the following subsections, we will discuss three typical deployment architectures of MC in STINs as shown in Fig. 2.

A. Multi-Satellite (MS)

Multiple satellites collaboration is one of the promising solutions to enhance satellite direct to cell communication. In this architecture, the available satellites are coordinated by a central processing unit (CPU), which is deployed on one of the low-earth orbit (LEO)/medium-earth orbit (MEO)/geostationary-earth orbit (GEO) satellites with sufficient computing power and capabilities [6]. Specifically, the CPU can be equivalently referred to as a central server (CS) or a central control unit (CCU); the satellite with CPU can also be referred to as the network controller (NC) or the central control satellite (CCS). The optical inter-satellite links (OISLs) can be adopted for connections between satellites. The OISLs between the CCS and other satellites, which are more commonly known as backhaul links, convey the necessary control signals.

When a UE uses the MS architecture, it will first initiate a connection request to the CCS. The CPU on it then conducts necessary calculations and arranges a cluster of satellites to simultaneously transmit data to the UE in the same time-frequency resource block. Clustering can be dynamic, and whether a handover is needed is determined by the received quality of service (QoS), the replacement of satellites in clusters, and the angle of the dome from the position of UE.

B. Single-Satellite Single-Base-Station (SS-SBS)

To further incorporate BS in TNs, the SS-SBS architecture can act as a foundation for network extensions to STINs. Note that this scenario indicates the potential availability of both a satellite and a BS for connection. Based on the time-division strategy, there are three modes of connection: Mode 1, where the UE is scheduled to be served by both a satellite and a BS; Mode 2, where the UE is only scheduled to be served by a satellite; Mode 3, where the UE is only scheduled to be served by a BS; and Mode 4, where the UE is neither scheduled by a satellite nor a BS [7].

A pair of available satellite and BS is initially selected to set the UE's connection into Mode 1. The availability of the current satellite is determined by the transmission




FIGURE 2. Deployment architectures of MC in STINs.

blockage and its inner mechanism switchover. In contrast, the availability of current BS is due to transmission blockage, unsatisfactory signal power, or UE's movement between cells. All of the above events will lead to handover. In addition, with the change of time, this connection status may not persist due to mobility of the current satellite and BS, and may thus shift to Mode 2, 3 or even 4.

C. Multi-Satellite Multi-Base-Station (MS-MBS)

The MS-MBS architecture is an ideal but generalized combination and extension of the above two setups. It not only covers the MS architecture but also extends the SS-SBS architecture. To reduce complexity in NTN-TN integration, one of the satellites is designed as a CCS to coordinate with the terrestrial core network via the NTN gateway. The BSs include terrestrial gNB stations and distributed access points (APs), all of which within a certain area are connected to a terrestrial TN CPU for coordinated transmission administration.

Note that unlike SS-SBS that coordinates the serving satellite and serving BS directly via the gateway, the MS-MBS architecture requires joint coordination of the NTN CPU and the TN CPU, as they each collect information of their cluster of satellites or ground BSs/access points (APs).

III. SYSTEM DESIGN CHALLENGES

In this section, we discuss four key challenges of MC in STINs from a system-level perspective, i.e., satellite networking, beamforming, channel estimation, and synchronization.

A. Satellite Networking

The iteration of each generation network needs to satisfy the requirement of compatibility. While the architecture of TN

has been involving in the past few decades and cannot be easily changed, the satellite network and its integration with TN are still at an early stage. Therefore, appropriate satellite networking schemes lay a foundation for STINs.

As mentioned, the available satellites should be organized properly to perform cooperative transmissions. The coordination of multiple satellites can be implemented in a variety of ways, depending on the cross-layer constellation designs. Two promising schemes are listed below, namely, cell-free (CF)-enabled networking and multi-tier-enabled networking.

