

Effective Joint Scheduling and Power Allocation for URLLC-Oriented V2I Communications

Jing Li, Yong Niu, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Hao Wu, *Member, IEEE*, Bo Ai, *Fellow, IEEE*,
Tony Q. S. Quek, *Fellow, IEEE*, Ning Wang, *Member, IEEE*, Sheng Chen, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—Future vehicular applications, such as safety guarantee and autonomous driving, rely on vehicular-to-infrastructure (V2I) ultra-reliable low-latency communication (URLLC). This paper investigates the flow scheduling and power allocation mechanism to improve the transmission capacity of the downlink V2I orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM) URLLC network. Given the stringent latency requirements, short package transmission is adopted and the approximation of the finite blocklength codes capacity is introduced for the algorithm design. Also in the system design, we fully consider the effect of Doppler spread caused by high vehicular mobility. We formulate the problem of maximizing the number of flows that satisfy delay and reliability requirements while meeting the constrained radio and power resources. To solve this challenging non-convex problem, we propose a joint optimization framework for iterative flow scheduling and power allocation. In the scheduling phase, we propose a deferred acceptance based flow scheduling algorithm by leveraging matching game. In the power allocation phase, we design a collection-reallocation algorithm for local power optimization while fully considering the dynamic characteristics of V2I scenarios. Numerical results show that the proposed scheme effectively enhances the system performance compared to other state-of-art mechanisms.

Index Terms—URLLC, OFDM, flow scheduling, power allocation, matching theory.

I. INTRODUCTION

Intelligent transportation system (ITS) is emerging as one of the most fundamental scenarios in the future communication era, which promises to improve network availability and reliability, reduce latency, and conserve energy [1], [2]. Among the technologies proposed for ITS, enhanced vehicle communication provides a more efficient and safer traffic experience for our daily life. On the one hand, vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) and vehicle-to-pedestrian (V2P) communications adopt the device-to-device (D2D) mode, which supports extended sensing and enhanced mobile broadband (eMBB) services [3]. On the other hand, vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communication achieves point-to-multipoint transmission, extends transmission range, and provides high data rates for nodes in coverage, which

promises to enable ultra-reliable low-latency communication (URLLC) for mission-critical applications, such as traffic management, autonomous driving, collision prevention, etc. [4], [5]. Typically, URLLC in V2I imposes strict requirements on latency (e.g., 3–10 ms) and reliability (e.g., 10^{-5}), with the payload size limited to around 300 bytes [6]. To meet these stringent metrics, research and development for V2I URLLC are rapidly advancing.

From the standards aspect, the third generation partnership project (3GPP) introduces the fifth generation (5G) new radio (NR) to vehicular systems, which proposes advanced physical (PHY) layer design and medium access control (MAC) layer operation for V2I communications [7]. 5G NR achieves flexible transmission durations and minimum control signaling overhead, where mini-slots, containing 2, 4 or 7 symbols, as short and agile transmission units can be applied to facilitate low-latency applications [8]. Orthogonal frequency-division multiplexing (OFDM) forms the baseline waveform in NR mobile systems, which can easily be combined with multiple antenna configurations for spectral efficiency and reliability enhancement. Evaluated by [9], 5G NR outperforms other standards, in terms of reliability, latency and data rates, which plays an essential role in motivating URLLC cases of vehicular scenarios. In the transmission phase, short-packet with finite blocklength codes (FBC) is introduced to satisfy latency requirements, where the achievable data rate can typically be modeled as a function of decoding error probability (DEP) and blocklength [10]. The authors of [11] have further extended the above result to quasi-static fading channels, and the work [12] has demonstrated the feasibility of achieving URLLC requirements in the 5.9 GHz vehicular system, providing a holistic study for promoting future mobile URLLC applications.

However, due to the limited available resources in mobile vehicular networks, scheduling and resource allocation becomes a significant part of practical URLLC system design. On the one side, considering the constrained radio resources, it is necessary to design the scheduling policies that satisfy the latency objectives of all users while addressing the uncertainty of the vehicle channel [13]. Hence, several recent efforts have been made to achieve this goal. The studies [14] and [15] reviewed the packet scheduling in the existing vehicular URLLC systems and presented potential challenges, thereby providing deep insights for further research. The work [13] innovatively modeled the scheduling problem in the mobile network as a Markov decision process, and proposed a dynamic programming based strategy to solve it. In addition, some researchers concentrated on the joint URLLC and eMBB traffic scheduler, attempting to maximize the utility of eMBB traffic while satisfying URLLC demands, for which

Jing Li, Yong Niu, Hao Wu and Bo Ai are with the State Key Laboratory of Advanced Rail Autonomous Operation, Beijing Jiaotong University, Beijing 100044, China, and also with Beijing Engineering Research Center of High-speed Railway Broadband Mobile Communications, Beijing 100044, China (E-mails: jinglee@bjtu.edu.cn, niuy11@163.com, hwu@bjtu.edu.cn, boai@bjtu.edu.cn.)

Tony Q. S. Quek is with the Information Systems Technology and Design, Singapore University of Technology and Design, Singapore 487372, and also with the Department of Electronic Engineering, Kyung Hee University, Yongin 17104, South Korea (e-mail: tonyquek@sutd.edu.sg).

Ning Wang is with School of Information Engineering, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou 450001, China (E-mail: ienwang@zzu.edu.cn).

Sheng Chen is with School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK (E-mail: sqc@ecs.soton.ac.uk).

puncturing-based transmission schemes [16]–[18] have been proposed. Nevertheless, these mechanisms mainly focus on static or low-mobility scenarios and thus cannot be directly applied to V2I networks.

On another side, power allocation is also crucial for the V2I URLLC system, especially in multi-user cases. Typically, this is a challenging task due to the time-varying channel state and the complex interactions among transmission signal power, blocklength and DEP. To tackle this challenging problem, several recent literature have conducted the related research [19]–[22]. Specifically, the work [19] aimed to maximize the overall capacity while guaranteeing the reliable and delay requirements of V2V links, which was formulated as a joint optimization problem of mode selection. A reinforcement learning algorithm was adopted to solve the formulated optimization. By characterizing the distribution of extreme events through extreme value theory, the study [20] proposed a federated learning framework to minimize the power consumption in V2V networks with URLLC constraints, which also yielded significant gains in reducing queue length. By noticing the coexistence of URLLC and eMBB services in vehicular networks, the studies [21] and [22] exploited the resource management schemes based on network slicing and puncturing technique to improve performance. These works devised feasible solutions for vehicular resource allocation, whereas the prioritized link scheduling as an important part of quality of service (QoS) guarantee has not been fully considered. In addition, efforts on satisfying URLLC requirements for V2I links are still sparse.

Motivated by the above discussion, we propose a joint framework for flow scheduling and power allocation in a multi-user downlink OFDM V2I network, aiming to maximize the number of successful flows while guaranteeing their specific delay and reliability constraints. The proposed scheme fits well with the dynamic channel and enables efficient power utilization, serving as a lightweight candidate technique to support vehicular URLLC networks. The main contributions are summarized as follows.

