

# A new approach for predicting the Quality of Experience in multimedia services using machine learning

Parsa H. S. Panahi , Amir H. Jalilvand , Abolfazl Diyanat , *Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—In today’s world, the internet is recognized as one of the essentials of human life, playing a significant role in communications, business, and lifestyle. The quality of internet services can have widespread negative impacts on individual and social levels. Consequently, Quality of Service (QoS) has become a fundamental necessity for service providers in a competitive market aiming to offer superior services. The success and survival of these providers depend on their ability to maintain high service quality and ensure customer satisfaction.

Alongside QoS, the concept of Quality of Experience (QoE) has emerged with the development of telephony networks. QoE focuses on the user’s satisfaction with the service, helping operators to adjust their services to meet user expectations. However, accurately measuring and evaluating QoE poses challenges due to its complex nature and the lack of precise models for real-time feedback from users.

In recent research, there is a trend towards utilizing machine learning and deep learning techniques to predict user QoE. Researchers aim to develop accurate models by leveraging large volumes of data from network and user interactions, considering various real-world scenarios. Despite the complexity of network environments, this research strives to provide an efficient and practical framework for improving and evaluating QoE.

This study presents a comprehensive framework for evaluating and measuring QoE in multimedia services, adhering to the ITU-T P.1203 standard. The framework includes automated data collection processes and uses machine learning algorithms to predict user satisfaction based on key network parameters. By collecting over 20,000 data records from different network conditions and users, the Random Forest model achieved a prediction accuracy of 95.8% for user satisfaction. This approach allows operators to dynamically and optimally allocate network resources in real-time, maintaining high levels of customer satisfaction with minimal costs.

**Index Terms**—QoE, QoS, Multimedia Services, Machine Learning, ITU Video MOS.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**A**MONG the many applications used in network infrastructures, applications with high QoS priorities have received increasing attention, including video streaming, VoIP, real-time monitoring, network control, etc. One of the common features of these applications is that they have specific requirements. In fact, QoS refers to the overall performance of a service, for example in a VoIP phone call there must be minimums defined for the network so that if they are violated, it can be said that the overall performance of this service is not suitable or in other words the QoS is not suitable for this service.

Over the years, extensive research has been conducted in the field of QoE, leading to the development of various frameworks for assessing user QoE. In [2], a framework is




Fig. 1. The image demonstrates an end-to-end system where servers deliver services such as video sharing, gaming, and social media to users. Users rate their experiences, and these ratings, along with other inputs like network conditions, are fed into an AI model. The AI model learns from this data to predict Quality of Experience (QoE) scores independently. [1].

presented consisting of a video server, network simulator, and receiver to study the impact of different network parameters on user QoE in IPTV networks. The framework also proposes a QoE-based algorithm for network management. Similarly, [3] introduces a tool for optimizing mobile networks by combining user QoE information collected through subjective experiments with network technical parameters gathered by software agents. This tool demonstrates high accuracy in QoE prediction using the PSQA method and neural networks.

Another notable framework is YoMoApp, utilized in [4] and [5] to measure key performance indicators related to YouTube video user QoE in mobile networks. YoMoApp records important parameters like stalling and video quality, showing high accuracy in capturing user experience through subjective testing. The tool’s performance has been validated against human evaluations, confirming its applicability in QoE optimization studies [4]. In [6], the authors propose the Critical Feature Analytics (CFA) algorithm, which leverages insights from the video domain to predict user QoE with high accuracy and scalability. The algorithm demonstrates significant improvements across key quality metrics. Ref. [7] introduces machine learning-based QoE prediction models utilizing data collected from a field trial in operational cellular networks. By combining objective measurements from passive in-smartphone network traffic with crowdsourced subjective user feedback, the best model achieves over 90% accuracy in predicting QoE.

Ref. [8] presents a five-stage framework for measuring and evaluating the QoE of IoT services. The framework involves defining services and QoE parameters, determining users, conducting mean opinion score surveys, and extracting strategic implications. Evaluation using real data from a smart city IoT services survey indicates improved user experience post-IoT implementation. A proactive LTE network management

The authors are affiliated with the School of Computer Engineering at Iran University of Science and Technology, Tehran, Iran. Email: {Parsa\_shariat, jalilvand\_a, a.diyantat}@iust.ac.ir

framework based on user QoE is introduced in [9]. Leveraging a large volume of real network performance data at the cell level, various machine learning algorithms are employed to predict QoE parameters. The framework demonstrates high accuracy in predicting user throughput and handover success rate. These frameworks and tools collectively contribute to the growing body of research aimed at enhancing QoE assessment and management in diverse network environments.

In recent years, the development of frameworks for assessing user QoE has been a primary focus in the telecommunications industry. These frameworks, available in both closed-source and open-source formats, play a crucial role in evaluating and improving user satisfaction within communication networks. Closed-source frameworks, typically developed by private organizations, offer comprehensive solutions with proprietary features and support. For instance, [2] presents a framework consisting of a video server, network simulator, and receiver to study the impact of network parameters on user QoE in IPTV networks, proposing a QoE-based algorithm for network management. Similarly, [3] introduces a closed-source tool that combines subjective user QoE information with objective network parameters to optimize mobile networks, demonstrating high accuracy in QoE prediction.

Another notable closed-source framework is YoMoApp, utilized in [4] and [5] to measure key performance indicators related to YouTube video user QoE in mobile networks. YoMoApp records important parameters like stalling and video quality, showing high accuracy in capturing user experience through subjective testing. The tool's performance has been validated against human evaluations, confirming its applicability in QoE optimization studies [4]. Ref. [6] proposes the Critical Feature Analytics (CFA) algorithm, which leverages insights from the video domain to predict user QoE with high accuracy and scalability, demonstrating significant improvements across key quality metrics.