1) *Cell-Free Satellite Network*: CF massive multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO), initially proposed in TNs, is anticipated to provide a new paradigm for satellite communication systems. In a traditional CF-enabled network, all APs concurrently serve all UEs in the same time-frequency resource block via time-division duplex (TDD) operation. Recently, scalable CF massive MIMO systems have been deemed more practical, with user-centric deployment through AP clustering emerging as a potential solution. Each UE has its own set of APs for services, and therefore, each AP collaborates with different APs when serving different UEs. Similarly, organized in a CF and scalable manner, satellites can be dynamically clustered to collaboratively communicate with terrestrial UEs at different locations, especially those with poor propagation conditions [8]. In this case, the CF structure can be leveraged in future ultra-dense LEO satellite networks to provide a macro-diversity gain for higher spectral efficiency (SE), energy efficiency (EE), and network flexibility.

2) *Multi-Tier Satellite Network*: The multi-tier satellite networks, or multi-altitude satellite networks, briefly refer to satellites distributed evenly across inclined circular orbits at different altitude levels [9]. They take advantage of the distinct

characteristics of satellites positioned at different altitudes of LEO, or MEO and GEO, and dynamically adjust their roles based on locations and specific service requirements of UEs. LEO satellites can provide high-speed data services and low-latency connections for UEs in urban areas, while MEO or GEO satellites support wider terrestrial coverage and navigation purposes. This mutual collaboration forms a coordinated network that offers complementary coverage and improved service delivery.

For example, when the UE experiences poor propagation conditions with the current LEO satellites, the satellite network can accurately locate the UE and seamlessly switch its connections to LEO satellites at a different altitude or position to ensure uninterrupted service. By employing this multi-altitude networking scheme, satellite networks can be more resilient to changes in UE density, interference, or environmental factors such as weather conditions. Moreover, as satellites can share the load based on their altitude-specific capabilities, more efficient resource management can be achieved, and the overall SE and EE of ultra-dense satellite networks can be improved.

However, implementing the above two satellite networking schemes can be challenging due to the high mobility of satellites. Although mutual information can be exchanged via OISLs between satellites, especially between the CCS and one of the other serving satellites, the channel state information (CSI) obtained during uplink training may not match the actual downlink transmissions. One possible solution is to compensate for this delayed CSI via a precoding strategy that uses the long-term characteristics of CSI uncertainty [10].

B. Beamforming

Beamforming has long been an effective strategy for achieving the desired directionality and gain. When designing MC systems in STINs, beamforming needs to be controlled so that the directions of multiple signals can be targeted at specific UEs or areas at almost the same time. This process can make full use of the desired signals received by UEs. In addition, by controlling the directions of transmitted signals, interference signals received by UEs can be mitigated, especially in environments where UEs are densely distributed. This will guarantee more reliable and high-quality communications and better user experience, and thus improve effective coverage and network throughput.

For example, in Fig. 3, the effects of beamforming and non-beamforming configurations are compared for a MS architecture, where m is the parameter for Nakagami- m fading. It is shown that beamforming counts for the improvement in coverage performance. After integrating satellites and BSs, the complexity of beamforming increases because multiple antennas need to be coordinated cooperatively. This problem even intensifies when the beam patterns are dynamically adjusted in response to UE mobility and their varying demands.

C. Channel Estimation

Channel estimation is also crucial for MC in STINs, as inaccurate CSI will downgrade the efficiency of uplink and downlink transmissions. In the uplink stage, the satellite/BS




FIGURE 3. Coverage probability versus SINR thresholds with different Nakagami- m parameters. The satellites are distributed with the density $\lambda_S = 1 \times 10^{-5}/\text{km}^2$ at an altitude of $H_S = 500$ km. The transmit power, antenna gain, and pathloss exponent are $p_d = 50$ dBm, $G_t = 30$ dBi, and $\alpha_N \approx 2.0$, respectively. The UEs are distributed on the earth surface with the density $\lambda_U = 4 \times 10^{-6}/\text{km}^2$, and the receive antenna gain is $G_r = 10$ dBi. The cases of beamforming and non-beamforming are compared.