- Considering the short-package transmission and vehicular mobility, we construct the system model for the downlink V2I URLLC based on the 5G NR standard, which specifies the practical antenna model, channel model and data rate. In this V2I network, to guarantee that the power-constrained road-side base station (RSU) can successfully send critical messages to multiple running vehicles, we maximize the number of successful flows via the joint optimization of flow scheduling and power allocation.
- Since the proposed optimization problem is non-convex and difficult to tackle directly, we decouple it into the sub-problems of flow scheduling and power allocation. The flow scheduling sub-problem can be viewed as a matching process between unscheduled flows and available frequency bins (FBs), which can be solved by the deferred acceptance based flow scheduling algorithm (DAFS). By fully leveraging the quasi-static characteristic of the vehicular channel, we realize the local power optimization by the collection-reallocation algorithm (CRA), which enhances the successful transmission probability

effectively. Joint scheduling and power allocation is then achieved by involving the iterative optimization between the two sub-problems.

- Extensive simulations are conducted to evaluate the performance of our proposed scheme under diverse network environments, including different numbers of users, power constraints, delay requirements and mobility speeds. The results show that the proposed algorithm always outperforms the existing works, in terms of the completed flows and system throughput.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the system model of the multi-user V2I URLLC system and formulates the optimization problem to maximize the number of successful flows. To solve this challenging problem, a joint flow scheduling and power allocation algorithm (JSPA) is proposed in Section III. Then Section IV provides numerical results and Section V concludes this paper.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Network Model

The downlink V2I network is illustrated in Fig. 1, where the power-constrained RSU attempts to send safety-critical information to K vehicles indexed by $k \in \mathcal{K} = \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ via short packages. For ease of exposition, we assume that vehicles are equipped with single antenna and are traveling in the same direction at a constant speed of v . Denote the sizes of the contents to be transmit by $\mathcal{N} = \{N_1, N_2, \dots, N_K\}$, where N_k represents the payload size of the k -th flow. Herein, to satisfy the users' latency and reliability requirements, each URLLC flow should be successfully transmitted within D_k mini-slots at a maximum block error rate (BLER) of ϵ_k . Thus, we summarize the QoS requirements of each flow as $\{N_k, D_k, \epsilon_k\}$.

In the transmission design, to avoid strong co-channel interference among different flows as well as to achieve the low-latency objective, OFDM modulation is employed with a subcarrier spacing of 15 kHz and supporting mini-slot transmission, which complies with the 5G NR standard [24], [25]. In this case, a mini-slot in the time domain and 12 subcarriers in the frequency domain form the basic scheduling




Fig. 1. Vehicular network.

unit called the resource block (RB). There are a total of $|\mathcal{I}| \cdot |\mathcal{J}|$ RBs, where $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \dots, I\}$ and $\mathcal{J} = \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$ represent respectively the sets of mini-slots and FBs. For clarity, we denote the RB in the i -th mini-slot and j -th FB by (i, j) .

Since both radio and power resources are limited in this V2I network, it is challenging to fulfill the QoS requirements of all flows. Therefore, the RSU performs both radio resource scheduling and transmit power allocation, based on the principles: 1) each RB can only be occupied by one flow at most, and 2) the total power consumption should be no more than the constrained power. In practice, resource management should also take into account the Doppler shift caused by vehicular mobility, and this is considered in this paper.

B. Antenna Model

Conventional studies assume the antenna radiation pattern at the RSU as omnidirectional since vehicles can be in any direction relative to it, which is however not throughput-effective [26], [27]. To achieve performance improvement, we deploy four 90° sector antennas on the RSU, while neglecting the interference effects of antenna co-location [28]. Such an antenna configuration has the same transmission characteristics as the omnidirectional ones and can realize the maximum gain $G_0 = 6$ dBi [29].

For vehicles, we consider the popular 3D antenna model in 3GPP TR 37.885, the power pattern of which is described as a function of horizontal angle θ and vertical angle ψ , with the total gain expressed as:

$$A(\theta, \psi) = -\min\{-(A_H(\theta) + A_V(\psi)), 3\} \text{ [dBi]}, \quad (1)$$

where $A_H(\theta)$ and $A_V(\psi)$ represent the antenna gains in the horizontal plane and the vertical plane, respectively.

C. Channel Model

As multiple learning techniques [30] have been developed to perform mobile channel estimation, it is reasonable to assume that the perfect channel state information (CSI) is available at the RSU, which is consistent with the studies [20], [31], [32]. We consider a quasi-static flat fading channel in which the channel gain remains constant in the coherent time \mathcal{T}_c but varies independently across consecutive coherent-time durations. The most common definition of coherence time is given by [33]

$$\mathcal{T}_c = \sqrt{\frac{9}{16\pi f_d^2}} = \frac{0.423}{f_d}, \quad (2)$$

where $f_d = \frac{v}{c} f_c$ is the maximum Doppler frequency shift, with c being the speed of light and f_c the carrier frequency. Let τ denote the mini-slot duration, and $\mathcal{T}_c \geq \tau$ holds. We define $T_c = \lceil \frac{\mathcal{T}_c}{\tau} \rceil$ as the coherent interval. Besides, the received power at the k -th vehicle in RB (i, j) can be written as

$$P_{i,j,k}^r = \beta P_{i,j,k} G_0 A(\theta_{i,j,k}, \psi_{i,j,k}) g_{i,j,k} d_{i,j,k}^{-\alpha}, \quad (3)$$

where β is a constant proportional to $(\frac{\lambda}{4\pi})^2$ with λ being the wavelength, G_0 is the antenna gain at the RSU, α is the

path loss (PL) exponent, $P_{i,j,k}$ and $A(\theta_{i,j,k}, \psi_{i,j,k})$ are the transmit power and the antenna gain at the k -th vehicle in RB (i, j) , while $d_{i,j,k}$ is the distance between the RSU and the k -th vehicle. Moreover, based on the channel measurement and analysis results [34]–[36], it is reasonable to assume that the channel gain $g_{i,j,k}$ follows the Rician fading, with the amplitude probability density function (PDF) [37]:

$$f(g) = \frac{2(K_f+1)g}{\Omega} e^{-K_f} e^{-\frac{(K_f+1)}{\Omega}g^2} I_0\left(2\sqrt{\frac{K_f(K_f+1)}{\Omega}}g\right), \quad (4)$$

where K_f denotes the Rician K-factor, Ω is the average envelope, and $I_0(\cdot)$ is the zero-order modified Bessel function of the first kind.