In contrast, open-source frameworks, developed through community collaboration, offer transparency, flexibility, and customization options. Ref. [10] introduces an open-source Android app that assesses YouTube user QoE by measuring network performance parameters and converting them into QoE scores. The app validates existing theoretical models through a pilot study with user feedback, proposing an alternative empirical model based on the collected data. Another open-source tool, VLQoE, is presented in [11] for evaluating video QoE on smartphones. VLQoE excels in predicting QoE by accurately modeling video stalls, making it valuable for QoE optimization studies.

Ref. [12] discusses an open-source framework that reflects end-user perception of mobile broadband services by simulating key quality indicators. Utilizing real data from three mobile operators, this framework assesses the impact of transport protocols on QoE, ensuring result reproducibility through its implementation using open-source tools. Additionally, [13] proposes an open-source model for evaluating QoE in IoT multimedia services, introducing the pure boost score as a QoE metric. The model calculates the QoE ratio, aiding in resource estimation and optimal allocation. Machine learning techniques have also been integrated into both closed-source and open-source QoE assessment frameworks to enhance

accuracy and adaptability. Ref. [7] introduces closed-source machine learning-based QoE prediction models utilizing data collected from a field trial in operational cellular networks. By combining objective measurements with crowdsourced subjective user feedback, the best model achieves over 90% accuracy in predicting QoE. Similarly, [9] presents a closed-source proactive LTE network management framework based on user QoE, employing various machine learning algorithms to predict QoE parameters with high accuracy.

### A. Motivation

However, in reality, knowing the QoS parameters is not enough to ensure overall customer satisfaction, because each individual is different and their quality expectations vary. For various reasons, QoE has become very important in recent years and defining related models has become an emerging research topic in the telecommunications community.

To define QoE models, extensive subjective quality assessments need to be performed by selected groups of people under fixed conditions. Therefore, MNO and leading OTT providers face new operational efficiency challenges. For example, YouTube currently has the highest Internet traffic consumption, accounting for over 30% of total global Internet traffic [14]. Given this, delivering high-quality video is very important for user retention over the long term under the service of these operators [15].

Evaluating and predicting the end-user QoE in multimedia video streaming is the first step in optimizing efficient delivery of streaming services in mobile networks and implementing efficient QoE Management. In order to properly estimate end-user QoE and control and manage QoE-aware networks, there is a need to develop reliable and accurate QoE models. Competent models usually involve multiple QoS network parameters and application parameters in addition to factors affecting QoE in predicting end-user QoE [16].

It is expected that mobile network operators will cope with this growing demand and be able to maintain high video QoE. This requires MNOs to have a complete understanding of the QoE of users' videos in order to aid in network planning, provisioning and traffic management. However, designing a system for measuring video QoE has multiple challenges:

- The large scale of video traffic data and the diversity of video streaming services,
- Multi-layer constraints due to the complex architecture of the cellular network,
- Extracting QoE metrics from network traffic [17].
- High confidence levels for QoE due to various factors such as different types of terminal devices, diverse services, changes in media content, fluctuations in playback and network conditions, and significant spatial and temporal changes in device performance make it a difficult task [18].

The success of a service depends on its acceptance by users. If QoE management is successful, it will lead to end user satisfaction, because their needs and/or expectations are met. As a result, this end user can be ready to accept newer and/or more complex services which can in turn lead to technological growth and advancement in general [19].

Moreover, in commercial environments, QoE plays a vital role in maintaining collaboration and productivity. Poor communication network quality can lead to misunderstandings, disruptions, and reduced efficiency. As organizations increasingly rely on telecommuting and virtual communication tools, focusing on QoE becomes a strategic priority to ensure effective business productivity management [20]. Additionally, with the emergence of new technologies such as augmented reality (AR) and virtual reality (VR) in communications, the importance of QoE is further amplified, as these applications heavily rely on an immersive and pervasive user experience to achieve their desired impact [10].

Consequently, the development of accurate and reliable QoE assessment frameworks has become a critical area of research in the telecommunications industry. These frameworks aim to provide a comprehensive understanding of user perception and satisfaction, enabling service providers to optimize their networks and deliver high-quality multimedia experiences. By incorporating various influencing factors, such as network parameters, application characteristics, and user context, these frameworks strive to capture the complex nature of QoE and provide actionable insights for QoE management strategies.

Moreover, the implementation of this research is available as open source on GitHub [21], allowing other researchers and developers to access the project source code, make improvements, or adapt it to their specific requirements. This approach fosters increased transparency and collaboration within the scientific community, facilitating the exchange of knowledge and experiences in the field of study.

## B. Contributions

The main contributions of this research have been listed below.

- 1) This paper presents an end-to-end framework for mobile network operators to predict and optimize the quality of experience for video streaming services solely based on network conditions, without needing visibility into the video contents.
- 2) The authors present a machine learning method to predict MOS by training a random forest model on network key performance indicators (KPI) like delay, jitter, packet loss, throughput and bitrate along with per-segment MOS measurements calculated based on the ITU-T P.1203 standard.
- 3) The dataset is generated by developing a video streaming data collection system using Selenium. The system extracts segment files from video streaming sessions, calculates per-segment MOS scores using the ITU P.1203 reference software, and stores them along with network measurements like delay and packet loss. Videos were streamed under diverse network conditions emulated on remote servers to capture a wide range of quality levels. In total over 20,000 labeled video segments were collected.
- 4) Simulation results show the random forest model predicts MOS from network metrics with an  $R^2$  score of 0.958, proving the method's efficacy for multimedia QoE optimization.

## C. Paper Structure

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. §II reviews relevant literature. In §III, we describe the system model that is used throughout the paper, alongside our new approach to predict QoE parameter. In §VI presents the simulation results. Finally, §VII provides some concluding remarks and outlines directions of future research.