FIGURE 4. Discrepancy between CDF of the signal received in the ideal channel and that in the estimated channels, with different numbers of pilots. The simulation parameters are the same as those in Fig. 3, except that $m = 2$.

employs multi-user detectors to retrieve the data symbols sent by UEs to reduce multi-user interference; in the downlink stage, the satellite/BS employ techniques such as precoding, beamforming, or MIMO and each UE adopts estimated channels to demodulate and decode the received signal. These implementations are heavily dependent on the CSI acquired at both the satellite/BS and UE, respectively. To harness the corresponding performance gains, satellites, BSs and UEs need to obtain CSI with sufficient accuracy [11]. Furthermore, MC requires UEs to establish multiple communication links, encompassing those in both the TN and NTN. Notably, NTN links experience significantly greater Doppler shifts and propagation delays compared to TN links, owing to the high velocity of movement and elevated satellite altitude in NTN.

Techniques such as pilot-based estimation can be used in the STIN MC system. For example, during the downlink process, pilot signals, which are pre-known to UEs, are periodically inserted prior to the data symbols that are intended for transmission by satellites and/or BSs. Generally, if an adequate number of orthogonal pilots are available, ensuring that not too many UEs share the same pilot, pilot contamination can be mitigated and the accuracy in channel estimation will be enhanced. Fig. 4 illustrates how the number of pilots influences the discrepancy between the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the signal received in the ideal channel and that in the estimated channels. The more accurately the channel is estimated, the smaller the CDF discrepancy will be. It is found that with an increasing number of pilots, the discrepancy narrows, which shows that effects of pilot contamination can be gradually alleviated.

D. Synchronization

Another important factor that makes cooperative transmission challenging for practical implementation is synchronization. Synchronization, also known as compensation for time delays, mainly results from the long varying propagation delays dependent on the satellite-direct-to-UE distance. However, robust downlink synchronization, for example, can be facilitated by the design of the synchronization signal block (SSB). In the following, we briefly demonstrate the process of conducting synchronization for the aforementioned three deployment architectures.

1) *MS*: Using UE positioning data from the Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) and ephemeris data of each coordinate satellite, the CCS performs coarse frequency shift compensation for the data streams from each satellite. It also manages the delay differences of these streams to ensure that they remain within the length of the cyclic prefix (CP). This process enables coarse symbol-level synchronization between data streams [12].

2) *SS-SBS*: When a ground UE requests cooperative transmission from an NTN satellite and a TN BS, the timing advances are calculated based on known factors such as the UE location, BS location, and satellite ephemeris. The satellite first calculates its timing advance to the UE according to the transmission time slot of its cooperative BS. Then, the satellite and BS select different transmission time slots so that signals from the satellite and BS arrive at the UE simultaneously [7].

3) *MS-MBS*: Similarly but with a step further, the CCS in NTN and the CPU in TN need to work closely for the more complex MS-MBS architecture. They first share UE positioning and CSI to establish a common consensus on the UE environment. Then, they collaboratively determine the best transmission strategy, including resource allocation and load balancing. Next, the CCS manages the coarse synchronization of the satellite signals, while the TN CPU aligns the timing of BS transmissions. Fine synchronization adjustments ensure that signals from satellites and BSs arrive at the UE with minimal delay discrepancies. By exchanging control information over dedicated links, the NTN CCS and the TN CPU coordinate the alignment of data streams to maximize signal

quality at the UE. Finally, a UE feedback loop provides real-time CSI to allow both entities to dynamically adjust transmission parameters. This collaboration process controlled by the NTN CCS and the TN CPU ensures that transmissions are effectively synchronized even with varying channel conditions and mobility of UE and satellites.

In summary, for TN-NTN joint transmissions, the exchange of signaling for CSI and transmitted signals is required. A trade-off must be struck between the performance gains of the system and the complexity of implementation.

IV. TYPICAL APPLICATIONS OF MC IN STINS

In this section, we present four typical applications that enable MC in STINs, as shown in Fig. 5, including coverage enhancement, traffic offloading, collaborative sensing, and low-altitude communication.

A. Coverage Enhancement

Due to the high cost and complexity of infrastructure deployment and maintenance, TNs, especially where traditional infrastructure faces geographical limitations, can often struggle to provide ubiquitous and sufficient coverage in remote areas with few BS or urban areas with heavy communication requirements. However, satellites can bridge this gap by providing complementary coverage to ensure that UEs in areas of high traffic or hard-to-reach areas remain connected.