D. Data Rate

Although RBs in OFDM systems are designed to be orthogonal, the high-speed motion of vehicles causes the Doppler shift, which destroys the orthogonality between subcarriers and introduces inter-RB interference. Hence, the interference power received by vehicle k in RB (i, j) , denoted by $S_{i,j,k}$, includes both inter-RB and intra-RB interferences, and can be expressed as

$$S_{i,j,k} = x_{i,j,k} S_{i,j,k}^e + S_{i,j,k}^a. \quad (5)$$

In (5), $x_{i,j,k}$ is a binary variable with $x_{i,j,k} = 1$ only when RB (i, j) is allocated to vehicle k . $S_{i,j,k}^e$ is the inter-RB interference from vehicle k' of RB (i, j') , given by [38]

$$S_{i,j,k}^e = \frac{P_{i,j,k}^r \Lambda(T_o f_d)^2}{2L} \times \left(\sum_{m=1}^L \sum_{n=1, n \neq m}^L \frac{1}{((Lj+n) - (Lj'+m))^2} \right), \quad (6)$$

in which $P_{i,j,k}^r$ and L stand for the received power at RB (i, j) from RB (i, j') and the number of subcarriers per RB, while Λ and T_o are the number of OFDM symbols and the duration of each symbol. In addition, the intra RB (i, j) interference can be calculated as

$$S_{i,j,k}^a = \frac{P_{i,j,k}^r \Lambda(T_o f_d)^2}{2L} \left(\sum_{m=1}^L \sum_{n=1, n \neq m}^L \frac{1}{(m-n)^2} \right). \quad (7)$$

Therefore, the signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) of the k -th vehicle in RB (i, j) is given by

$$\gamma_{i,j,k} = \frac{P_{i,j,k}^r}{S_{i,j,k} + N_0 B}, \quad (8)$$

where N_0 and B denote the bandwidth of each RB and the noise power density, respectively.

As aforementioned, URLLC systems involve small payloads and employ short packet transmission, rendering the classic Shannon capacity no longer appropriate to describe the maximum achievable data rate. To this end, the FBC capacity formula given in [10] is adopted to characterize the relationship among the achievable rate, latency and BLER,

with the achievable rate of vehicle k in RB (i, j) given by

$$R_{i,j,k} = x_{i,j,k} B \left(\log(1 + \gamma_{i,j,k}) - \frac{Q^{-1}(\epsilon_k)}{\ln 2} \sqrt{\frac{V(\gamma_{i,j,k})}{N_k}} \right), \quad (9)$$

where $Q^{-1}(\epsilon_k)$ stands for the inverse function of the Gaussian tail function $Q(\epsilon_k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\epsilon_k}^{\infty} e^{-t^2/2} dt$, and $V(\gamma_{i,j,k}) = 1 - (1 + \gamma_{i,j,k})^{-2}$ defines the channel dispersion.

Then based on the joint channel coding theory [39], we encode the data packets of each vehicle over all the scheduled RBs, and the maximum number of the received data bits for the k -th vehicle can be approximated as

$$C_k = \sum_i \sum_j \tau R_{i,j,k}. \quad (10)$$

E. Problem Formulation

In this V2I network, the RSU receives the transmission requests with QoS requirements from vehicles at mini-slot 0. Then the transmission of the desired data flows begins when the scheduling is completed. Note that the RSU has the complete knowledge of vehicles' location and the system resource utilization. Our objective is to fully exploit the transmission ability of the V2I network, i.e., to accomplish the traffic demand of URLLC services as much as possible, by jointly optimizing the flow scheduling and power allocation, given the constrained radio resource and limited transmission power. Mathematically, this joint flow scheduling and power allocation optimization problem can be described as

$$\mathcal{P} : \max \sum_k \delta_k, \quad (11)$$

$$\text{s.t. } C_k \geq N_k, \quad \forall k, \quad (12)$$

$$x_{i,j,k} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall i, j, k, \quad (13)$$

$$\sum_k x_{i,j,k} \leq 1, \quad \forall i, j, \quad (14)$$

$$x_{i,j,k} = 0, \quad \forall i \geq D_k, \quad (15)$$

$$x_{i,j,k} P_{i,j,k} \geq 0, \quad \forall i, j, k, \quad (16)$$

$$\sum_i \sum_j \sum_k x_{i,j,k} P_{i,j,k} \leq P_{\text{sum}}, \quad \forall i, j, k, \quad (17)$$

$$\delta_k = \begin{cases} 1, & C_k \geq N_k \text{ within } D_k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

The objective value $\sum_k \delta_k$ is the number of successful flows. Constraint (12) ensures that the payload demand of N_k bits for user k is met. Constraints (13) and (14) indicate that each RB is assigned to at most one flow, to eliminate mutual interference. To meet the delay requirement, constraint (15) specifies that vehicle k is served within the first D_k time slots. Constraint (16) guarantees the non-negative power allocation, and constraint (17) restricts the total available power of the RSU to no more than P_{sum} . Constraint (18) defines the value of δ_k , i.e., only when the target payload demand of flow k is satisfied in the required delay D_k , $\delta_k = 1$; otherwise $\delta_k = 0$. Therefore, the joint flow scheduling and power allocation optimization is to maximize the number of successful flows, while guaranteeing their specific rate, delay and reliability

requirements as well as meeting the RSU's radio resource and power constraints.

III. PROPOSED ALGORITHM FOR URLLC SERVICE SCHEDULING AND POWER ALLOCATION

The joint flow scheduling and power allocation optimization formulated in Subsection II-E involves both binary and continuous variables, and it is a mixed-integer nonlinear programming problem (MINLP), which is NP-hard and difficult to solve directly. Inspired by the concurrent scheduling mechanism in time division multiple access systems, we propose a heuristic algorithm to solve it. Specifically, we separately address the flow scheduling and power allocation sub-problems while considering content sizes, latency, and reliability requirements. Subsequently, an efficient joint optimization framework is designed to solve this MINLP problem iteratively.

A. Sub-problem 1: Flow scheduling

Given that each flow can use multiple RBs but each RB can only be assigned to one flow, the previous studies [32], [40] modeled the flow scheduling as a many-to-one matching game (MG) and solve it accordingly. However, we notice that each flow tends to transmit in consecutive RBs with stable CSI, i.e., not change its transmission state within a coherence-time duration unless completed. Therefore, we reorganize the entire radio resource and formulate a one-to-one MG as follows.

Definition 1 (Matching Concept). Let $\hat{\mathcal{J}}(i)$ be the set of available radio resource in the i -th mini-slot, each element of which represents an idle FB. Let $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ denote the set of remaining flows that load URLLC services. Initially, we have $\hat{\mathcal{J}}(1) = \mathcal{J}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. A two-side matching is defined as the mapping result between flows in $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ and resource in $\hat{\mathcal{J}}(i)$, with each available FB exclusively assigned to one flow for collision avoidance, where

$$1) \quad \forall j \in \hat{\mathcal{J}}, \mathcal{M}(j) \in \hat{\mathcal{K}} \text{ and } |\mathcal{M}(j)| = 1,$$

$$2) \quad \forall k \in \hat{\mathcal{K}}, \mathcal{M}(k) \in \hat{\mathcal{J}}(i) \cup \emptyset \text{ and } |\mathcal{M}(k)| = \{0, 1\}.$$

Herein, $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ represents the partner of player j or k under matching \mathcal{M} , and $|\mathcal{M}(\cdot)|$ denotes the cardinality of the matched partners. To avoid resource waste and possible extra latency, FBs should be fully allocated, such that $|\mathcal{M}(j)| = 1$ holds. However, due to the limited radio resource, not all flows can be scheduled such that $|\mathcal{M}(k)| = \{0, 1\}$.