## II. RELATED WORKS

A wide body of scientific works is related to the QoE estimation. In this section, we briefly cover two lines of researches that their results are mostly related to our work.

As shown in Tab.I, in the field of QoE assessment for multimedia services, various research works have been conducted to address the challenges and propose solutions. Baraković et al. [22] in 2013 focused on modeling, monitoring, and measuring QoE, laying the groundwork for further research in this area. However, their work did not provide specific tools for data collection or MOS calculation, nor did it examine the impact of human factors or utilize machine learning techniques. Sultan et al. [23] in 2023 evaluated multimedia services based on QoE in communication networks with high bandwidth and low latency. They considered the impact of human factors and employed machine learning algorithms, but did not provide data collection or MOS calculation tools. Their results were helpful for resource allocation, and they utilized the ITU P.1203 standard for their evaluations.

Barman et al. [24] in 2019 conducted a review of QoE assessment models for adaptive video streaming. They provided tools for MOS calculation based on video parameters and considered the impact of human factors. Machine learning techniques were used in their work, but they did not provide a comprehensive framework from data collection to QoE calculation. Liotou et al. [25] in 2023 investigated the impact of using an intermediate server for caching on user QoE. They provided MOS calculation tools based on video parameters and examined the influence of human factors. However, they did not employ machine learning algorithms or provide data collection tools. Their work utilized the ITU P.1203 standard and produced results that could aid in resource allocation decisions.

Barakabitze et al. [26] in 2019 proposed QoE management solutions for multimedia services in future networks. They considered the impact of human factors and utilized machine learning techniques in their approach. However, they did not provide specific tools for data collection or MOS calculation. Kougioumtzidis et al. [27] in 2022 focused on quality assessment in multimedia QoE and machine learning-based prediction. They provided MOS calculation tools based on video parameters and examined the impact of human factors. Machine learning algorithms were employed, but a comprehensive framework from data collection to QoE calculation was not presented. Their work yielded results that could assist in resource allocation. Omar et al. [28] in 2023 utilized machine learning to predict QoE in multimedia networks. They provided subjective data collection tools and considered network parameters. The impact of human factors was examined, and machine learning techniques were applied.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF RELATED WORKS ON QoE ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT IN MULTIMEDIA SERVICES. THE TABLE HIGHLIGHTS THE KEY ASPECTS COVERED BY EACH WORK, INCLUDING DATA COLLECTION TOOLS, MOS CALCULATION METHODS, THE IMPACT OF HUMAN FACTORS, MACHINE LEARNING TECHNIQUES, AND ADHERENCE TO THE ITU P.1203 STANDARD. THE COMPARISON REVEALS THE DIVERSE APPROACHES AND FOCUS AREAS OF THE EXISTING RESEARCH IN THE FIELD.

Related Work	Year	Covered Topics	Data collection	MOS calculation	Human factors	Utilize ML	End-to-end calculation	ITU P.1203	Helpful for resource allocation
This research	-	Calculating Quality of Experience in Multimedia Services based on Machine Learning	✓	✓(Objective)	✓(Net. params)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Baraković et al. [22]	2013	Modeling, monitoring, measuring Quality of Experience	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Sultan et al. [23]	2023	Evaluation of multimedia services, based on Quality of Experience, communication networks with high bandwidth and low latency	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓
Barman et al. [24]	2019	A review of Quality of Experience assessment models for adaptive video streaming	✗	✓(Video params)	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
Liotou et al. [25]	2023	The impact of using an intermediate server for caching on user Quality of Experience	✗	✓(Video params)	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Barakabitze et al. [26]	2019	Quality of Experience management solutions for multimedia services in future networks	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓
Kougioumtzidis et al. [27]	2022	Quality assessment in multimedia Quality of Experience and machine learning-based prediction	✗	✓(Video params)	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓
Omar et al. [28]	2023	Using machine learning to predict Quality of Experience in multimedia networks	✓ (Subjective)	✓(Net. params)	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓

However, they did not provide a complete framework from data collection to QoE calculation or utilize the ITU P.1203 standard. Nonetheless, their findings could be beneficial for resource allocation purposes.

In contrast to the aforementioned works, this research [21] aims to provide a comprehensive framework for calculating QoE in multimedia services based on machine learning techniques. The proposed approach offers tools for both objective data collection and MOS calculation, considering network parameters as influential factors. The impact of human factors is also examined, and machine learning algorithms are employed to predict QoE. A notable feature of this research is the provision of a complete framework that encompasses the entire process from data collection to QoE calculation. Furthermore, the ITU P.1203 standard is utilized to ensure the reliability and comparability of the results. The outcomes of this research are expected to be valuable for efficient resource allocation in multimedia networks. By addressing the limitations of previous works and offering a holistic solution, this research contributes significantly to the field of QoE assessment and management in multimedia services.

#### A. Subjective QoE Assessments

Video services constitute one of the most challenging QoE assessments, and therefore, multiple methods have been developed to conduct subjective video quality assessment [27], [29]–[32].

Degradation category rating (DCR) and Double Stimulus Impairment Scale (DSIS) are also referred to. It specifies that the test sequences be presented in pairs, with the primary

stimulus always being the source reference, while the second one is the same source transmitted through the system under evaluation. After viewing these two sequences in each session, the evaluators provide a subjective judgment of the impairment sequence on a five-level classification scale. The DCR method can be used to evaluate the accuracy of playback systems as well as high fidelity systems.

The Double Stimulus Continuous Quality Scale (DSCQS) is a cyclical approach in that evaluators are required to evaluate a pair of sequences from the same source, one directly from the source and the other from the system under evaluation, after which they are tasked with evaluating the quality of both. A set of random sequence pairs as well as random impairments including all required combinations is presented to the evaluators in sessions of up to half an hour. The average scores are evaluated at the end of the assessment sessions.

