

Wireless Channel Modeling based on Extreme Value Theory for Ultra-Reliable Communications

Niloofar Mehrnia* and Sinem Coleri†

*Koc University Ford Otosan Automotive Technologies Laboratory (KUFOTAL), Sariyer, Istanbul, Turkey, 34450
Email: nmehrnial7@ku.edu.tr

†Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Koc University, Istanbul, Turkey, 34450
Email: scoleri@ku.edu.tr

Abstract—A key building block in the design of ultra-reliable communication systems is a wireless channel model that captures the statistics of rare events and significant fading dips. Ambitious reliability objectives, on the order of $10^5 - 10^9$ packet error rate, only make sense when they are related to a statistical model of the environment in which the system is deployed. In this study, we propose a novel methodology based on extreme value theory (EVT) to statistically model the behavior of extreme events in a wireless channel for ultra-reliable communication. This methodology includes techniques for fitting the lower tail of the distribution to the generalized Pareto distribution, determination of optimum threshold over which the tail statistics are derived, derivation of optimum stopping condition on the sufficient number of samples required to apply EVT, and finally an assessment of the validity of the derived model. The analysis demonstrates that the proposed algorithm decreases the number of required samples for modeling the tail statistics by about 7×10^5 , and provides the best fit to the collected data and performs much better than the conventional methods based on the extrapolation of the average statistics in the ultra-reliable regime.

Index Terms—EVT, Channel modeling, Ultra reliability, URLLC, 5G.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ultra-reliable and low-latency communication (URLLC) is an essential part of beyond 5th generation (5G) networks with the potential to enable mission-critical applications, such as remote control of robots, self-driving cars, and remote surgeries [1]-[3]. In URLLC, the targeted packet error rate is in the range of $10^{-5} - 10^{-9}$, while the acceptable latency is on the order of milliseconds or less [3], [4]. Addressing the strict requirements of URLLC necessitates fundamental breakthroughs in the statistical modeling of the wireless channel at the physical layer, incorporating novel techniques to analyze the lower tail of the distributions with the extremely low probabilities, and handling and optimizing large amounts of data to realize these low probability events. The right approach to channel modeling is the key to achieve URLLC, not only at the physical layer but also at the upper layers, i.e., data link layer and network layer.

The physical layer studies on channel modeling at URLLC focus on either a unified framework by extrapolating a wide range of practically important channel models to extend their applicability for an ultra-reliability regime of operation [3], or the proposal of new channel parameters incorporating extreme reliability requirements into the communication [5]-[7]. [3] proposes a simple power-law expression for estimating the tail of the cumulative distribution function of block fading channels in the regime of extremely rare events by extrapolating the

commonly used practical fading models. On the other hand, [5] and [6] proposes a new channel parameter by challenging the definition of coherence time, during which channels are considered to be static for an average performance of traditional cellular and WiFi networks. Instead, a more nuanced notion of coherence time, considering an ultra-reliability regime, is defined as the time over which a channel is predictable to given reliability. Besides, [7] provides an alternative performance measure for the reliability of the channel, considering that the exact knowledge of the channel is not available at the ultra-reliability level. Accordingly, [7] suggests averaged reliability, suitable for dynamically changing environments, and probably correct reliability, where we assign confidence that the reliability target will be met. However, there exists no wireless channel modeling framework to derive and verify these ultra-reliability statistics. The main challenge is the requirement of an extensive amount of data to capture the statistics of rare events and usage of novel statistical tools to guarantee the stability of the resulting distributions with the minimum amount of data. As a result, deriving a proper wireless channel model is extremely important since model uncertainty and/or mismatch degrade the communication performance by several orders of magnitude, which is not acceptable at URLLC [7].

Extreme Value Theory (EVT) provides a powerful and robust framework for the analysis of ultra-reliable communication by characterizing the extreme events that form the lower tail of a distribution [3]. EVT has been used in the upper layers to model tail statistics of queue length and delay [8]-[12], or in wireless channel modeling to provide a fit to the whole distribution of large scale or small scale fading [13]-[17]. [8] and [9] propose methods to reduce the number of vehicular users with large queue lengths by applying EVT on the extreme queue lengths. Also, [10]-[12] utilize EVT to derive closed-form asymptotic expressions for the throughput and packet error rate to choose the best communication link with the maximum throughput. Nevertheless, these studies use the existing average statistics-based channel models, which corresponds to the mode extrapolation in the ultra-reliable region. [13], [14], and [16] fit extreme value distribution (EVD) to the whole path-loss or power distribution and then claim that EVD can be used to model fading in wireless channel better than the well-known models. Additionally, in [15] and [17], generalized extreme value (GEV) distribution is used to model the small scale fading at maritime communication, and root-mean-square (RMS) delay spread at V2V communication,

respectively. However, EVT has never been incorporated into wireless channel modeling to model the tail statistics nor to use the theorems for the consistency of the distributions, stopping conditions on determining the sufficient number of samples required in EVT, and validation procedures to address reliability constraint at the URLLC levels.