Definition 2 (Preference List). The matching \mathcal{M} contains two groups of players whose preference relations are utilized to describe the decision process. On the one hand, each flow aims to maximize its achievable rate, and its preference list can be built by calculating (9) over all available FBs. Denote the preference relation by \succ_k , we have $j \succ_k j' \Leftrightarrow R_{i,j,k} > R_{i,j',k}$. On the other hand, each FB tends to accept the flow most likely to be successfully transmitted, with its preference relation denoted by \succ_j . Herein, $k \succ_j k' \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{N_k \cdot D_k} > \frac{1}{N_{k'} \cdot D_{k'}}$ indicates that priority ones are flows with strict latency requirements and light loads, in that a) flows with strict latency constraints should be prioritized to increase the probability of successful transmission; b) the content size N_k should be considered to realize the optimization goal of completing URLLC services

as much as possible. Since content-loaded flows take up a large amount of resources, they are less preferred than lightly loaded ones.

Definition 3 (Deferred Acceptance Based Algorithm). *Since both the FBs and flows are selfish and rational, the above matching process can be formulated as a game in which the preference list of each player is strict and complete [41]. According to [42], there exist stable states for such a game and the classical deferred acceptance (DA) algorithm can find the stable matching that maximizes the sum-utility.*

Therefore, we propose the DA-based solution to obtain the optimal flow scheduling results, as shown in Algorithm 1. The matching procedure is performed at the RSU side, which receives the overall URLLC requests from vehicles beforehand and captures real-time system parameters such as vehicle location, flow scheduling, FB allocation and preference lists. Since no FB proposes to a flow twice, the complexity is bounded by the number of flows, denoted as $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{K}|)$.

Algorithm 1: Deferred Acceptance Based Flow Scheduling Algorithm (DAFS)

Input : Set of flows that have not been scheduled, $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$, and their corresponding content sizes, $\hat{\mathcal{N}}$; Set of available radio resource in time slot i , $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(i)$;

Output: Flow scheduling results; Index of each scheduled flow, k_μ .

- 1 Each flow in $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ builds its preference list over $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(i)$ by calculating (9);
 - 2 Each flow proposes to its top-ranked FB j that has not rejected it before;
 - 3 **if** j receives one request **then**
 - 4 accept it;
 - 5 **if** j receives two or more requests **then**
 - 6 accept the top-ranked one by calculating $\frac{1}{N_k \cdot D_k}$;
 - 7 Repeat steps 2-6 until no flow request or each j has been assigned.
-

B. Sub-problem 2: Local Power Allocation

We adjust the power of the scheduled flows to optimize the transmission. In view of the quasi-static channel, it is reasonable to locally adjust the power in each \mathcal{T}_c , with the basic idea of: 1) collecting available power from flows that have more power than needed to complete their payloads before the tolerable delay; 2) and reallocating it to flows that cannot meet the latency requirements, thereby increasing the number of completed flows. Algorithm 2 shows the two-phase pseudo-code of the proposed algorithm, where $a = \lceil \frac{i}{T_c} \rceil$ denotes the index of the current coherent interval.

1) *Phase I:* First we calculate the data rate of each flow at the average power \bar{P} , and then check whether its transmission deadline D_{k_μ} lies in the current coherent-time duration. If so, we further examine whether and how much available power this flow can provide, as indicated by lines 4-14. Specifically,

Algorithm 2: Collection-Reallocation Algorithm (CRA)

Input : Index of each scheduled flow at time slot i , k_μ ; Delay and BLER requirements, and remaining content size of each scheduled flow, D_{k_μ} , ϵ_{k_μ} , and \hat{N}_{k_μ} ; Initial transmit power of each flow, \bar{P} ;

Output: Completed number of flows δ ;

- 1 **Phase I: Available power collection**
 - 2 **foreach** scheduled flow k_μ **do**
 - 3 Calculate corresponding R_{i,j,k_μ} by (9);
 - 4 **if** $D_{k_\mu} \leq a \cdot \tau \cdot T_c$ **then**
 - 5 **if** $R_{i,j,k_\mu} \cdot (D_{k_\mu} - (a-1)\tau T_c) \geq \hat{N}_{k_\mu}$ **then**
 - 6 Decrease power allocated to k_μ from \bar{P} to P_{k_μ} so that:
 - 7 $R'_{i,j,k_\mu} \cdot (D_{k_\mu} - (a-1)\tau T_c) = \hat{N}_{k_\mu}$;
 - 8 $\delta = \delta + 1$;
 - 9 $\Delta P_a = \Delta P_a + (\bar{P} - P_{k_\mu}) \cdot (D_{k_\mu} - (a-1)\tau T_c)$;
 - 10 **else**
 - 11 $\mathcal{K}_\mu = \mathcal{K}_\mu \cup k_\mu$;
 - 12 $\hat{N}_{k_\mu} = \hat{N}_{k_\mu} - R_{i,j,k_\mu} \cdot (D_{k_\mu} - (a-1)\tau T_c)$;
 - 13 $\hat{N}_{k_\mu} = \hat{N}_{k_\mu} \cup \hat{N}_{k_\mu}$;
 - 14 **else**
 - 15 $\hat{N}_{k_\mu} = \hat{N}_{k_\mu} - R_{i,j,k_\mu} \cdot \tau \cdot T_c$;
 - 16
 - 17 **Phase II: Power reallocation**
 - 18 **if** $|\mathcal{K}_\mu| \geq 1$ **then**
 - 19 Sort elements in \hat{N}_{k_μ} in ascending order;
 - 20 **for** $l = 1 : |\mathcal{K}_\mu|$ **do**
 - 21 **if** $\Delta P_a > 0$ **then**
 - 22 Calculate power required by flow l to achieve $R'_{i,j,l} \cdot (D_l - (a-1)\tau T_c) = \hat{N}_l$;
 - 23 **if** $P_l - \bar{P} \leq \Delta P_a$ **then**
 - 24 $\delta = \delta + 1$;
 - 25 $\Delta P_a = \Delta P_a$
 - 26 $- (P_l - \bar{P}) \cdot (D_l - (a-1)\tau T_c)$.
-

this algorithm obtains the local achievable data of flow k_μ by multiplexing its data rate R_{i,j,k_μ} and transmission duration $(D_{k_\mu} - (a-1)\tau T_c)$, after which the following two cases exist. a) When the achievable data size exceeds its remaining content, decrease the power to P_{k_μ} that just can complete its transmission. Then increase the number of completed flows by 1 and store the available power in P_a , as in lines 9-10. b) When flow k_μ fails to accomplish transmission within the required delay, record it in \mathcal{K}_μ and store its unfinished data size \hat{N}_{k_μ} in \hat{N}_{k_μ} , as described in lines 12-14. As for the flow that does not end in this interval, just update its remaining content size \hat{N}_{k_μ} as given in line 16. In this phase, the total available power in the a -th T_c , denoted by ΔP_a , is collected.