The Pair Comparison (PC) method presents the test sequences in pairs, the systems under evaluation (A, B, C, etc.) usually come together in all possible combinations like AB, BA, CA, etc. Therefore, all sequence pairs must be shown in both arrangements (e.g. AB, BA). The number of repetitions usually does not need to be examined for the PC technique, since this approach itself requires repeat presentations of the same conditions applied in different sequence pairs. At the end, after displaying each pair, it is decided which element in a pair is preferred within the framework of the test method.

The Subjective Assessment Methodology for Video Quality (SAMVIQ) is a subjective, non-interactive approach to assess the video quality of multimedia programs. This approach can be used for various applications including algorithm selection, ranking audiovisual system performance, and evaluating video



quality level during an audiovisual connection. It uses a continuous quality scale where each evaluator adjusts a sliding bar on a continuous scale from 0 to 100 which is divided into five quality levels (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Bad).

### B. Objective QoE Assessments

Objective models are described as a method to obtain perceived quality based solely on objective quality measurements or metrics [33]. That is, these models are expected to produce estimates close to the ratings obtained by subjective assessment methods. The advantages of the objective approach are ease of implementation and modifiability, since researchers only need to pay attention to the measurable QoS factors and associated mathematical models.

The weakness of objective assessment is its lack of accuracy, since the obtained QoE is only an approximation, not an exact value of the end user's perceived quality [34]. Over the years, researchers have investigated methods and approaches to estimate the image, video and audio quality perceived by end users, and have made considerable efforts to develop assessments and models capable of objectively predicting the quality of a multimedia service. These assessments use audio, visual and video features to estimate quality and classify them as full-reference (FR), reduced-reference (RR) and no-reference (NR), depending on how much of the source information is available [35].

FR methods have access to the reference sequence and output, and therefore multimedia sequences enable a comprehensive connection between the subjective and objective methods. Such evaluations are suitable for conventional playback and television systems [36]. In terms of human perception accuracy, FR assessments that perform a frame-by-frame examination between the source and the impaired (test environment) sequence produce better results.

Examples of such assessments include structural similarity (SSIM) [37], video quality models (VQM) [38], and Peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR) [39] which measures structural similarities. However, these assessments require access to source data and have computational requirements. As a result, they are not suitable for real-time evaluation, but are preferred for benchmarking.

RR methods use the same group of features (i.e. reference sequence and result) for calculation. To obtain quality, only a small subset of the input and output sequence parameters is required as the initial sample [40]. These features can exist at the application layer, such as bit rate and frame rate, as well as at the network layer, such as packet losses. RR methods are suitable for real-time transmission networks with limited computational and transmission bandwidth. In addition, they are well-suited to conditions where the input sequence is complex for transmission or storage, or where computational power is limited [41].

In NR methods, only the output sequence is provided so quality must be evaluated without a reference. NR methods have efficient time response and are much lighter compared to other methods, but they cannot provide an accurate evaluation across a wide range of video conditions [42]. These metrics are more suitable for online services where only the output

sequence is presented to end users. For example, in mobile video streaming services, but in NR methods, determining whether mismatches in quality relate to the reference quality or if intermediate network components have problems is difficult [36].

### C. Machine learning in QoE of Multimedia services

In [25], the possibility of improving the user's quality of experience has been provided using a cache between the main server and the user device. The following results were also obtained from this study:

- Send while get model (SWG): This model is smarter than the get before send (GBS) model and provides the ability to send simultaneously with customer request without the need for queuing. This model significantly improves video viewer performance and quality of experience.
- Benefiting from cache: Using an intermediate server with proper caching can improve overall system performance and increase viewer experience quality. Choosing an intelligent cache algorithm results in better utilization of available bandwidth.
- Effect of DASH algorithm: Proper selection of the DASH algorithm for choosing video segments based on future playback capability has a direct impact on viewer quality and experience. Over-optimization should not be relied upon too much in order to prevent excessive stalling that may occur due to lack of awareness of content available on the intermediate server.
- Need for an advanced cache algorithm: The paper shows that selecting an intelligent cache algorithm can significantly improve performance and service quality for video viewers. An algorithm that decides based on the playback possibility of more specific segments can yield the best results.
- Balance between performance and bandwidth utilization: Finally, points are mentioned that make precise balancing between bandwidth utilization and improving viewer experience quality possible. Increasing available buffer size improves video playback quality, but this improvement requires coordination with cache algorithm and DASH decisions simultaneously.

In [28], research has been done on predicting user QoE in enterprise multimedia networks using machine learning methods, some of which are described below:

- An architecture for QoE monitoring has been proposed, including: QoE monitoring server, QoS monitoring tools such as PRTG (a network monitoring tool), database, and surveying to collect user feedback MOS.
- QoS parameters including delay, jitter, bandwidth, packet loss rate are collected through PRTG and correlated with user satisfaction subjective scores. This data is used to train machine learning models.
- Several supervised machine learning algorithms including: linear regression, logistic regression, support vector machines, random forest, decision trees and multi-layer perceptron have been implemented and evaluated.
- Algorithm performance was measured by criteria such as  $R^2$ , RMSE for regression models and accuracy, precision,




Fig. 2. Workflow of the data collection process. The first evaluation platform involves downloading the Docker image on a PC for data collection. The second evaluation platform extends this process to servers, simulating various network configurations for comprehensive data analysis.

and F1-score for classification models. The random forest algorithm had about 80% accuracy, the best performance in predicting MOS scores among classification algorithms. Linear regression also had the best performance among regression algorithms, as well as the best overall performance, with 90% prediction accuracy.

- The results indicate the possibility of using machine learning to predict QoE of multimedia networks based on technical QoS parameters and user subjective feedback. These models can proactively identify network issues.