The goal of this paper is to propose a novel channel modeling methodology at URLLC to derive the lower tail statistics of communication using extreme value theory while efficiently dealing with a massive amount of corresponding data, for the first time in the literature. The modeling approach adopts EVT to 1) determine the optimum threshold over which we derive the tail statistics and guarantee the validity and stability of the model, 2) define the stopping condition to determine the amount of data necessary to model the tail characteristics, and 3) assess the validity of the final model by the usage of probability plots. The main contributions of this work are as follows:

- We propose a detailed channel modeling approach at URLLC using extreme value theory for the first time in the literature. The methodology includes techniques for fitting the tail distribution to the generalized Pareto distribution (GPD), determination of optimum threshold and optimum stopping condition, and assessment of model validity.
- We derive the tail parameters by fitting GPD to the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) samples extracted from either Auto-Regressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA)-Generalized Auto-Regressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (GARCH) model or declustering method. Both ARIMA-GARCH and declustering approaches are employed in this study to remove the dependency among the observations and provide EVT input by the necessarily i.i.d. samples.
- We propose a methodology for determining the optimum threshold over which the tail characteristics are derived in the channel modeling procedure, for the first time in the literature. In this regard, we combine two complementary methods, mean residual life and parameter stability methods attained by the extreme value theory.
- We propose the Minimum Sample Size Determination (MSSD) Algorithm to specify the stopping conditions on the number of measured samples, sufficiently large enough to model the channel tail parameters in the URLLC region, by extending the applicability of the method initially presented in [18].
- We propose a validation procedure using the probability plots to test the precision of the channel model obtained by extreme value theory. We utilize the probability-probability (PP) plot and quantile-quantile (QQ) plot to assess the Pareto model's goodness of fit.
- We demonstrate the superiority of the proposed framework in terms of fitting to the collected data within the engine compartment of the vehicle, compared to the conventional methods based on the extrapolation of the average statistics in the ultra-reliable regime.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews the basics of extreme value theory, relative applications, and its requirements. Section III proposes a novel framework to estimate the channel with ultra-reliability constraints by taking

the advantages of EVT and provides an algorithm that specifies the optimal stopping conditions in the determination of the minimum sample size required for applying EVT. Measurement setup and performance evaluation are presented in Section IV. Finally, concluding remarks are given in Section V.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Extreme Value Theory

EVT is a powerful tool for characterizing the probabilistic distribution for the occurrence of extreme events with low probability. Although EVT has been used for a long time in a wide variety of fields, it has been recently applied in the communication engineering for analyzing the network traffic, worst-case delay, and ultra-reliable communication [8][19]. In general, we can divide EVT applications into two categories. In the first one, we model the asymptotic distribution of the maxima/minima of a long finite sequence of random variables by the generalized extreme value (GEV) distribution. In the second application, we concern the distribution of the values exceeding a given threshold [20], and model it by the generalized Pareto distribution (GPD). Since in ultra-reliable communication, we consider all the extreme values exceeding a threshold rather than just maxima/minima, we focus on the second category of EVT applications. In this section, we briefly introduce the extreme value theory and its major results that are used in developing methodologies in the upcoming sections.

Theorem 1. *Let $X = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]$ be a sequence of independent random variables with common distribution function F , then for large enough threshold u , the distribution function of the values exceeding u , is approximated by generalized Pareto distribution (GPD) defined as*

$$H(X - u | X > u) = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{\xi(X - u)}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right)^{-1/\xi}. \quad (1)$$

where ξ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are shape and scale parameters, respectively [21].

Proof. Let X has a cumulative distribution function F , and let $M_n = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$. It is proven in [22] that for large enough sample size n ,

$$\Pr\{M_n \leq u\} \approx F^n(u),$$

where,

$$F^n(u) = \exp\{-[1 + \xi(\frac{u - \mu}{\sigma})]^{-1/\xi}\}, \quad (2)$$

is in the form of GEV distribution, and μ , ξ , and σ are the location, shape, and scale parameters, respectively [22], [23]. By taking the logarithm from both sides of Eqn. (2), and using Taylor series expansion for large values of u , we obtain

$$\Pr\{X > u + y | X > u\} = \left[1 - \frac{\xi y}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right]^{-1/\xi}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma + \xi(u - \mu). \quad (4)$$

□

Theorem 1 implies that the threshold excesses of i.i.d. random samples have distribution within the GPD family. The consequences of Theorem 1 are given in the following corollaries. Corollaries 1.1 and 1.2 will be used in Section III-C to evaluate the optimum threshold, while Corollary 1.3 will be utilized in Section III-D to evaluate the minimum number of samples sufficiently enough to estimate the Pareto parameters.

Corollary 1.1. *If we suppose that GPD is a valid model for the distribution of the excesses beyond a threshold u_0 , then the expected value of excesses is a linear function of threshold $u > u_0$, such that*

$$E(X - u | X > u) = \frac{\sigma_u}{1 - \xi}, \quad (5)$$

where $\sigma_u = \sigma_{u_0} + \xi u$ is the scale parameter at threshold u , and ξ and σ_{u_0} are the shape and scale parameters of Pareto distribution for threshold u_0 .