2) *Phase II:* Considering that the flows with less content remaining tend to be successful and deserve priority for power reallocation, Phase II ranks the content sizes in \hat{N}_{k_μ} in line

19. Then ΔP_a is iteratively assigned to the flows most likely to complete until all the flows are considered or the available power runs out, as shown in lines 20-26. In this process, once a flow's payload is accomplished, increase δ by 1 and subtract the power consumed in ΔP_a . The computational complexity of Algorithm 2 is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{J}|^2)$.

C. Joint Flow Scheduling and Power Allocation

Based on the solutions to the flow scheduling and power allocation sub-problems, we propose the JSPA to iteratively solve \mathcal{P} . The basic idea is to schedule flows for idle FBs and adjust local power at the first mini-slot of each coherent-time interval or when a flow transmission completes. To illustrate the principle clearly, an example of 5 FBs is presented in Fig. 2, with the specific operations of JSPA at the following time points:

- 1) $aT_c + 1$: No idle FB, run CRA for all ongoing flows;
- 2) i_1 : Run DAFS for the idle FB 4 and CRA for the newly scheduled flow;
- 3) $(a+1)T_c + 1$: Run DAFS for FBs 5, 2 and then conduct CRA for all ongoing flows;
- 4) i_2 : For FB 1, execute the same procedure as in i_1 ;
- 5) i_3 : For FB 3, execute the same procedure as in i_1 .




Fig. 2. Illustration of JSPA principle.

The corresponding pseudo-code is summarized in Algorithm 3. In the system, I mini-slots are divided by coherent interval T_c into A segments, where $I = A \cdot T_c$. After the initialization, the algorithm sequentially executes the joint optimization algorithm for A intervals. In each T_c , we capture the CSI, update the vehicles' location, and initialize the available power as 0. Then in lines 4-15, we make scheduling decisions and conduct power allocation mini-slot by mini-slot. Specifically, it is reasonable to adjust the power of the scheduled flows at the first mini-slot of T_c according to the updated system parameters, before which whether idle FB exists is checked. If so, run Algorithm 1 to assign the flows from $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ to idle FBs, and then conduct the CRA in Algorithm 2 for the transmitting flows. In the following mini-slots, once a

Algorithm 3: Joint Scheduling and Power Allocation Algorithm (JSPA)

Input : Set of vehicles \mathcal{K} ; Set of radio resource \mathcal{J} ; Initial transmit power of each flow \bar{P} ; Content sizes of overall flows \mathcal{N} ;

Initialization: Remaining flows $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}$; Remaining content sizes $\hat{\mathcal{N}} = \mathcal{N}$; Completed flows $\delta = 0$;

```

1 for  $a = 1 : A$  do
2   Update system parameters;
3   Reallocated power  $\Delta P_a = 0$ ;
4   if slot  $i = ((a - 1)T_c + 1)$  then
5     if idle FB exists then
6       foreach idle FB do
7         Assign a flow  $k'$  from  $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$  by using
          Algorithm 1;
8         Update  $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \hat{\mathcal{K}} - k'$ ;
9       Execute CRA using Algorithm 2 for all
          scheduled flows;
10     $i = i + 1$ ;
11    for slot  $i = ((a - 1)T_c + 2) : aT_c$  do
12      if idle FB exists then
13        Execute steps 6-8;
14      Conduct CRA using Algorithm 2 for newly
          scheduled flows;
15       $i = i + 1$ ;
16     $a = a + 1$ ;
17 return  $\delta$ .
```

flow reaches its content requirement, the corresponding FB turns idle. At this time, execute the same procedure as lines 6-8 and conduct the CRA for the newly scheduled flows. In this way, we fully utilize the overall radio resource in each interval and maximize the number of completed flows.

In Algorithm 3, the outer loop has A iterations, while in the inner loop, the part (lines 11-15) has at most $|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{J}||\mathcal{K}|$ iterations, which is generally more than the part (lines 4-9), and dominates the inner loop complexity. Thus, the worst-case computational complexity of Algorithm 3 is $\mathcal{O}(A|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{J}||\mathcal{K}|)$, which can be implemented in practice.

Besides, since the completed flows are upper-bounded by a finite value due to the limited RB resource and total power, Algorithm 3 guarantees to converge.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In this section, we provide numerical results to validate the performance of our proposed scheme for V2I OFDM URLLC, and investigate the impacts of the network parameters, such as number of users, transmit power, delay requirement and mobility speed, on the achievable system performance.

A. Simulation Setup

In the simulation, we consider a wireless vehicular network in the 5.9 GHz band, where an RSU is located at the center of

the coverage area with a radius of 500 m. Vehicles requiring URLLC services are randomly distributed within the cell and are moving in the same direction at a constant speed of 60 km/h. The antenna heights of the RSU and vehicles are respectively 5 m and 1.5 m [29]. According to the 5G NR specifications [43], we set the duration of one mini-slot to 0.28 ms, consisting of 4 OFDM symbols. Then each RB is composed of 12 subcarriers with 15 kHz spacing in the frequency domain and 4 OFDM symbols in the time domain. Thus, the bandwidth of each RB is 180 kHz. Note that we consider URLLC services with different QoS requirements in the evaluation, which is more practical than the mean payload size assumption in most of the previous works. The complete list of the simulation parameters is given in Table I. Unless otherwise specifically stated, these default parameters are used in the simulations.

TABLE I
DEFAULT SYSTEM PARAMETERS

Parameter	Symbol	Value
Carrier frequency	f	5.9 GHz
System bandwidth	W	20 MHz
Number of mini-slots	I	17
Number of FBs	J	20
Symbol duration	T_o	66.67 μ s
Total transmit power	P_{sum}	30 dBm
Noise power density	N_0	-169 dBm/Hz [39]
Rician K-factor	K_f	7
PL exponent	α	2
Speed of vehicles	v	60 km/h
Number of vehicles	K	34
BLER	ϵ_k	1×10^{-5}
Latency requirement	D_k	3 – 5 ms [6]
Package size	Q_k	2400 – 3000 bits [6], [32]


Based on the analysis of [1], [32], [44], we choose the number of completed flows and the system throughput as the key evaluation metrics, and we consider the four benchmark schemes for performance comparison, which are

- 1) MG only (MGO) [45]: This scheme utilizes MG to solve the flow scheduling sub-problem while allocating equal power to all ongoing flows.
- 2) Local power allocation only (LPAO): This scheme runs the proposed scheme without matching. Specifically, it randomly selects an unscheduled flow for each idle FB and conducts the CRA for local power allocation.
- 3) Water-filling power allocation only (WPAO) [46]: This scheme utilizes random flow scheduling while conducting water-filling power allocation for all scheduled flows.
- 4) Random transmission scheme (RTS): This scheme runs random flow scheduling for idle FBs while maintaining the same average power during transmission.