Specifically, in urban areas, compared with single satellite communications, MC takes advantage of the existing TNs and reaps the “add-on” coverage by establishing communication links between satellite(s) and the UE who have already been served. In remote areas where terrestrial BSs are sparsely distributed or even hardly available, the UE could resort to multiple satellites for service provision instead of relying only on a single satellite [13]. Combining satellites and terrestrial BSs with MC technology will guarantee more robust and expansive coverage for UEs served.

B. Traffic Offloading

The increasing number of UEs and the booming number of communication and computation-intensive services have led to greater traffic restrictions. To address such problems, MC offers greater flexibility in offloading connections. For instance, the UE located at the edge of its serving BS’s coverage area may experience poor link quality. If a satellite connection offers better link quality, e.g., increased bandwidth or improved signal strength, the UE can shift its connection from the BS to the satellite. Conversely, if the UE experiences poor offloading performance when connected to a satellite, it can reassess its link quality with the BS and switch back to it if a superior connection can be provided.

It should be noted that the UE is designed to support satellite-terrestrial dual-mode communication, so that the connection shift can be realized. In addition, link quality can be determined using various metrics, including signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR), available bandwidth, latency, and link stability. It can also be influenced by atmospheric conditions, UE mobility, interference levels, and the distance between the UE and the BS or satellite.




FIGURE 5. A sketch of application scenarios of MC in STINs.

C. Collaborative Sensing

MC also plays an important role in collaborative sensing, especially for the detection of unauthorized entries and unknown targets. For instance, when unknown targets are detected, MC can provide seamless sensing capabilities in diverse environments such as mountainous and urban areas. On the contrary, BSs that perform sensing tasks in TNs can often be confronted with signal blockages due to irregular natural environments and dense buildings. By encompassing satellite links to provide additional detection feedback, robust and continuous sensing tasks can be guaranteed [14].

To be specific, while terrestrial BSs may lose line-of-sight (LoS) and experience signal degradation when the target moves within areas with densely forested mountainous or urban areas, satellites will maintain consistent sensing data streams due to their wide coverage. Sensing results can be shared with BSs via the satellite gateway and the data network. Although satellite sensing alone is less accurate than integrated sensing empowered by MC, general locations of the targets can be continuously recorded. When a BS regains its echo signals, MC-enabled sensing will be reactivated. This will ensure real-time tracking of targets regardless of their locations, and further enhance the reliability and precision of related intrusion detection systems.

D. Low-Altitude Communication

Due to the rise of low-altitude economy in recent years, effective air-ground coordination requires reliable and real-time communications with low-altitude platforms such as un-

manned aerial vehicles (UAVs), weather balloons, etc. In such cases, continuous connectivity to transmit data such as sensor readings, video information, and operating records to terrestrial stations is a vital prerequisite. However, when ground receivers lack upward-facing antennas or when upward-facing antennas are blocked in some directions, data transmission could be incomplete. MC can ensure uninterrupted communication by seamlessly switching UEs to available ground BSs and/or satellites. This can be extremely valuable for low-altitude communication in rural, remote, or maritime areas with few terrestrial infrastructures.

In addition, MC can also facilitate the expansion of the service range of low-altitude communications. As the number of low-altitude platforms grows, traffic management in the airspace remains a critical problem. MC can be used to improve both operational efficiency and regulatory compliance by navigating multiple moving platforms in a more organized and real-time manner without discontinuity of echo signals. This will facilitate the expansion of low-altitude economic activities, enable businesses to explore new service areas, and improve the quality and reliability of their offerings.