Proof. If GPD is a reasonable model for data exceeding a threshold u_0 , then the model should be consistent for a higher threshold u [24]. Also, since the random variable Y with generalized Pareto distribution has expectation function as

$$E(Y) = \frac{\sigma}{1 - \xi}, \quad (6)$$

then for all $u > u_0$,

$$E(X - u | X > u) = \frac{\sigma_u}{1 - \xi}, \quad (7)$$

where $\sigma_u = \sigma_{u_0} + \xi u$. \square

Corollary 1.2. *If u_0 is a valid threshold for excesses modeled by GPD, then estimates of both shape parameter (ξ) and scale parameter (σ) should be a linear function of the threshold for $u > u_0$.*

Proof. If a generalized Pareto distribution is a reasonable model for the excesses over the threshold u_0 with the corresponding σ_{u_0} and ξ parameters, then for all thresholds $u > u_0$, GPD is still valid to model the excesses. The shape parameters of Pareto distributions corresponding to the thresholds u_0 and u are identical, while the scale parameter of Pareto distribution at threshold level u follows Eqn. (4). Hence

$$\sigma_u = \sigma_{u_0} + \xi(u - u_0). \quad (8)$$

It can be inferred from Eqn. (8) that the scale parameter changes with u unless $\xi = 0$. We can rearrange Eqn. (8) and compute the modified scale parameter of Pareto distribution as

$$\sigma^* = \sigma_u - \xi u, \quad (9)$$

where scale parameter is constant with respect to u as a result of Eqn. (8). However, the estimates of Pareto distribution parameters versus threshold can not be exactly constant, but should be linear in $u > u_0$ [22], [25]. \square

Corollary 1.3. *If the sample size n is sufficiently large to estimate the tail distribution using GPD accurately, then maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of Pareto parameters (σ and ξ) should be normally distributed, hence any function of MLE such as the return level given by*

$$r_m = u + \frac{\sigma}{\xi} [(m\zeta_u)^\xi - 1], \quad (10)$$

should be normally distributed, where r_m , return level, is the maximum block value expected to be exceeded only once in every m observations, u is the predefined threshold, and $\xi_u = Pr\{X > u\}$.

Proof. According to Theorem 1,

$$Pr\{X > r_m\} = \zeta_u \left[1 + \xi \left(\frac{r_m - u}{\sigma} \right) \right]^{-1/\xi}, \quad (11)$$

where $\xi_u = Pr\{X > u\}$.

Hence, the return level r_m that is actually the $(1 - \frac{1}{m})^{th}$ quantile is given by

$$r_m = u + \frac{\sigma}{\xi} [(m\zeta_u)^\xi - 1], \quad (12)$$

where m is large enough to ensure that $r_m > u$. \square

B. Dependency Removal Methods

The EVT requires the input to be a sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables. One method to obtain the i.i.d. samples from the dependent observations is declustering method introduced in [22], and the other one is extracting i.i.d. residuals from ARIMA-GARCH model [26]-[29] used for channel prediction. In the former method, we split the observations into multiple clusters and then apply EVT to the cluster maxima, while in the later method, we apply EVT to the filtered residuals.

1) *Declustering model:* In a communication system, it is observed that the threshold exceedances occur in a group. However, this clustering induces dependency in the observations while EVT is enforceable only on i.i.d. samples. In this study, we apply the declustering method to filter the samples and remove the dependency among them. Declustering method works as follows:

- It defines a cluster of values exceeding a threshold using an empirical rule.
- It determines the optimum threshold as well as the minimum number of allowed samples between consecutive clusters.
- It extracts the maximum excess in each cluster and then fits generalized Pareto distribution to the cluster maxima.

To cluster the extremes, we specify a threshold, u , and assign consecutive values exceeding u to the same cluster. Once we observe a value not exceeding the threshold, we terminate the cluster. The next cluster initiates when a sample exceeding u is found. In the cases that we have only one or a few samples between the consecutive clusters, the independency assumption of cluster maxima is violated. To overcome such deficiency, we let the cluster to be active for r successive values not exceeding the threshold u . There is a trade-off in choice of r values: too low r leads to the unrealistic assumption of independent maxima for the close by clusters, and too high r ignores some valuable samples that could be extreme in a separated cluster.

To obtain the best u and r values that ensure independence, we fit the generalized Pareto distribution on the values exceeding a threshold for a range of different u and r . We then extract scale and shape parameters for each pair. In the next step, by referring to Corollary (1.2), we plot the Pareto distribution

parameter against different u and r and seek for the value after which, Pareto parameters have a linear relation to the changes in u and r . Note that in order to investigate the linear relationship between any dependent variable Y and independent variable X , we use the regression model $Y = a + bX + e$, where a , b , and e are constant, slope and the error term, respectively. To evaluate the goodness of fit, we check a statistical measure, named R squared and denoted by R^2 , which determines the proportion of variations of Y explained by X [30]. This measure takes values between zero and one. A R^2 of one means that the changes of X thoroughly explain those of Y .

After clustering the exceedances, we collect the maximum value in each cluster. If the correlations among the clusters maxima are not significant, we can fit a Pareto distribution to these i.i.d. samples. Otherwise, we should replicate the previous step to determine the optimum of u and r .

2) *ARIMA-GARCH model*: ARIMA-GARCH is an approach to predict the channel by modeling the mean and variance dependency among the samples. The residuals of ARIMA-GARCH is the sequence of i.i.d. samples that in this study are considered for the channel tail analysis.