All the simulation results are averaged over 500 realizations.

B. Performance Under Different Numbers of Users


Fig. 3 compares the performance versus the number of users for the proposed JSPA and four benchmark schemes.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Fig. 3. Comparison of performance as the functions of number of users for five schemes: (a) number of completed flows, (b) system throughput, and (c) maximum delay experienced.

From Fig. 3a, it can be observed that as the number of request users increases, the completed flows for all the

five schemes increase until reaching the saturation values of completed flows at 13 for RTS, 24 for WPAO, 27 for LPAO, 35 for MGO and 39 for JSPA, respectively. Evidently, the proposed JSPA attains the best performance, and the proposed local power allocation (LPAO) outperforms the traditional water-filling mechanism (WPAO). Therefore, the simulation results demonstrate that both our flow scheduling and power allocation are effective in improving the transmission capacity.

Fig. 3b plots the achievable system throughput of the five schemes as the functions of user numbers. Again we observe that our JSPA achieves the best performance, MGO is better than LPAO and WPAO, while RTS has the worst performance. It can also be seen that the achievable system throughput of JSPA and MGO decrease as K increases. This is owing to the greedy nature of the matching process, which tends to select flows with stricter latency requirements and lighter payloads.

In Fig. 3c, the maximum delay represents the completion time of the last successful flow, i.e., the actual total time consumption. It can be seen that as the number of users increases, the total time consumptions of RTS, WPAO, LPAO

and JSPA increase until reaching their maximum values. For MGO, the time consumption first increases with K since more flows can be completed. However, since the matching process tends to select flows with stricter latency requirements and lighter payloads, its time consumption starts to reduce slightly from $K = 40$ onward. Note that the maximum delay or the actual total time consumption is only a parameter reflecting the transmission process, rather than a performance metric. That is, it should be seen in the context of the number of completed flows depicted in Fig. 3a. From this context, the proposed JSPA is particularly effective. For example, under light loads of $K \leq 40$, our JSPA consumes less time to complete more flows than the other schemes.

C. Performance Under Different Maximum Power Constraints

As shown in Fig. 4, both the number of completed flows and system throughput increase with the available total power P_{sum} . This is because larger available power enables higher data rate and lower transmission delay, whereby more flows can be transmitted successfully in the limited time. It can be seen that our proposed JSPA outperforms the other schemes, in terms of both number of completed flows and achievable system throughput. We also notice that the performance gap between the best JSPA and the second-best MGO narrows as P_{sum} increases, because almost all flows can be accomplished with sufficient power. However, since most practical wireless communication systems are power-constrained, efficient and effective resource allocation is required.

D. Performance Under Different Delay Requirements

To investigate the impact of delay requirements on system performance, in the simulation, we define a stricter delay model of 3 – 4 ms and a looser delay model of 4 – 5 ms. Fig. 5 compares the performance of the five schemes, in terms of completed flows and system throughput, as the functions of the ratio (%) of stricter-delay flows to looser-delay flows.

It can be seen from Fig. 5a that our JSPA completes the most flows, which is expected. Also as the percentage of stricter-delay flows increases, fewer flows are completed. This is because when the delay requirements are looser, precious radio resource can be allocated first to those flows with tighter requirements. Then, once a flow is accomplished, one of the remaining flows with looser delay demand can be scheduled to the idle FB and transmitted successfully. However, in the case with only stricter-delay flows, all the flows require to be considered for transmission immediately or they easily fail to meet the delay requirements.

Fig. 5b shows that our JSPA attains the best throughput performance and its achievable throughput remains constant as the percentage of stricter-delay flows increases, demonstrating its effectiveness. However, the system throughput of MGO, LPAO, WPAO and RTS first decrease with the increase of the percentage of stricter-delay flows, and then improve slightly when the percentage exceeds 80%. The reason is that when most flows impose stricter latency requirements, the total time consumption drops with less transmitted data, which is slightly beneficial to throughput.






Fig. 4. Comparison of performance as the functions of total power constraint for five schemes: (a) number of completed flows, and (b) system throughput.



(a)



(b)


Fig. 5. Comparison of performance as the functions of delay requirement for five schemes: (a) number of completed flows, and (b) system throughput.

E. Impact of Mobility


Fig. 6 depicts the achievable performance of the five schemes in terms of number of completed flows and system throughput, given different mobility speeds. As expected, our JSPA achieves the best performance in both the number of completed flows and system throughput, indicating its ability to adapt to mobile scenarios. It can also be seen that both the numbers of completed flows and achievable system throughput for JSPA, MGO, LPAO and WPAO degrade significantly with the increase of mobile speed. The reason is that when the Doppler shift enlarges as the speed increases, the RB interference increases, which is detrimental to the network performance. Besides, the performance of the worst RTS scheme degrades slightly as the mobility speed increases, since it can only transmit a small amount of flows at low data rates, thereby less affected by RB interference.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has proposed an effective joint flow scheduling and power allocation (JSPA) scheme to maximize the number



(a)



(b)

Fig. 6. Comparison of performance as the functions of mobility speed for five schemes: (a) number of completed flows, and (b) system throughput.

of successful flows in the downlink V2I OFDM URLLC network. Since this problem is NP-hard, we have derived a tractable framework to decouple it into the sub-problems of flow scheduling and power allocation. As the flow scheduling process can be viewed as a MG between unscheduled flows and available FBs, we have proposed the low-complexity DAFS solution. We have also designed the CRA for local power allocation, which fully leverages the quasi-static nature of the vehicular channel and further improves the system performance. Subsequently, the overall iterative optimization algorithm has been summarized as JSPA. Numerical results provided have demonstrated the superiority of the proposed JSPA solution over the existing solutions, in terms of the number of completed flows and system throughput.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. R. Ghanem, V. Jamali, Y. Sun, and R. Schober, "Resource allocation for multi-user downlink MISO OFDMA-URLLC systems," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 68, no. 11, pp. 7184–7200, Nov. 2020.
- [2] B. Wang, R. Shi, F. Shi, and J. Hu, "MmWave-NOMA-based low-latency and high-reliable communications for enhancement of V2X services," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 57049–57062, 2020.