### III. SYSTEM MODEL AND ASSUMPTIONS

#### A. ITU P.1203: Video quality assessment

The ITU-T P.1203 model was chosen as it is designed for short video chunks used in HTTP adaptive streaming. It produces a standard Mean Opinion Score reflecting user perception of quality derived from subjective assessments. This provided an appropriate method to label video training data with quality scores, enabling the machine learning model to predict streaming satisfaction from network metrics alone. The collected data is assigned continuous MOS values based on the P.1203 computation.

#### B. ITU P.1203 Specs

The inputs of the proposed ITU-T software for calculating QoE are as follows [43]–[45]:

- One or more audio/video files (segments), or
- Input specifications in JSON format

Based on the input, this software calculates the audio and video quality scores per second and the overall integrated audiovisual quality score according to ITU P.1203 standards. The following codecs are supported:

- Audio: AAC-LC, HE-AAC, MP2, AC-3
- Image: H.264

When the input is specified, the software automatically decides which mode to use for calculating QoE:

- Mode 0 (metadata only): bit rate, frame rate and image resolution,
- Mode 1 (frame header data only): all Mode 0 items, plus frame types and sizes,
- Mode 2 (two percent stream data): all Mode 1 items, plus two percent of QP values of all frames,
- Mode 3 (hundred percent stream data): all Mode 1 items plus QP values of all frames.

ITU P.1203 is an ITU-T standard by which video parameters are extracted as input, then these parameters are applied as input to this standard, and the output is the calculated MOS standard for various parameters including audio, video, and stalling.

## IV. THE PROPOSED APPROACH

### A. Data collection

As shown in Figure 3, a cycle of the first and second phases that shows the Data collection process executive steps.

- 1) In the first step, we open the a video streaming platform website through Selenium,
- 2) In the next step we search for a specific video,
- 3) We select the desired video,
- 4) We find the start button and click on it,
- 5) If an advertisement is played, we skip it,
- 6) We watch some of the video (defined in the startup file),
- 7) After watching the desired amount of video, we extract the HAR file from WebDriver through Selenium,
- 8) In the HAR file we separate the .ts files (using Regex1) and keep them in a list. Then we download these files and keep them in a folder. And then we send them one by one to the ITU P.1203 program to calculate the QoE score.
- 9) We attach these scores as labels to the video data and store them in a database.

As part of the data collection process, measurement of KPIs such as throughput, delay, jitter, packet loss and bit rate associated with the video streaming sessions was performed.

### B. Evaluation and Training

The purpose of this is to obtain labeled data and use it in an ML model to train this model. This program can be distributed and executed on user devices, and the ML model can also be trained in a distributed way.




Fig. 3. Detailed workflow of the data collection and MOS calculation process. The process begins with opening an HTTP Adaptive Streaming Service website using Selenium, followed by searching and selecting a specific video. After skipping any advertisements and watching the desired video segment, HAR file extraction is performed. The extracted .ts files are then sent to the ITU P.1203 program to calculate the QoE score. Finally, these scores are stored in a database, facilitating the measurement of KPIs such as throughput, delay, jitter, packet loss, and bit rate.

- 1) Execute the data collection program on personal devices under different real network conditions or simulate various network conditions on servers and collect data
- 2) Preprocess collected data then, select features like delay, jitter, packet loss, bit rate, throughput (independent variables) and MOS (dependent variable)
- 3) Train models like linear regression, DNNs, random forest on 80% of data and 20% test data

## V. DETAILS OF THE PROPOSED APPROACH

In this section, the execution and network simulation phase was carried out in two parts (Figure 2). The first part was running the program by different people on personal devices and with various Internet service providers. The second part was simulated on servers from different data centers under various network conditions. The implementation of this research is also available as open source [21], which makes it possible for other researchers and developers to use the project source code, improve it, or customize it to their needs. This approach promotes increased transparency and collaboration in the scientific community and enables further sharing of knowledge and experiences in the field of study.

The implementation of this research uses Python 3.11.1 and sqlite3 database for simplicity and speed. The maximum RAM requirement is 700 MB and 1 CPU core is sufficient to run the program. The disk space usage by the program codes is less than 100 MB, however an additional storage buffer needs to be considered for the video file currently being processed by the program. Therefore, allocating 500 MB of disk space for this purpose is suitable.

All systems running on AMD and ARM architectures are suitable to execute the program. Building the code for other architectures is also possible. The tested operating systems to run the program are: Windows (7 and 10), Linux, and MacOS (both Intel and Apple Silicon architectures). The software execution test was also performed on the Raspberry Pi 5 single-board computer running Raspberry OS.

Therefore, in general the program is capable of running and collecting data on all operating systems that support Docker (e.g. Android).

Git was also used to manage the project and the project was uploaded as open source on Github.

### A. First Evaluation Platform

As shown in Figure 2, the program was executed on individuals' personal computers. The evaluation was actually performed on the personal computers of 8 people to examine the effects and performance of the program in different environments with various devices, operating systems, and Internet service providers. This assessment included performance, stability, and compatibility with different devices and services (Figure 4).

These personal computers were running Windows, Linux and MacOS operating systems. All of these computers had appropriate and sufficient hardware to execute the program.

### B. Second Evaluation Platform

As shown in Figure 2, in the second execution platform, containers were running on several servers. The evaluation was




Fig. 4. Results of the First Evaluation Platform, showing the number of collected data points across various ISPs. The chart highlights the diversity of network conditions evaluated, with Mobin Net and Shatel Mobile providing the highest data collection volumes.

TABLE II

SPECIFICATIONS AND PARAMETERS OF THE MACHINE LEARNING MODELS USED IN THIS STUDY. THE MODELS INCLUDE LINEAR REGRESSION, RANDOM FOREST, AND DEEP NEURAL NETWORK (DNN), EACH WITH DETAILED CONFIGURATIONS TO PREDICT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES.