ARIMA and GARCH are auto-regressive models used to represent time series data with significant correlation among them. ARIMA is used to model the mean dependency, while GARCH is applied to capture the conditional variance of the samples. These two models are perfectly compatible with each other so that they are applied simultaneously and construct the ARIMA-GARCH model. There is a two-phase procedure in the hybrid model of ARIMA and GARCH. In the first phase, ARIMA is used to model the first moment (mean) of the time series; The residual of this model will contain only the correlation between the second moment (variance), i.e., sample squares. In the second phase, the GARCH is used to model the dependency in the squares of the samples. Appropriate modeling by ARIMA-GARCH results in independent residuals that are identically distributed with zero mean and constant variance. In our approach, the construction of these i.i.d. residuals is of paramount importance since they serve as an input to the EVT tail estimation. In the following, we present the general process of the ARIMA-GARCH approach to remove the dependency from the measured samples.

ARIMA(p, d, q) is commonly used to model the conditional mean of a sequence, where p , q are the number of autoregressive (AR) and moving average (MA) terms, respectively, and d is the degrees of differencing [29]. In the first step to determine ARIMA parameters, we should check whether the time series is stationary or not. If the series is stationary, we may skip this step. Otherwise, it should be converted to the stationary process. Typically, non-stationarity is caused by two types of reasons: non-constant mean or variance. In the case that non-constant variance is the reason for non-stationarity, power transformation should be applied to the observations for converting them to the stationary process. On the other hand, if non-stationarity is due to the non-constant mean, differencing is applied to make the series stationary. Although there is no limitation on the number of times we apply differencing, i.e., d value, it is not recommended to apply differencing more than twice. If both reasons caused non-stationarity, power transformation

should be applied prior to differencing [31]. The output of differencing/power transformation is ARIMA($p,0,q$) [31] given by

$$r_t = c + \epsilon_t + \sum_{i=1}^p \theta_i r_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \epsilon_{t-i}, \quad (13)$$

where r_t , ϵ_t , θ_i , and β_i are the conditional mean and expected value of the residual at time t , and AR and MA coefficients, respectively. At the end of this step, we come up with the estimated conditional mean at time t and some residuals. If the residuals are iid, we can skip GARCH filtering and quit the estimation procedure; Otherwise, residuals will be served as the input of GARCH modeling for further analysis.

GARCH filtering is applied to estimate the conditional variance at time t , and extract independent residuals that are identically distributed. For most practical purposes, the simplest form of the GARCH model, GARCH(1, 1), is utilized to model the conditional variance as

$$\sigma_t^2 = k + \gamma \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \phi \epsilon_{t-1}^2 + \psi \text{sgn}(-\epsilon_{t-1}) \epsilon_{t-1}^2, \quad (14)$$

where ϵ_t^2 is variance of the residuals in forecasting the sample at time t , respectively [26]-[29]. Note that $\text{sgn}(-x) = 1$ if $x < 0$ and 0 if $x \geq 0$. All coefficients of ARIMA-GARCH model, i.e. c , θ , β_i , k , γ , ϕ , and ψ need to be determined through maximum likelihood estimation (MLE).

The autocorrelation function (ACF) of the samples measures the similarity among the observations as a function of the time lag, whereas the ACF of the squared samples illustrates the resembles in variance [26]. ACF of the residuals, as well as ACF of the squared residuals, are used in determining the suitability of the fitted ARIMA and GARCH models, respectively. If both ACFs do not show significant correlation at any lag except lag 0, we conclude that the model obtained by ARIMA-GARCH properly predicts the channel and the residuals can be used in EVT tail analysis. Otherwise, we apply the ARIMA-GARCH model one more time to remove the additional dependency.

III. PROPOSED CHANNEL MODELING FRAMEWORK

We propose a novel channel modeling methodology for URLLC systems by using the extreme value theory. This methodology is the first measurement-based approach that derives the lower tail statistics of the communication channel in the ultra-reliable regime. The methodology consists of four main steps. In the first step, the sequence of measured samples is converted into i.i.d samples by removing their dependency. In the second step, the parameters of the Pareto distribution corresponding to the resulting i.i.d. sequence are estimated through maximum likelihood estimation for different thresholds. The optimum threshold is determined by applying mean residual life and parameter stability methods over an extensive set of thresholds. In the third step, the stopping condition for the adequacy of the amount of data used in the estimation of tail probabilities is determined. In the final step, the validity of the resulting distribution and threshold is tested by using probability plots from EVT. The outline of the algorithm is given in Fig. 1. In the following, we explain each step of this methodology in detail.




Figure 1: Flowchart for the derivation of Pareto model in the channel estimation.

A. Dependency removal

The challenge behind using EVT is to converting the samples to independent and identically distributed random variables. Our proposed algorithm starts by calculating the correlation between the sample at time t and another sample at time $t+k$, where $k = 0, \dots, K$, where K is the maximum lag. If the correlation among the samples at different lags is negligible, we can skip this step. Otherwise, the correlation must be reduced by applying dependency removal methods given in Section II-B2.

B. Estimation of Pareto model parameters

The parameters of Pareto distribution (i.e., shape and scale parameters) are calculated through maximum likelihood estimation for different threshold values, u . The threshold value determines the percentage of the data, which is considered an extreme event and included in the tail.