- [3] Z. Dong, *et al.*, "Dynamic manager selection assisted resource allocation in URLLC with finite block length for 5G-V2X platoons," *IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technology*, vol. 71, no. 11, pp. 11336–11350, Nov. 2022.
- [4] M. Klapez, C. A. Grazia, and M. Casoni, "Application-level performance of IEEE 802.11p in safety-related V2X field trials," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 3850–3860, May 2020.
- [5] H. Yang, K. Zheng, L. Zhao, and L. Hanzo, "Twin-timescale radio resource management for ultra-reliable and low-latency vehicular networks," *IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technology*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 1023–1036, Jan. 2020.
- [6] H.-S. Park, *et al.*, "Handover mechanism in NR for ultra-reliable low-latency communications," *IEEE Network*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 41–47, Mar./Apr. 2018.
- [7] H. Ji, *et al.*, "Ultra-reliable and low-latency communications in 5G downlink: Physical layer aspects," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 124–130, Jun. 2018.
- [8] S. A. Ashraf, *et al.*, "Supporting vehicle-to-everything services by 5G new radio release-16 systems," *IEEE Commun. Standards Mag.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 26–32, Mar. 2020.
- [9] W. Anwar, N. Franchi, and G. Fettweis, "Physical layer evaluation of V2X communications technologies: 5G NR-V2X, LTE-V2X, IEEE 802.11bd, and IEEE 802.11p," in *Proc. VTC 2019-Fall* (Honolulu, HI, USA), Sep. 22–25, 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [10] Y. Polyanskiy, H. V. Poor, and S. Verdú, "Channel coding rate in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 2307–2359, May 2010.
- [11] W. Yang, G. Durisi, T. Koch, and Y. Polyanskiy, "Quasi-static multiple-antenna fading channels at finite blocklength," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 4232–4265, Jul. 2014.
- [12] J. Yan and J. Härrri, "On the feasibility of URLLC for 5G-NR V2X sidelink communication at 5.9 GHz," in *Proc. GLOBECOM 2022* (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), Dec. 4–8, 2022, pp. 3599–3604.
- [13] A. Destounis, G. S. Paschos, J. Arnau, and M. Kountouris, "Scheduling URLLC users with reliable latency guarantees," in *Proc. WiOpt 2018* (Shanghai, China), May 7–11, 2018, pp. 1–8.
- [14] G. J. Sutton, *et al.*, "Enabling technologies for ultra-reliable and low latency communications: From PHY and MAC layer perspectives," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 2488–2524, thirdquarter 2019.
- [15] M. E. Haque, *et al.*, "A survey of scheduling in 5G URLLC and outlook for emerging 6G systems," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 34372–34396, 2023.
- [16] M. Almekhlafi, *et al.*, "A downlink puncturing scheme for simultaneous transmission of URLLC and eMBB traffic by exploiting data similarity," *IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technology*, vol. 70, no. 12, pp. 13087–13100, Dec. 2021.
- [17] A. K. Bairagi, *et al.*, "Coexistence mechanism between eMBB and uRLLC in 5G wireless networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 69, no. 3, pp. 1736–1749, Mar. 2021.
- [18] M. Darabi, V. Jamali, L. Lampe, and R. Schober, "Hybrid puncturing and superposition scheme for joint scheduling of URLLC and eMBB traffic," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 1081–1085, May 2022.
- [19] H. Yang, X. Xie, and M. Kadoch, "Intelligent resource management based on reinforcement learning for ultra-reliable and low-latency IoV communication networks," *IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technology*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 4157–4169, May 2019.
- [20] S. Samarakoon, M. Bennis, W. Saad, and M. Debbah, "Distributed federated learning for ultra-reliable low-latency vehicular communications," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 1146–1159, Feb. 2020.
- [21] R. M. Sohaib, *et al.*, "Intelligent resource management for eMBB and URLLC in 5G and beyond wireless networks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 65205–65221, 2023.
- [22] Q. Chen, H. Jiang, and G. Yu, "Service oriented resource management in spatial reuse-based C-V2X networks," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 91–94, Jan. 2020.
- [23] Y. Sun, *et al.*, "Surrogate-assisted evolutionary deep learning using an end-to-end random forest-based performance predictor," *IEEE Trans. Evolutionary Comput.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 350–364, Apr. 2020.
- [24] A. A. Zaidi, *et al.*, "OFDM numerology design for 5G new radio to support IoT, eMBB, and MBSFN," *IEEE Commun. Standards Mag.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 78–83, Jun. 2018.
- [25] W. Kim and B. Shim, "Ultra-mini slot transmission for 5G+ and 6G URLLC network," in *Proc. VTC 2020-Fall* (Victoria, BC, Canada), Nov. 18–Dec. 16, 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [26] E. Abdul-Rahman and D. N. Aloï, "Design of a 5G sub-6 GHz vehicular cellular antenna element with consistent radiation pattern using characteristic mode analysis," *Sensors*, vol. 22, article no. 8862, pp. 1–16, Nov. 2022.
- [27] T. T. de Almeida, *et al.*, "Comparative analysis of a vehicular safety application in NS-3 and Veins," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 620–629, Jan. 2022.
- [28] M. Noor-A-Rahim, G. G. M. N. Ali, H. Nguyen, and Y. L. Guan, "Performance analysis of IEEE 802.11p safety message broadcast with and without relaying at road intersection," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 23786–23799, 2018.
- [29] "3GPP TR 37.885 V15.3.0-Study on evaluation methodology of new Vehicle-to-Everything (V2X) use cases for LTE and NR," Sophia Antipolis, France, Jun. 2019.
- [30] M. M. Awad, K. G. Seddik, and A. Elezabi, "Low-complexity semi-blind channel estimation algorithms for vehicular communications using the IEEE 802.11p standard," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 1739–1748, May 2019.
- [31] X. Li, *et al.*, "Joint power control and resource allocation mode selection for safety-related V2X communication," *IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technology*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 7970–7986, Aug. 2019.
- [32] C.-H. Fang, K.-T. Feng, and L.-L. Yang, "Resource allocation for URLLC service in in-band full-duplex-based V2I networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 70, no. 5, pp. 3266–3281, May 2022.
- [33] Y. S. Cho, J. Kim, W. Y. Yang, and C.-G. Kang, *MIMO-OFDM Wireless Communications With MATLAB*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2010.
- [34] S. Yan, R. Malaney, I. Nevat, and G. W. Peters, "Location verification systems for VANETs in Rician fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technology*, vol. 65, no. 7, pp. 5652–5664, Jul. 2016.
- [35] J. Gozalvez, M. Sepulcre, and R. Bauza, "IEEE 802.11p vehicle to infrastructure communications in urban environments," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 176–183, May 2012.
- [36] J. Wang, *et al.*, "Network-ELAA beamforming and coverage analysis for eMBB/URLLC in spatially non-stationary Rician channels," in *Proc. ICC 2022* (Seoul, Korea), May 16–20, 2022, pp. 3508–3513.
- [37] M. A. Al-Jarrah, K.-H. Park, A. Al-Dweik, and M.-S. Alouini, "Error rate analysis of amplitude-coherent detection over Rician fading channels with receiver diversity," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 134–147, Jan. 2020.
- [38] T. Wang, J. G. Proakis, E. Masry, and J. R. Zeidler, "Performance degradation of OFDM systems due to Doppler spreading," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 1422–1432, Jun. 2006.
- [39] J. Cheng, C. Shen, and S. Xia, "Robust URLLC packet scheduling of OFDM systems," in *Proc. WCNC 2020* (Seoul, Korea), May 25–28, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [40] T. Höbller, *et al.*, "Stable matching for wireless URLLC in multi-cellular, multi-user systems," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 5228–5241, Aug. 2020.
- [41] Y. Xiao, D. Niyato, K.-C. Chen, and Z. Han, "Enhance device-to-device communication with social awareness: A belief-based stable marriage game framework," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 36–44, Aug. 2016.
- [42] E. A. Jorswieck, "Stable matchings for resource allocation in wireless networks," in *Proc. DSP 2011* (Corfu, Greece), Jul. 6–8, 2011, pp. 1–8.
- [43] J. Sachs, *et al.*, "5G radio network design for ultra-reliable low-latency communication," *IEEE Network*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 24–31, Mar./Apr. 2018.
- [44] L. Li, *et al.*, "Resource Allocation and Computation Offloading in a Millimeter-Wave Train-Ground Network," *IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technology*, vol. 71, no. 10, pp. 10615–10630, Oct. 2022.
- [45] S. Sekander, H. Tabassum, and E. Hossain, "Decoupled uplink-downlink user association in multi-tier full-duplex cellular networks: A two-sided matching game," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 16, no. 10, pp. 2778–2791, Oct. 2017.
- [46] S. Zhang, B. Di, L. Song, and Y. Li, "Sub-channel and power allocation for non-orthogonal multiple access relay networks with amplify-and-forward protocol," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 2249–2261, Apr. 2017.



