

# Uncertainty Aware Deep Learning Model for Secure and Trustworthy Channel Estimation in 5G Networks

Ferhat Ozgur Catak

*Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science  
University of Stavanger  
Stavanger, Norway  
f.ozgur.catak@uis.no*

Umit Cali

*Department of Electric Power Engineering  
Norwegian University of Science and Technology  
Trondheim, Norway  
umit.cali@ntnu.no*

Murat Kuzlu

*Electrical Engineering Technology  
Old Dominion University  
Norfolk, VA, USA  
mkuzlu@odu.edu*

Salih Sarp

*Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
Richmond, VA, USA  
sarps@vcu.edu*

**Abstract**—With the rise of intelligent applications, such as self-driving cars and augmented reality, the security and reliability of wireless communication systems have become increasingly crucial. One of the most critical components of ensuring a high-quality experience is channel estimation, which is fundamental for efficient transmission and interference management in wireless networks. However, using deep neural networks (DNNs) in channel estimation raises security and trust concerns due to their complexity and the need for more transparency in decision-making. This paper proposes a Monte Carlo Dropout (MCDO)-based approach for secure and trustworthy channel estimation in 5G networks. Our approach combines the advantages of traditional and deep learning techniques by incorporating conventional pilot-based channel estimation as a prior in the deep learning model. Additionally, we use MCDO to obtain uncertainty-aware predictions, enhancing the model's security and trustworthiness. Our experiments demonstrate that our proposed approach outperforms traditional and deep learning-based approaches regarding security, trustworthiness, and performance in 5G scenarios.

**Index Terms**—Uncertainty, Trustworthy AI, Wireless network security, Channel estimation

## I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, communication systems have undergone a significant transformation driven by advances in information and processing technologies. Next-generation communication systems, such as 5G and beyond, have garnered significant attention due to their potential to meet the growing demands of industry and consumers. These requirements include higher data transmission speeds, ultra-low latency, increased reliability, a better quality of service, massive network coverage, and increased availability. However, with the proliferation of new applications, such as Augmented Reality (AR)/Virtual Reality (VR), the Internet of Things (IoT), and autonomous vehicles, come significant cyber security risks [1].

These risks stem from the exponential growth in traffic volume and the increased complexity of the communication networks, which seriously threaten the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of data. For instance, an attacker may exploit a vulnerability in the communication network to intercept sensitive information or launch a Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) attack, which can result in a significant disruption of service. In addition, the ITU-R study on "IMT traffic predictions for the years 2020 to 2030" predicts that mobile traffic (excluding M2M traffic) will expand at an annual rate of roughly 54% in 2020-2030, reaching 543EB in 2025 and 4394EB in 2030 [2]. Therefore, it is crucial to develop secure and trustworthy communication systems that can meet the growing demands of industry and consumers while mitigating cyber security risks.

In recent years, NextG technologies have been equipped with improved information, and computing methodologies [3]. Various studies have proposed different algorithms for channel estimation. This paper presents a novel approach for channel estimation that employs deep learning models. Channel estimation is a challenging task in wireless communication due to algorithms' high computational complexity level, many mathematical operations, and the low accuracy of channel estimation. To overcome these challenges, machine learning approaches have been successfully used in 5G and beyond communication systems, resulting in improved performance of channel estimation algorithms [4]. Deep learning-based algorithms, in particular, offer the potential for reduced computing costs and excellent channel estimation accuracy. However, the trustworthiness of using machine learning methods in NextG technologies is a concern. The lack of transparency in deep learning algorithms makes interpreting and understanding their decision-making processes challenging, leading to uncertainty

and trust issues [5]. To address this, research has been conducted on interpretable deep learning models and proposed a taxonomy for categorizing interpretation algorithms. Trustworthy autonomy for NextG technologies, along with explainable AI (XAI) and its test protocols for integration with radio resource management and associated key performance indicators (KPIs) for trust, has also been introduced [6]. Building trust and transparency into AI optimization algorithms from the design through the testing phase is crucial for ensuring their trustworthiness in NextG technologies.

## II. RELATED WORK

Quantifying uncertainty in deep learning (DL) models is a topic of ongoing research. One of the primary methods for assessing uncertainty in DL models is using the softmax variance and expected entropy across multiple models. Gal et al. [7] showed that a neural network model with dropout activated during prediction time is equivalent to a specific variation of a Bayesian neural network model. This approach approximates the model's uncertainty by averaging probabilistic feed-forward MC dropout sampling during prediction time. This method is efficient for large models and helps understand how networks perform under different test conditions [8].

An alternative method for quantifying uncertainty in DL models is through the use of Deep Ensembles, which is a non-Bayesian approach [9]. This method trains multiple models in parallel, each with random noise and adversarial instances in its training dataset subset. This results in a set of independent classifiers, each with a unique weight. The ensemble can produce different predictions for the same input instance using its models. However, since Deep Ensembles require multiple models, it is unsuitable for single-model uncertainty quantification. In this study, we have chosen the prediction time-activated dropout-based neural network approach [10] for single-model uncertainty quantification.