V. CASE STUDY: MULTI-CONNECTIVITY VERSUS SINGLE-CONNECTIVITY FOR COVERAGE ENHANCEMENT

In this section, we use coverage enhancement as a typical use case and provide simulation results to illustrate the effectiveness of MC in STINs. We explore MC for downlink transmission in the SS-SBS architecture and compare it with its single-connectivity (SC) counterparts of single-satellite and




FIGURE 6. Coverage probability against varying SINR thresholds under different connectivity schemes. The coverage of MC in STIN is provided by SS-SBS, and we benchmark SC cases, i.e., SC by only a satellite, and SC by only a BS in the TN.

single-BS. In this setup, a 50 km \times 50 km rural or remote area is considered, where the BSs are distributed with a density of $\lambda_T = 6 \times 10^{-3}/\text{km}^2$. The service radius and transmit power of a BS are $R_T = 8$ km and $P_T = 46$ dBm, respectively. The pathloss exponent in the TN is $\alpha_T = 3.5$, and we assume that there are four UEs in each BS's service area, with one of them being the typical UE for simulation analysis. In the NTN, the satellites are at altitude $H_N = 500$ km and are distributed with a density of $5 \times 10^{-7}/\text{km}^2$. The transmit power, main-lobe gain, side-lobe gain, and pathloss exponent are $P_N = 50$ dBm, $G_{ml} = 30$ dBi, $G_{sl} = 10$ dBi and $\alpha_N \approx 2.0$, respectively. The noise power on the UE side is -110 dBm. Both the BS and the satellite are assumed to be equipped with four antennas.

It can be observed from Fig. 6 that the coverage probability of all connectivity cases decreases as the SINR requirement increases. This finding aligns with our expectation, since larger SINR thresholds correspond to stricter requirements for signal quality, and this leads to a reduction in the probability of a successful connection. From Fig. 6, it is also shown that the coverage probability of STIN outperforms that of the satellite-only case and that of the TN-only case, particularly when the SINR requirement is low. This is because MC leverages the complementary strengths of both a satellite in the NTN and a BS in the TN and obtains a combined coverage. Moreover, as the SINR requirement becomes relatively higher, the coverage probability of STIN remains at least as high as the greater of that of the satellite-only case and that of the TN-only case. This shows that MC can make full use of the combined coverage and try its best to maintain more robust services for the system even under stricter SINR requirements.

VI. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS OF MC IN STINs

A. Interference Management in MC-Enabled STINs

Resource allocation optimization is a vital strategy to improve the performance of the STIN MC system. Although in MC, adding additional satellite links and/or terrestrial links can enhance the desired signals, the interference signal may also

increase. This consequently presents a trade-off between the increase of desired signals and that of interference signals: which dominates performance of overall system, and how will metrics change, such as SINR? Therefore, adaptive and dynamic beamforming, power allocation, user association and other factors need to be jointly optimized. Moreover, advanced tools such as machine learning (ML) or game theory also help adjust available resources while mitigating both inter-/intra-cell interference and inter-/intra-satellite interference.

B. Massive Access Technique in MC-Enabled STINs

Massive access technique is a promising technology for MC in STINs because it adds more flexibility and enables efficient management of concurrent connections. After adopting the MC communication mode, a UE will be served by more than one wireless link. However, with an increasing number of UEs, the number of links will be much larger. It remains a problem how to manage and maintain these additional links. In addition, a proper multiple access mode and successive interference cancellation (SIC) techniques need to be designed to enable a number of UEs to communicate simultaneously while mitigating the interference from messages destined for other UEs. Load balancing between NTN and TNs, dynamic clustering of TN UEs and NTN UEs, and minimizing handover times for more stable connections are also important issues.

C. Spectrum Sharing Policy between NTN and TN

Spectrum sharing allows satellites and BSs to access the same spectrum and optimize the utilization of available bandwidth in STINs. From a system-level perspective, it is important to ensure per-user performance while improving overall network capacity. MC brings more wireless links and leads to more severe interference of the same spectrum. However, reserved spectrum needs to be allocated to guarantee the operation of conventional equipment in TN and that in NTN. Their spectrum requirement may not be static and may vary with the area density of UEs and the demand for service. Given such cases, dynamic spectrum sharing policies count for overall performance. When conventional equipment becomes intensified, reserved spectrum is allocated with more bandwidth while less is allocated for shared spectrum, and vice versa.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this article, the architectures, challenges, and typical applications for the MC in STINs are provided. We introduced three general deployment architectures and discuss their characteristics. Then, fundamental challenges in terms of system design, namely satellite networking, beamforming, channel estimation, and synchronization, were explored, each followed by a brief discussion of solutions. Moreover, we presented four typical applications of MC in STINs and demonstrated their effectiveness through a case study on coverage enhancement. Finally, we outlined the critical and promising future research directions and hope that this article will provide valuable insights for the real-world design and implementation of MC in STINs towards future generation networks.