Jing Li received the M.E. degree from Beijing Jiaotong University, China, in 2020, where she is currently pursuing her Ph.D. degree. Her research interests include millimeter wave communications and medium access control.



Yong Niu (IEEE Senior Member) received the B.E. degree in Electrical Engineering from Beijing Jiaotong University, China in 2011, and the Ph.D. degree in Electronic Engineering from Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, in 2016. His research interests are in the areas of networking and communications, including millimeter wave communications, device-to-device communication, medium access control, and software-defined networks. He is currently an Associate Professor with the State Key Laboratory of Rail Traffic Control and Safety, Beijing Jiaotong

University. During November 2014 to April 2015, he visited University of Florida, FL, USA as a Visiting Scholar. He received the Ph.D. National Scholarship of China in 2015, Outstanding Ph. D Graduates and Outstanding Doctoral thesis of Tsinghua University in 2016, and Outstanding Ph. D Graduates of Beijing in 2016. He has served as Technical Program Committee (TPC) member for CHINACOM 2015 and IWCMC 2017, and also session chair for IWCMC 2017 and CHINACOM 2017.



Hao Wu (IEEE Member) received the Ph.D. degree in information and communication engineering from Harbin Institute of Technology in 2000. She is currently a full professor with the State Key Lab of Rail Traffic Control and Safety at Beijing Jiaotong University (BJTU), China. She has published more than 100 papers in international journals and conferences. Her research interests include Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), security and QoS issues in wireless networks (VANETs, MANETs and WSNs), wireless communications, and Internet of

Things (IoT). She is a member of IEEE and a reviewer of its major conferences and journals in wireless networks and security.



Bo Ai (IEEE Fellow) received his M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Xidian University, China, in 2002 and 2004, respectively. He is a full professor and Ph.D. degree candidate advisor with the State Key Laboratory of Rail Traffic Control and Safety at Beijing Jiaotong University, China. He is the deputy director of the State Key Laboratory of Rail Traffic Control and Safety. He has authored/co-authored six books and published over 230 academic research papers. He holds 21 invention patents. He is an Institution of Engineering and Technology fellow.

He is an associate editor of IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics and an editorial committee member of Wireless Personal Communications.




Tony Q. S. Quek (IEEE Fellow) received the B.E. and M.E. degrees in electrical and electronics engineering from the Tokyo Institute of Technology in 1998 and 2000, respectively, and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering and computer science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 2008. Currently, he is the Cheng Tsang Man Chair Professor with Singapore University of Technology and Design (SUTD) and ST Engineering Distinguished Professor. He also serves as the Director of the Future Communications R&D Programme, the Head

of ISTD Pillar, and the Deputy Director of the SUTD-ZJU IDEA. His current research topics include wireless communications and networking, network intelligence, non-terrestrial networks, open radio access network, and 6G.

Dr. Quek has been actively involved in organizing and chairing sessions, and has served as a member of the Technical Program Committee as well as symposium chairs in a number of international conferences. He is currently serving as an Area Editor for the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS.

Dr. Quek was honored with the 2008 Philip Yeo Prize for Outstanding Achievement in Research, the 2012 IEEE William R. Bennett Prize, the 2015 SUTD Outstanding Education Awards – Excellence in Research, the 2016 IEEE Signal Processing Society Young Author Best Paper Award, the 2017 CTTC Early Achievement Award, the 2017 IEEE ComSoc AP Outstanding Paper Award, the 2020 IEEE Communications Society Young Author Best Paper Award, the 2020 IEEE Stephen O. Rice Prize, the 2020 Nokia Visiting Professor, and the 2022 IEEE Signal Processing Society Best Paper Award. He is a Fellow of IEEE and a Fellow of the Academy of Engineering Singapore.



Ning Wang (IEEE Member) received the B.E. degree in communication engineering from Tianjin University, Tianjin, China, in 2004, the M.A.Sc. degree in electrical engineering from The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada, in 2010, and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering from the University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada, in 2013. From 2004 to 2008, he was with the China Information Technology Design and Consulting Institute, as a Mobile Communication System Engineer, specializing in planning and design of

commercial mobile communication networks, network traffic analysis, and radio network optimization. From 2013 to 2015, he was a Postdoctoral Research Fellow with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of British Columbia. Since 2015, he has been with the School of Information Engineering, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, China, where he is currently an Associate Professor. He also holds adjunct appointments with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada, and the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada. His research interests include resource allocation and security designs of future cellular networks, channel modeling for wireless communications, statistical signal processing, and cooperative wireless communications. He has served on the technical program committees of international conferences, including the IEEE GLOBECOM, IEEE ICC, IEEE WCNC, and CyberC. He was on the Finalist of the Governor Generals Gold Medal for Outstanding Graduating Doctoral Student with the University of Victoria in 2013.



Sheng Chen (IEEE Fellow) received the B.Eng. degree in control engineering from the East China Petroleum Institute, Dongying, China, in 1982, the Ph.D. degree in control engineering from City University, London, in 1986, and the higher doctoral (D.Sc.) degree from the University of Southampton, Southampton, U.K., in 2005. He held research and academic appointments with the University of Sheffield, the University of Edinburgh, and the University of Portsmouth, U.K., from 1986 to 1999.

Since 1999, he has been with the School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, where he is a Professor of Intelligent Systems and Signal Processing. His research interests include adaptive signal processing, wireless communications, modeling and identification of nonlinear systems, neural network and machine learning, intelligent control system design, evolutionary computation methods, and optimization. Professor Chen has authored over 700 research papers. He has 19,000+ Web of Science citations with h-index 60, and 37,000+ Google Scholar citations with h-index 82. Dr Chen was elected to a fellow of the United Kingdom Royal Academy of Engineering in 2014. He is a fellow of Asia-Pacific Artificial Intelligence Association (FAAIA), a fellow of IET, and an original ISI Highly Cited Researcher in engineering (March 2004).