The goal of methods in adversarial ML is to create modified input instances that can evade or fool a DL model. Recently, Ma et al., in their work [10], have shown the relationship between uncertainty and model prediction performance. Their approach focused on increasing the robustness of DL models by applying various adversarial ML attacks, such as the Fast Gradient Sign Method, Basic Iterative Method, DeepFool, Jacobian-Based Saliency Map Attack, and Carlini-Wagner, to create instances that are highly uncertain and misclassified. These newly generated instances are then used as a new training dataset in a re-training phase to enhance the DL model's robustness. This iterative training with adversarial instances is similar to traditional adversarial training techniques [11]. They evaluated their approach on the MNIST, Fashion MNIST, and CIFAR-10 image datasets. While the method is similar to adversarial training, it improves the prediction performance of DL models by using highly uncertain inputs instead of adversarial ones.

The authors of [12] investigated the use of Bayesian Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) for quantifying uncertainty in Deep Learning models to improve the diagnostic capabilities

of human-machine collaboration using a dataset of COVID-19 chest X-ray images. Another research paper, [13], proposed a method for estimating predictive uncertainty in DL models by considering uncertainty values and quality estimates. However, this approach is limited to object detection tasks and cannot be applied to data from cyber-physical systems (CPS).

The study [14] provides a comprehensive review of AI-based techniques at the algorithm, implementation, and optimization levels. It highlights the advantages and disadvantages of these solutions, outlines upcoming techniques, and discusses unresolved research problems. Additionally, it introduces machine learning (ML) techniques that handle model uncertainties, such as AI-based full-duplex SI cancellation and RF/PA linearization. The emergence of network slicing in 5G networks has created a need for new resource allocation algorithms that can satisfy service level agreements (SLAs) and optimize resource utilization while minimizing costs for tenants. The authors in [15] propose a family of online algorithms that can improve prediction-based decisions and adapt to prediction error variance, thus addressing the issue of uncertainty in prediction models. Results indicate that the proposed probabilistic approach is capable of addressing the uncertainty inherent in prediction-based decisions, thereby improving the overall performance of network resource allocation algorithms for 5G network slicing.

In our recent study [16], we introduced a new method for measuring uncertainty in object detection models called PURE. To evaluate the effectiveness of PURE, we conducted experiments on a variety of datasets, including KITTI, Stanford cars, Berkeley DeepDrive, and NEXET, using popular object detection models such as YoLo, SSD300, and SSD512. The results showed that PURE effectively quantified the prediction uncertainty of these models.

A variety of methods have been proposed in the literature for addressing uncertainty in requirements, design models, and other areas of software engineering, including RELAX [17], Fuzzy RE [18], U-RUCM [19], and UncerTum [20]. Additionally, some approaches focus on refining uncertainty measurements using historical data, such as the work by Zhang et al. [21] or using Bayesian inference, as in the study by Valdes et al. [22]. There also exist methods for testing software systems under uncertainty, such as the approaches by Ma et al. [23] and Camilli et al. [24].

Various approaches have been proposed in the literature to ensure the quality and reliability of software systems that employ Deep Learning (DL) models. Zhang [25] proposed a method to enhance the prediction performance of DL models by using adversarial machine learning (ML) attacks to generate highly uncertain test inputs. This approach uses genetic algorithms to create adversarial instances that can effectively penetrate DL defense techniques and reveal hidden defects in the models. The models are then re-trained with these adversarial inputs. On the other hand, Tuna et al. [26] demonstrated that adversarial inputs generated by adversarial ML attacks could deceive DL models with low prediction uncertainty values.

In autonomous driving, Michelmore et al. [27] applied variation ratios, entropy, and mutual information-based uncertainty quantification methods to discover the relation between uncertainty and wrong prediction of steering angles of autonomous cars. They found that wrong angle decisions of an autonomous car have significantly higher uncertainty values than correct decisions.

### III. PRELIMINARIES

#### A. Uncertainty in Deep Learning

In their work, Gal et al. in their work [7] presented an MC Dropout technique, which incorporates dropout layers in existing object recognition models without altering the number of neurons or layers. This is an ensemble technique in which the system randomly drops out different neurons in each layer during the prediction phase according to a specified dropout ratio. The final prediction is obtained by averaging the predictions from multiple dropout iterations, as represented by the following equation:

$$p(\hat{y} = c | \mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}) \approx \hat{\mu}_{pred} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{y \in Tp(\hat{y}|\theta, \mathcal{D})} y \quad (1)$$

Where  $\theta$  represents the model's weights,  $\mathcal{D}$  is the input dataset,  $T$  is the number of predictions of the MC dropouts, and  $\mathbf{x}$  is the input sample. The overall prediction uncertainty is approximated by finding the entropy and the probabilistic feed-forward MC dropout sampling variance during prediction time. Using this approach, the class label of the input sample can be estimated by taking the mean value of multiple MC dropout predictions. This allows for the prediction and quantification of the overall prediction uncertainty.