C. Determine the optimum threshold

The threshold value significantly affects the suitability of the Pareto model as it determines the point where the tail is to start. The choice of threshold represents a trade-off between bias and variance such that too low a threshold leading to bias while too high a threshold will generate a few excesses with which the model is estimated, and therefore leading to high variance. We use mean residual life and parameter stability methods to determine the best and close to the optimum threshold.

1) *Mean residual life method*: According to the mean residual life method, we plot the expected value of the samples exceeding a given threshold against different possible thresholds. Consequently, the mean residual life plot consisting of pairs

$$\left\{ \left(u, \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} (X_i - u) \right) : u < X_{max} \right\},$$

where $X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n_u)}$ are n_u observations exceeding the threshold u , and X_{max} is the largest value in sequence of X_i [22], [25]. Referring to corollary 1.1, the best threshold, u_0 , is the one above which, the mean residual life plot, is almost linear in u . In some cases, the mean residual life plot is almost linear for all possible thresholds, and so it is not very easy to decide on the optimum threshold according to this method. Therefore, we use a parallel approach, as stated by the parameter stability method explained in the following.

2) *Parameters stability method*: Parameters stability is a complementary method to the mean residual life plot, derived from corollary 1.2. In this method, we fit GPD at a range of thresholds to extract the Pareto parameters and then plot them against the threshold values. The optimum threshold, u_0 , is the point after which the estimation of Pareto parameters becomes linear to $u : u > u_0$.

D. MSSD Algorithm

MSSD Algorithm is used to specify the stopping condition in the determination of the minimum required samples for modeling the tail statistics by Pareto distribution. Although the larger sample size leads to better statistical results, collecting a large number of samples might be expensive, time-consuming, and even impossible in many experiments [18]. In the proposed MSSD Algorithm, we extend the applicability of the method initially presented in [18] to determine the minimum sample size for GEV distribution at the environmental sciences, to the generalized Pareto distribution at the communication engineering.

This approach inspired by "return level" function consisting of three parts: (a) Check whether the existing observations are enough to accurately model the sample data by Pareto parameters, (b) Determine how many more observations are needed to estimate the Pareto model, if the existing samples are not sufficient, and (c) Approximate how much gain we will have in terms of accuracy of the parameter estimation if we increase the sample size. In the case we have many different sample sets, it is possible to check the normality of return levels distribution. Otherwise, we apply the bootstrap method

to generate a large enough number of data sets for assessing distribution of the return levels.

Algorithm 1 Minimum Sample Size Determination (MSSD) Algorithm

```

1: Input: observed data:  $x_1 = (x_{11}, \dots, x_{1n})$ , and  $\alpha$ ;
2: for  $m=2:M$  do
3:   bootstrap samples of  $x_1$ , as  $x_m = x_{m1}, \dots, x_{mn}$ ;
4:   for  $j = n_0 : n$  do
5:      $y_{mj}^{(1)}$  = first  $j$  values of  $x_m$ ;
6:     for  $k = 2 : K$  do
7:       construct bootstrap samples of  $y_{mj}$ , as  $y_{mj}^{(k)}$ ;
8:       calculate the return level,  $r_{mj}^k$ ;
9:     end for
10:    Apply AD normality test and record  $p$ -values,
        as  $p_{mj}$ ;
11:   end for
12: end for
13: for  $j = n_0 : n$  do
14:   Calculate mean  $p$ -value  $\bar{p}_j$ , and standard deviation  $s_j$ 
15:   Calculate confidence-interval  $\bar{p}_j \pm (\alpha)s_j$ ;
16:   if  $\bar{p}_j - (\alpha)s_j > \alpha$  then
17:      $j$  is sufficient number of samples;
18:   end if
19: end for
20: if for all  $j > j_0$ ,  $\bar{p}_j - \alpha s_j > \alpha$  then
21:    $j_0$  = minimum number of required samples;
22: end if
23: for all  $j > j_0$  do
24:    $G_j = s_j - s_{j_0}$ ;
25: end for

```

MSSD Algorithm given by Algorithm 1 is described in detail as follows. The inputs of the algorithm are the observation sample set and the critical value, α , which is typically assumed 0.05. The algorithm starts by bootstrapping the input samples with replacement to generate $M - 1$ sample sets each of size n (Line 3). Then from each newly generated data set, we extract first j samples (Line 5) to create data sets with different lengths. Again we apply the bootstrap method to generate $K - 1$ sets each with length j (Line 7). Eventually, we collect $M \times K$ data sets with different lengths. Afterward, we calculate the return level according to Eqn. (10) for different sample sizes (Line 8). We carry out Anderson-Darling (AD) normality test on the return levels, r_{mj}^k , and record the test p -values, denoted by p_{mj} (Line 10). After that, for p -values corresponding to the same sample size, we compute mean and standard deviation (SD), denoted by \bar{p}_j and s_j , respectively (Line 14), and the lower and upper bound for the confidence interval (CI) (Line 15). Assuming that n is the original sample size, if the lower bounds of the confidence intervals for all sample sizes less than n are greater than the critical value α , we are $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ confident that we have enough samples to apply EVT (Line 16-17). Otherwise, we should collect more data to increase the sample size. The next step of the algorithm is to determine the minimum required number of samples (less than the original sample size n) to estimate the Pareto model parameters. For this end, we seek for sample size j_0 , $j_0 < n$, such that for any

$j > j_0$, lower bound of the confidence interval is greater than α (Line 20). Consequently, with $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence, we conclude that j_0 is the minimum number of samples required for obtaining proper Pareto model parameters derived by EVT (Line 21). The algorithm terminates by approximating the gain attained if we increase the sample size from j_0 to j . The gain is presented in terms of the difference between the corresponding SD values (Line 24).