REFERENCES

- [1] 3GPP, “Solutions for NR to support non-terrestrial networks (NTN) (Release 16),” 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), Technical Report (TR) 38.821, 05 2021, version 16.1.0.
- [2] Y. Sun, M. Peng, S. Zhang, G. Lin, and P. Zhang, “Integrated satellite-terrestrial networks: Architectures, key techniques, and experimental progress,” *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 191–198, Jul. 2022.
- [3] C. Pupiales, D. Laselva, Q. De Coninck, A. Jain, and I. Demirkol, “Multi-connectivity in mobile networks: Challenges and benefits,” *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 116–122, Dec. 2021.
- [4] M. Majamaa, “Toward multi-connectivity in beyond 5g non-terrestrial networks: Challenges and possible solutions,” *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, pp. 1–7, Jan. 2024.
- [5] S. Morosi, A. Rago, G. Piro, F. Matera, A. Guidotti, M. De Sanctis, A. V. Coralli, E. Cianca, G. Araniti, and L. A. Grieco, “Terrestrial/non-terrestrial integrated networks for beyond 5g communications,” in *Space Data Management*. Springer, Mar. 2024, pp. 89–101.
- [6] B. Shang, X. Li, C. Li, and Z. Li, “Coverage in cooperative leo satellite networks,” *J. Commun. Inf. Netw.*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 329–340, Dec. 2023.
- [7] B. Shang, X. Li, Z. Li, J. Ma, X. Chu, and P. Fan, “Multi-connectivity between terrestrial and non-terrestrial mimo systems,” *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 5, pp. 3245–3262, May 2024.
- [8] J. Zheng, J. Zhang, H. Du, D. Niyato, B. Ai, M. Debbah, and K. B. Letaief, “Mobile cell-free massive mimo: Challenges, solutions, and future directions,” *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 140–147, Feb. 2024.
- [9] N. Okati and T. Riihonen, “Stochastic coverage analysis for multi-altitude leo satellite networks,” *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 27, no. 12, pp. 3305–3309, Oct. 2023.
- [10] Y. Omid, S. Lambotharan, and M. Derakhshani, “Tackling delayed csi in a distributed multi-satellite mimo communication system,” *arXiv:2406.06392*. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.06392>, 2024.
- [11] K.-X. Li, X. Gao, and X.-G. Xia, “Channel estimation for leo satellite massive mimo ofdm communications,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 7537–7550, Mar.
- [12] S. Yang, D. Wang, L. Liu, B. Wang, and C. Sun, “Distributed multiple leo satellites cooperative downlink power enhancement transmission scheme based on ofds,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Commun. Technol. (ICCT)*. IEEE, Feb. 2024, pp. 1208–1213.
- [13] L. Bai, L. Zhu, X. Zhang, W. Zhang, and Q. Yu, “Multi-satellite relay transmission in 5g: Concepts, techniques, and challenges,” *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 38–44, Sep. 2018.
- [14] X. Li, B. Shang, and Q. Wu, “A bistatic sensing system in space-air-ground integrated networks,” in *Proc. IEEE/CIC Int. Conf. Commun. China (ICCC)*, Aug. 2024, pp. 1823–1827.

BIOGRAPHIES

Xiangyu Li (xiangyuli@sjtu.edu.cn) received the M.S. degree in Electrical and Computer Engineering from Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA, in 2023, and he is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree with Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China, in the EIT-SJTU Joint PhD Program. His research interests include space-air-ground integrated networks, non-terrestrial networks, satellite communications, and performance analysis of wireless systems.

Bodong Shang (bdshang@eitech.edu.cn) received his Ph.D. degree from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, USA, in 2021, and he was a Postdoctoral Research Associate at Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA. He is currently an Assistant Professor at College of Information Science and Technology, Eastern Institute of Technology (EIT), Ningbo, China. His research areas are wireless communications and networking, including space-air-ground-sea integrated networks, non-terrestrial networks, and space information networks.