Model	Specifications and Parameters
Linear Regression	A baseline model for predicting the linear relationship between independent and dependent variables
Random Forest	A decision tree-based model
Random Forest (continued)	Combination of multiple decision trees to improve prediction accuracy: -Number of trees (n_estimators): 600 -Maximum depth of each tree (max_depth): 48 -Maximum features in each node (max_features): 0.58
Deep Neural Network (DNN)	A neural network-based model using a multilayer perceptron architecture -Network Architecture: -One input layer with 128 neurons -Four hidden layers with 256 neurons in each layer -One output layer with one neuron Activation Functions: -Hidden layers: ReLU -Output layer: Linear Number of training epochs: 2000 Batch size: 32
Deep Neural Network (continued)	Optimizer: Adam Loss function: Mean Absolute Error (MAE)

actually performed on Arvan Cloud, Parspack, and Hetzner Cloud servers. The servers had 8 GB of RAM, 4 CPU cores with amd64 architecture. 4 Docker containers were running on each server, with each container having different network parameters. This approach makes it possible to simulate many real network conditions and users and obtain the MOS scores for the observed videos according to these conditions. Figure 5 shows the data collection from different servers with various network configuration profiles.

### C. Train a machine learning model

As shown as seen, Tab. II presents a comparison of three machine learning models employed for predicting the relationship between independent and dependent variables: Linear Regression, Random Forest, and Deep Neural Network (DNN). Linear Regression serves as a baseline model, capturing the linear relationship between variables. The Random Forest

TABLE III  
Results obtained from different machine learning models

Model	$R^2$	MSE	RMSE	MAE
Linear Regression	0.559	0.332	0.576	0.443
Deep Neural Networks	0.741	0.195	0.442	0.292
Random Forest	0.958	0.031	0.178	0.126

model, based on decision trees, combines multiple trees to enhance prediction accuracy. It is characterized by parameters such as the number of trees (n\_estimators), maximum depth of each tree (max\_depth), and maximum features used in each node (max\_features). On the other hand, the DNN model utilizes a multilayer perceptron architecture with one input layer, four hidden layers, and one output layer. The hidden layers employ the ReLU activation function, while the output layer uses a linear activation function. The DNN model is trained using the Adam optimizer and Mean Absolute Error (MAE) as the loss function, with a specified number of training epochs and batch size. These models offer diverse approaches to capturing and predicting the relationships between variables, each with its own set of specifications and parameters.

The required data in the first and second platforms was collected using the data collection system with Selenium to about 20,000 rows and stored in the database. Next, we enter the next phase, which is training the machine learning model. The goal of this phase is to train a machine learning model with parameters related to the network, so that along it we can determine the MOS only by having these network parameters. First the collected data is processed by removing problematic data. Then processes like feature engineering and normalization were performed on the data. Therefore, features like delay, jitter, packet loss, bit rate, and throughput were selected as independent variables and MOS as the dependent variable for model training.

## VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULT

As shown in Table III, three models of linear regression, deep neural networks, and random forest were trained with 80% of the obtained data, then tested with the remaining 20% data. As a result, according to the obtained results, it can be determined how accurately the model can estimate the MOS (the dependent variable of the model) given the mentioned network-related inputs.

According to the obtained values, the random forest yielded the best result with the highest  $R^2$  equal to 0.958 and the lowest error, which can be considered as the research result. Therefore, given the introduced tools for collecting video streaming data and calculating MOS in phases 1 and 2, as well as network simulation and program execution in phase 3 of the implementation, the required data for phase 4, which was machine learning model training, was obtained. The random forest model was then trained with 80% of the data and tested with 20% of the data to validate the model. According to the obtained numerical results, a reliable model was reached to predict MOS by only providing 5 main network parameters: delay, jitter, packet loss, bit rate, and throughput. Thus, this






Fig. 5. Results of the Second Evaluation Platform, illustrating the number of collected data points across various network settings profiles. The data was gathered from three different cloud service providers: ParsPack, Arvan, and Hetzner. Each provider's data is represented by different colors: blue for ParsPack, red for Arvan, and gray for Hetzner. The chart demonstrates a diverse range of network conditions, including custom configurations and standard profiles such as Good 3G, Poor 4G, and High Jitter. The variation in collected data highlights the robustness of the evaluation process and the comprehensive coverage of different network scenarios, essential for accurate QoE assessment.

research has provided a framework for calculating the quality of experience of video streaming multimedia services based on machine learning.

## VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

In recent years, QoE has received considerable research attention and is recognized as an important factor in determining network operational efficiency. Measuring and modeling QoE has become important for various multimedia services, and operators have made considerable efforts to provide satisfactory services to their users based on the end-user experience.

In this regard, the first step in optimizing the delivery of multimedia streaming services is evaluating and predicting end-user QoE, which provides a better understanding of the impact of network technical aspects on the multimedia service quality experienced by end users.

However, QoS metrics are not directly related to end-user satisfaction and perceived experience, so other user-centric metrics have been developed for quality assessment. Recognizing and identifying the influencing subjective and objective QoE factors is vital to understanding these metrics, the result of which is proper QoE management. These influencing factors can be categorized as human-related, system-related, context-related, or content-related.

Quality assessment includes two approaches: subjective and objective assessment. Subjective assessment techniques rely on human evaluators, while objective techniques are ways to

measure perceived quality solely based on objective quality metrics. Given the extremely large number of factors involved in calculating QoE, QoE assessment has become a complex issue, so various ML solutions have been proposed in recent years to address this problem.

Since ML improves QoE model accuracy, aids in QoE monitoring, and provides a methodological basis for measuring the relationship between QoS and QoE, the research community has adopted ML-based approaches to achieve real-time, accurate and adaptable QoE management frameworks.