E. Model Validation Check

The validity of the corresponding Pareto model is assessed through the probability plots. Probability plots are graphical techniques applied to investigate whether the estimated values obtained by the model are identical to the actual values or not.

The probability plots include probability/probability (PP) plot and quantile/quantile (QQ) plot. In the PP plot, the empirical cumulative distribution function (CDF) is plotted versus the modeled CDF by Pareto. In the QQ plot, empirical and modeled quantiles are plotted against each other. If the estimation of generalized Pareto is appropriate for modeling the excesses of threshold u , then both probability and quantile plots should consist of the points that form a line with slope 1 [22]. Hence, the linearity test should result in a constant 0 and a slope 1. Considering the optimum threshold determined in the previous section, **PP plot** includes the pairs

$$\{(i/k + 1), \hat{H}_{(Y_{(i)})}; i = 1, \dots, k\}$$

$$\hat{H}_{(Y)} = 1 - \left(1 + \frac{\hat{\xi}Y}{\hat{\sigma}}\right)^{-1/\hat{\xi}}, \quad (15)$$

where $Y_{(1)} \geq \dots \geq Y_{(k)}$ are the threshold excesses, k is the total number of excesses, \hat{H} is the estimated Pareto model, and $\hat{\xi}$ and $\hat{\sigma}$ are the estimated shape and scale parameters of the fitted Pareto distribution, respectively. **QQ plot** consists of the pairs

$$\{Y(i), (\hat{H}^{-1}(i/(k + 1))), i = 1, \dots, k\},$$

$$\hat{H}^{-1}(Y) = u + \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\hat{\xi}} \left[1 - Y^{-\hat{\xi}}\right], \quad (16)$$

where the parameters are the same as that of defined for the probability plot.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The goal of this section is to evaluate the performance of the proposed channel modeling algorithm compared to the existing extrapolation-based methods for predicting the tail statistics of the communication channel.

The measurements are carried out in the time domain using a Vector Network Analyzer (VNA) (R & S[®] ZVA67). The transmitter and receiver are attached to the VNA ports through the R & S[®] ZV-Z196 port cables with 610mm length and maximum 4.8dB transmission loss. The antennas used are Horn antennas operating from 50 GHz to 75 GHz with a nominal 24 dBi gain and 12° vertical beamwidth. The antennas are connected to the waveguide to coax adapter with frequency 50 to 65 GHz, insertion loss 0.5 dB, and impedance 50 Ω . The transmitter and receiver antennas are placed in the engine compartment of a commercial vehicle Fiat Linea as shown in Fig. 2.



Figure 2: Transmitter and receiver antennas in the engine compartment




Figure 3: ACFs of the samples and squared-samples before and after filtering by ARIMA-GARCH (a) ACF of the samples before filtering, (b) ACF of the squared-samples before filtering, (c) ACF of the samples after filtering, and (d) ACF of the squared-samples after filtering.

We captured about 10^6 successive samples in each 2 ms while transmitting the data at 60 GHz. The data was collected at low vehicular traffic on the asphalt and stone roads in the Koc University campus on a cloudy day. The moving car experienced different situations, including pushing the gas paddle while the car is static, moving on the ramp, and typical driving. We use MATLAB to apply the algorithm proposed in Section III-C to the measured samples for determining the optimum threshold and minimum required samples to apply EVT, and then compare the results with the conventional extrapolation approach proposed in [3].

A. Optimum Threshold Determination

Fig. 3 illustrates the auto-correlation functions of the samples and squared-samples before and after filtering by ARIMA-





Figure 4: Threshold determination after ARIMA-GARCH filtering: (a) Mean residual life method, and (b) Parameter stability method.

GARCH. Although the correlation among the observations before filtering is significant, it becomes negligible after filtering. Since the process was stationary, the d parameter of ARIMA was 0. It was observed that ARIMA with p and q equal to 2 removes dependency remarkably, while for the values lower than 2, the filtering is not effective enough. According to Fig. 3, the standardized residuals are now approximately i.i.d., and therefore more amenable for the tail estimation.

Fig. 4 shows optimum threshold determination according to mean residual life plot and stability of the Pareto model parameters introduced in Section III-C. As it has already been mentioned and also can be seen from Fig. 4a, the mean residual life plot does not give us enough intuition for determining the optimum threshold. Therefore, we refer to its complementary method to choose the best threshold. According to Fig. 4b, -1.8 dBm is the optimum threshold after which, both scale and shape parameters stay linear with respect to the threshold variations.