In this report, we define QoE in a framework for multimedia services and analyze the QoE Influencing Factors (IFs). In addition, we introduce important quality assessments such as subjective and objective ones, and present their evaluation methods and performance.

In addition, we elaborate on the QoE calculation method introduced by the ITU-T and examine its details in order to consider an appropriate and standard method for calculating QoE. We also examined an application example that could demonstrate the role of ML in video watching and studied an ML model called Federated Learning.

Moreover, we introduced a video data collection tool and MOS calculation, then used the collected data to train various machine learning models, where network-related data was identified as the independent variable and MOS score as the dependent variable. Finally, we evaluated these models' results. According to these evaluations, the random forest

model with an  $R^2$  of 0.958 yielded the best MOS estimate, so we introduced it as the selected model for predicting MOS by only providing network-related variables.

Therefore, we used the ITU-T QoE calculation model to obtain scores for viewed videos to reach labeled data, then utilized this labeled data to train a machine learning model. This trained model was introduced to estimate user satisfaction in real-time using only network input parameters.

Ultimately, we reached an overall framework for real-time multimedia data QoE calculation and operators' utilization of this framework to dynamically and optimally allocate resources to their users, so that users are satisfied with using this multimedia data. As a result, operators can keep their users satisfied at the lowest cost.

- Using this labeled data in a distributed federated artificial intelligence model, so that training operations are performed in a distributed manner on user devices and the model is returned to the reference after changes. In this way, users are also part of the learning process, which enriches the artificial intelligence model in real time.
- Expanding this framework for use in social networks and messaging apps and examining user satisfaction regarding these networks
- Applying deep learning models after collecting more data, in order to increase accuracy
- Using reinforcement learning algorithms to continuously optimize the prediction model based on user feedback
- Implementing a recommender system to suggest personalized content based on the user QoE prediction model
- Combining information obtained from various measurements such as eye movements and facial reactions with the ML model

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. H. S. Panahi, A. H. Jalilvand, and A. Diyanat, "Enhancing quality of experience in telecommunication networks: A review of frameworks and machine learning algorithms," 2024.
- [2] J. Lloret, M. Garcia, M. Atenas, and A. Canovas, "A qoe management system to improve the iptv network," *International Journal of Communication Systems*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 118–138, 2011.
- [3] C. Lozano-Garzon, C. Ariza-Porras, H. Riveros-Ardila, Y. Donoso *et al.*, "Mobile network qoe-qos decision making tool for performance optimization in critical web service," *International Journal of Computers Communications & Control*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 892–899, 2012.
- [4] F. Wamser, M. Seufert, P. Casas, R. Irmer, P. Tran-Gia, and R. Schatz, "Yomoapp: A tool for analyzing qoe of youtube http adaptive streaming in mobile networks," in *2015 European Conference on Networks and Communications (EuCNC)*, 2015, pp. 239–243.
- [5] —, "Poster: Understanding youtube qoe in cellular networks with yomoapp: A qoe monitoring tool for youtube mobile," in *Proceedings of the 21st Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*, 2015, pp. 263–265.
- [6] J. Jiang, V. Sekar, H. Milner, D. Shepherd, I. Stoica, and H. Zhang, "CFA: A practical prediction system for Video QoE optimization," in *13th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 16)*. Santa Clara, CA: USENIX Association, 2016.
- [7] P. Casas, A. D'Alconzo, F. Wamser, M. Seufert, B. Gardlo, A. Schwind, P. Tran-Gia, and R. Schatz, "Predicting qoe in cellular networks using machine learning and in-smartphone measurements," in *2017 Ninth International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [8] M. Suryanegara, D. A. Prasetyo, F. Andriyanto, and N. Hayati, "A 5-step framework for measuring the quality of experience (qoe) of internet of things (iot) services," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 175 779–175 792, 2019.
- [9] U. S. Hashmi, A. Rudrapatna, Z. Zhao, M. Rozwadowski, J. Kang, R. Wuppalapati, and A. Imran, "Towards real-time user qoe assessment via machine learning on lte network data," in *2019 IEEE 90th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2019-Fall)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [10] G. Gómez, L. Hortigüela, Q. Pérez, J. Lorca, R. García, and M. C. Aguayo-Torres, "Youtube qoe evaluation tool for android wireless terminals," *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, vol. 2014, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2014.
- [11] S. Ickin, M. Fiedler, K. Wac, P. Arlos, C. Temiz, and K. Mkocho, "Vlqoe: Video qoe instrumentation on the smartphone," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 74, pp. 381–411, 2015.
- [12] J. Sandoval, A. Ehijo, A. Casals, and C. Estevez, "New model and open tools for real testing of qoe in mobile broadband services and the transport protocol impact: The operator's approach," *IEEE Latin America Transactions*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 546–551, 2015.
- [13] M. Aazam and K. A. Harras, "Mapping qoe with resource estimation in iot," in *2019 IEEE 5th World Forum on Internet of Things (WF-IoT)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 464–467.
- [14] P. Casas, R. Schatz, and T. Hoßfeld, "Monitoring youtube qoe: Is your mobile network delivering the right experience to your customers?" in *2013 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, 2013, pp. 1609–1614.
- [15] A. Ahmad, A. Floris, and L. Atzori, "Qoe-aware service delivery: A joint-venture approach for content and network providers," in *2016 Eighth International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [16] N. Barman and M. G. Martini, "Qoe modeling for http adaptive video streaming—a survey and open challenges," *Ieee Access*, vol. 7, pp. 30 831–30 859, 2019.
- [17] A. Floris, L. Atzori, G. Ginesu, and D. D. Giusto, "Qoe assessment of multimedia video consumption on tablet devices," in *2012 IEEE Globecom Workshops*, 2012, pp. 1329–1334.
- [18] A. A. Barakabitze, N. Barman, A. Ahmad, S. Zadtootaghaj, L. Sun, M. G. Martini, and L. Atzori, "Qoe management of multimedia streaming services in future networks: a tutorial and survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 526–565, 2019.
- [19] N. Barman and M. G. Martini, "Qoe modeling for http adaptive video streaming—a survey and open challenges," *Ieee Access*, vol. 7, pp. 30 831–30 859, 2019.
- [20] P. Casas, M. Seufert, S. Egger, and R. Schatz, "Quality of experience in remote virtual desktop services," in *2013 IFIP/IEEE International Symposium on Integrated Network Management (IM 2013)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1352–1357.
- [21] P. Hassani Shariat Panahi, "Qoe selenium," <https://github.com/F4RAN/qoe-selenium>, 2024, [Online; accessed 03-January-2024].
- [22] S. Baraković, L. Skorin-Kapov *et al.*, "Survey and challenges of qoe management issues in wireless networks," *Journal of Computer Networks and Communications*, vol. 2013, 2013.
- [23] M. T. Sultan and H. El Sayed, "Qoe-aware analysis and management of multimedia services in 5g and beyond heterogeneous networks," *IEEE Access*, 2023.
- [24] N. Barman and M. G. Martini, "Qoe modeling for http adaptive video streaming—a survey and open challenges," *Ieee Access*, vol. 7, pp. 30 831–30 859, 2019.
- [25] E. Liotou, D. Xenakis, V. Georgara, G. Kourouniotis, and L. Merakos, "Cache-enabled adaptive video streaming: A qoe-based evaluation study," *Future Internet*, vol. 15, no. 7, p. 221, 2023.
- [26] A. A. Barakabitze, N. Barman, A. Ahmad, S. Zadtootaghaj, L. Sun, M. G. Martini, and L. Atzori, "Qoe management of multimedia streaming services in future networks: A tutorial and survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 526–565, 2019.
- [27] G. Kougioumtzidis, V. Poulkov, Z. D. Zaharis, and P. I. Lazaridis, "A survey on multimedia services qoe assessment and machine learning-based prediction," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 19 507–19 538, 2022.
- [28] H. O. Hamidou, J. P. Kouraogo, O. Sie, and D. Tapsoba, "Machine learning based quality of experience (qoe) prediction approach in enterprise multimedia networks," in *Proceedings of the 5th edition of the Computer Science Research Days, JRI 2022, 24-26 November 2022, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso*, 2023.
- [29] R. I.-R. BT, "Methodology for the subjective assessment of the quality of television pictures," *International Telecommunication Union*, 2002.
- [30] P. ITU-T RECOMMENDATION, "Subjective video quality assessment methods for multimedia applications," 1999.
- [31] I.-T. ITU-T P.800, "Methods for subjective determination of transmission quality," 1996.
- [32] I.-T. ITU-T P.913, "Methods for the subjective assessment of video quality, audio quality and audiovisual quality of internet video and distribution quality television in any environment," 2016.

- [33] A. Takahashi, "Framework and standardization of quality of experience (qoe) design and management for audiovisual communication services," vol. 7, 04 2009.
- [34] Y. Wang, W. Zhou, and P. Zhang, *QoE Management in Wireless Networks*, 08 2016.
- [35] M. Fiedler, T. Hossfeld, and P. Tran-Gia, "A generic quantitative relationship between quality of experience and quality of service," *IEEE Network*, vol. 24, 05 2010.
- [36] P. Juluri, V. Tamarapalli, and D. Medhi, "Measurement of quality of experience of video-on-demand services: A survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 401–418, 2015.
- [37] Z. Wang, L. Lu, and A. Bovik, "Video quality assessment based on structural distortion measurement," *Signal Processing: Image Communication*, vol. 19, pp. 121–132, 02 2004.
- [38] M. Pinson and S. Wolf, "A new standardized method for objectively measuring video quality," *Broadcasting, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 50, pp. 312 – 322, 10 2004.
- [39] R. Serral-Gracià, E. Cerqueira, M. Curado, M. Yannuzzi, E. Monteiro, and X. Masip, "An overview of quality of experience measurement challenges for video applications in ip networks," 06 2010, pp. 252–263.
- [40] W. Song, D. W. Tjondronegoro, and M. Docherty, "Understanding user experience of mobile video: framework, measurement, and optimization," *Mobile Multimedia: User and Technology Perspectives*, pp. 3–30, 2012.
- [41] M. Yang, S. Wang, R. N. Calheiros, and F. Yang, "Survey on qoe assessment approach for network service," *Ieee Access*, vol. 6, pp. 48 374–48 390, 2018.
- [42] M. T. Vega, C. Perra, F. De Turck, and A. Liotta, "A review of predictive quality of experience management in video streaming services," *IEEE Transactions on Broadcasting*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 432–445, 2018.
- [43] GitHub, "Itu-t rec. p.1203 standalone implementation," <https://github.com/itu-p1203/itu-p1203>, [Online; accessed 10-November-2022].
- [44] A. Raake, M.-N. Garcia, W. Robitza, P. List, S. Göring, and B. Feiten, "A bitstream-based, scalable video-quality model for HTTP adaptive streaming: ITU-T P.1203.1," in *Ninth International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)*. Erfurt: IEEE, May 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7965631/>
- [45] W. Robitza, S. Göring, A. Raake, D. Lindgren, G. Heikkilä, J. Gustafsson, P. List, B. Feiten, U. Wüstenhagen, M.-N. Garcia, K. Yamagishi, and S. Broom, "HTTP Adaptive Streaming QoE Estimation with ITU-T Rec. P.1203 – Open Databases and Software," in *9th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference*, Amsterdam, 2018.