Fig. 5 illustrates the probability plots to validate the Pareto model adopted to the optimum threshold. According to Fig. 5a, the CDF values obtained by the Pareto model are identical to the empirical values. In spite of existing spars points that deviate from the fitted line in Fig. 5b, QQ plot fits the line with slope 1 when we compare the model with the empirical for not very low quantile values. However, we may compensate for this difference in the QQ plot by the expense of obtaining




Figure 5: Validity check of the fitted Pareto model by : (a) Probability plot, and (b) Quantile plot.

more measured samples corresponding to the residuals less than about -8 .




Figure 6: Optimum sample gap, r , determination in the declustering method : (a) According to scale parameter, and (b) According to shape parameter.

Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 are provided to determine the best sample gap and the optimum threshold denoted by r and Th , respectively, according to declustering approach. Fig. 6 shows the scale parameter and shape parameter against different r values for each specific threshold, whereas Fig. 6 illustrates the scale and shape parameters versus Th values for each specific




Figure 7: Optimum threshold, Th , determination in the declustering method : (a) According to scale parameter, and (b) According to shape parameter.

r . Both Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 should be used simultaneously to determine the optimum sample gap and threshold values. It is observed that by choosing a r value greater than about 15, we remove the dependency of the declustering method to the initial threshold value. However, it is not recommended to choose a r value greater than 15, as you may introduce variance to the model estimation. On the other hand, for the thresholds less than -16 dBm, the scale and shape parameters

vary considerably with the changes in the threshold. However, after -16 dBm, these parameter estimations become constant and do not vary considerably with the changes in the threshold. Therefore, we consider 15 and -16 as the optimum values for the r and Th , respectively, in the declustering approach for removing dependency among the samples. Please note that since the declustering method deals with the original observations, i.e., power values, not the residual, we rather prefer this method to compare our proposed methodology with the existing extrapolation-based approach.

B. Minimum Required Samples for the Channel Tail Estimation

Fig. 8 shows the minimum number of samples required to estimate the Pareto parameters for modeling the tail distribution. We apply the MSSD Algorithm to the original measured samples to generate more data sets via the bootstrap method and obtain the minimum sample size required to use EVT. According to the p-values obtained from the linearity test on 1000 samples return levels, we obtained 2×10^5 as the sufficient number of samples required to model the tail distribution satisfactory. Moreover, the gain we attain by increasing the sample size from 2×10^5 to 9×10^5 , is 0.08. As a result, although at URLLC, it is required to capture 10^6 samples or more for modeling the events occurring once in million-billion, we can still model the tail statistics with a lower sample number by considering MSSD Algorithm constraints.




Figure 8: Stopping condition on determining the minimum required samples for EVT

C. Comparison with the Conventional Tail Estimation Method

Fig. 9 compares the proposed algorithm with the conventional extrapolation-based method for estimating the tail distribution. Based on our proposed methodology, we use Pareto distribution to estimate the upper and lower tails, while for the interior values, the kernel-smoothing function MATLAB is used to estimate the CDF between the lower and upper tail probabilities. It is worth mentioning that, for the sake of simplicity and without loss of generality, in this work, we ignored threshold modeling for the upper tail as it was not the purpose of this study; So that we considered sample portion of the upper tail same as that of in the lower tail. To obtain the extrapolated curve in Fig. 9, we apply different distributions to the observations corresponding to the reliability

order of $10^0 - 10^{-3}$. Then we select the best-fitted distribution according to the Akaike information criterion/Bayesian information criterion (AIC/BIC), which assesses the quality of statistical models. In our case, "Weibull" has maximum AIC/BIC, so that we compute the corresponding extrapolated tail distribution from the formula given in [3]. Fig. 9 illustrates the superior performance of our proposed model compared to the conventional extrapolation approach, especially when we concern ultra-reliability and aim to model the events occurring with the probability of around 10^{-6} .




Figure 9: Comparison between the proposed algorithm and the existing extrapolated approach

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we introduce a novel framework based on the extreme value theory for estimating the lower tail of channel distribution, considering reliability constraint at URLLC. The proposed methodology adopts EVT to determine the optimum threshold over which we derive the tail statistics, the stopping condition to specify the minimum necessary samples to model the tail characteristics, and the assessment to validate the final model using probability plots. The usage of stopping conditions enabled a remarkable decrease in the number of required samples by about 7×10^5 . The significant difference between our proposed methodology and the conventional extrapolation-based approach demonstrates the superiority of our approach in modeling the channel tail statistics.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Popovski, J. J. Nielsen, C. Stefanovic, E. De Carvalho, E. Strom, K. F. Trillingsgaard, A.-S. Bana, D. M. Kim, R. Kotaba, J. Park, *et al.*, "Wireless access for ultra-reliable low-latency communication: Principles and building blocks," *Ieee Network*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 16–23, 2018.
- [2] P. Popovski, Č. Stefanović, J. J. Nielsen, E. De Carvalho, M. Angelichinoski, K. F. Trillingsgaard, and A.-S. Bana, "Wireless access in ultra-reliable low-latency communication (urllc)," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 2019.
- [3] P. C. F. Eggers, M. Angelichinoski, and P. Popovski, "Wireless channel modeling perspectives for ultra-reliable communications," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 18, pp. 2229–2243, April 2019.
- [4] B. Singh, O. Tirkkonen, Z. Li, and M. A. Uusitalo, "Ultra-reliable low latency communication (urllc) using interface diversity," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, 2017.
- [5] V. N. Swamy, P. Rigge, G. Ranade, B. Nikolic, and A. Sahai, "Predicting wireless channels for ultra-reliable low-latency communications," in *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 2609–2613, IEEE, 2018.

- [6] V. N. Swamy, P. Rigge, G. Ranade, B. Nikolić, and A. Sahai, "Wireless channel dynamics and robustness for ultra-reliable low-latency communications," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 705–720, 2019.
- [7] M. Angjelichinoski, K. F. Trillingsgaard, and P. Popovski, "A statistical learning approach to ultra-reliable low latency communication," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 2019.
- [8] S. Samarakoon, M. Bennis, W. Saad, and M. Debbah, "Federated learning for ultra-reliable low-latency v2v communications," in *2018 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, pp. 1–7, IEEE, 2018.
- [9] C.-F. Liu and M. Bennis, "Ultra-reliable and low-latency vehicular transmission: An extreme value theory approach," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 1292–1295, 2018.
- [10] Y. H. Al-Badarnah, C. N. Georghiadis, and M.-S. Alouini, "Asymptotic performance analysis of the k th best link selection over wireless fading channels: An extreme value theory approach," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 6652–6657, 2018.
- [11] G. Song and Y. Li, "Asymptotic throughput analysis for channel-aware scheduling," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 1827–1834, 2006.
- [12] A. Mahmood and R. Jäntti, "Packet error rate analysis of uncoded schemes in block-fading channels using extreme value theory," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 208–211, 2016.
- [13] M. Molina-Garcia, A. Fernandez-Duran, and J. I. Alonso, "Application of extreme value distribution to model propagation fading in indoor mobile radio environments," in *2008 IEEE Radio and Wireless Symposium*, pp. 97–100, IEEE, 2008.
- [14] G. S. Dahman, R. J. Bultitude, and R. H. Hafez, "Identifying and modelling multipath clusters in propagation measurement data," in *2010 IEEE 72nd Vehicular Technology Conference-Fall*, pp. 1–5, IEEE, 2010.
- [15] J. Reyes-Guerrero and L. Mariscal, "5.8 ghz propagation of low-height wireless links in sea port scenario," *Electronics Letters*, vol. 50, no. 9, pp. 710–712, 2014.
- [16] H. Sawada, K. Mizutani, K. Ishizu, T. Matsumura, H.-N. Tran, H. Murakami, F. Kojima, and H. Harada, "Path loss and throughput estimation models for an ieee 802.11 af prototype," in *2015 IEEE 81st Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC Spring)*, pp. 1–5, IEEE, 2015.
- [17] C. Li, K. Yang, J. Yu, F. Li, Y. Shui, F. Chang, and W. Chen, "V2v radio channel performance based on measurements in ramp scenarios at 5.9 ghz," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 7503–7514, 2018.
- [18] Y. Cai and D. Hames, "Minimum sample size determination for generalized extreme value distribution," *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 87–98, 2010.
- [19] M. Bennis, M. Debbah, and H. V. Poor, "Ultrareliable and low-latency wireless communication: Tail, risk, and scale," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 10, pp. 1834–1853, 2018.
- [20] Y. Bensalah *et al.*, *Steps in applying extreme value theory to finance: a review*. Citeseer, 2000.
- [21] P. de Zea Bermudez and S. Kotz, "Parameter estimation of the generalized pareto distribution part ii," *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, vol. 140, no. 6, pp. 1374–1388, 2010.
- [22] S. Coles, J. Bawa, L. Trenner, and P. Dorazio, *An introduction to statistical modeling of extreme values*, vol. 208. Springer, 2001.
- [23] B. Finkenstadt and H. Rootzen, *Extreme Values in Finance, Telecommunications, and the*. Abingdon: Chapman and Hall, 2003.
- [24] S. S. Far and A. K. A. Wahab, "Evaluation of peaks-over-threshold method," *Ocean Science Discussions*, pp. 1–25, 2016.
- [25] J. Galambos, J. Lechner, E. Simiu, and C. HAGWOOD, "Extreme-value theory and applications-proceedings of the conference on extreme-value theory and applications. 2. gaithersburg, md, may-1993-preface," 1994.
- [26] K. Nystrom and J. Skoglund, "A framework for scenario-based risk management," *Preprint, Swedbank*, 2002.
- [27] K. Nystrom and J. Skoglund, "Univariate extreme value theory, garch and measures of risk," *Preprint, Swedbank*, 2002.
- [28] L. R. Glosten, R. Jagannathan, and D. E. Runkle, "On the relation between the expected value and the volatility of the nominal excess return on stocks," *The journal of finance*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 1779–1801, 1993.
- [29] S. Pellegrini, E. Ruiz, and A. Espasa, "The relationship between arima-garch and unobserved component models with garch disturbances," 2007.
- [30] A. Gelman, B. Goodrich, J. Gabry, and A. Vehtari, "R-squared for bayesian regression models," *The American Statistician*, vol. 73, no. 3, pp. 307–309, 2019.
- [31] U. Demir and S. C. Ergen, "Arma-based time variation model for beneath the chassis uwb channel," *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, vol. 2016, no. 1, p. 178, 2016.