#### B. Uncertainty Sources

DNN models are known to be affected by two types of uncertainties: epistemic [28], and aleatoric [29]. Epistemic uncertainty refers to the uncertainty that arises from the model's lack of knowledge. This can be mitigated by increasing the training data and fine-tuning the model's architecture, such as the number of layers and activation functions, to better suit the problem at hand [7]. On the other hand, aleatoric uncertainty arises from inherent noise in the data, such as measurement errors. This type of uncertainty cannot be reduced, even with more data. This is an important consideration when working with neural networks, as it can affect the accuracy of the predictions (cite: Kendall and Gal [29]).

#### C. Uncertainty Quantification Methods

A typical DNN model generates a single output for a regression problem or a softmax probability for each label in a classification problem. To quantify the uncertainty of a single prediction, the model should produce multiple outputs for a single input instance. An uncertainty quantification metric is a scalar value that measures the reliability of the prediction for an input instance. For regression models, the only uncertainty quantification metric is the variance of the predictions:

$$S^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^T (y_i - \bar{y})^2}{T - 1} \quad (2)$$

where  $y_i$  is the  $i$ th prediction of the input instance  $\mathbf{x}$ , and  $\bar{y}$  is the average of all the predictions,  $y = [y_1, \dots, y_T]$ .

In addition to variance, several other uncertainty quantification metrics can be used for DNN models. One such metric is the Confidence Interval, which can be computed using the following equation:

$$CI = \bar{y} \pm z_{\alpha/2} \frac{S}{\sqrt{T}} \quad (3)$$

where  $\bar{y}$  is the mean prediction,  $S$  is the standard deviation of the predictions,  $T$  is the number of predictions, and  $z_{\alpha/2}$  is the critical value of the standard normal distribution for a given confidence level  $\alpha$ .

Another metric is Predictive Entropy, which is a measure of the Uncertainty of a classifier's prediction, computed as the Entropy of the predicted class probabilities:

$$H(p) = - \sum_{c=1}^C p(c) \log p(c) \quad (4)$$

where  $C$  is the number of classes and  $p(c)$  is the predicted probability of class  $c$ .

Additionally, Aleatoric Uncertainty, a measure of the inherent noise in the data, can be estimated by adding a noise term to the model's output. Finally, Epistemic Uncertainty, a measure of Uncertainty due to limited data or model capacity, can be estimated by training an ensemble of models or using Bayesian neural networks. These are just a few examples of uncertainty quantification metrics, and many other methods can be used depending on the specific problem and data set.

#### D. Channel Estimation

Without a doubt, one of the most important procedures in wireless communication is channel estimation, which assures the communication channel's performance is high. It is also used to boost overall system performance by enhancing capacity and data rates. The properties of the link between a transmitter and receiver in a wireless communication system is known as the channel characteristic or channel state information (CSI). When a signal is transmitted through a medium, it can become distorted and contain noise by the time it is received. To properly decode the received signal, it's important to first identify the channel characteristic through a process called channel estimation and remove any unwanted distortion or noise added by the channel. The received signal is attenuated by a factor  $h_0$  and delayed by a specific time  $\tau_0$  which is effected by the propagation speed in communication medium.  $h_0$  also determined by the  $Tx/Rx$  gains, propagation medium and frequency.

Transmitted signal ( $x(t)$ ) is distorted during its propagation through a communication channel, i.e., air, and absorbs noise. That's why received signal ( $y(t)$ ) differs from the transmitted signal. Received signal  $y(t)$  can be represented as:

$$y(t) = h_0 * x(t - \tau_0) \quad (5)$$

However, the received signal is composed of multiple paths, such as reflected and scattered paths, each with its own unique attenuation and delay. This results in a composite received signal.

$$y(t) = \sum_{l=0}^l h_l * x(t - \tau_l) \quad (6)$$

where  $l$  indicates the specific path/tap at a time.

In addition to composite received signal, the movement of the transmission elements can introduce Doppler effect. This results in the frequency shift which alters the perception of an observer who is moving alongside the signal source. Channel characteristics, represented by  $h_0$  and  $\tau_0$  are effected greatly by the Doppler effect while calculating multi-path signal loss and fading. The Doppler effected channel characteristics,  $h_l^t$  and  $\tau_l^t$  incorporates number of paths and the delay. The received signal can be represented as follows:

$$y(t) = \sum_{l=0}^l h_l^t * x(t - \tau_l^t) \quad (7)$$

Channel estimation is a crucial aspect of wireless communications, as it plays a vital role in increasing capacity and overall system performance. New technologies are integrated to the communication networks to improve quality of service by providing higher data and network capacity. Transition from Single Input Single Output (SISO) antennas to Multiple Input Multiple Output (MIMO) antennas is one of these technologies that enables the next-generation (NextG) communication systems. Reliable estimation of channel parameters draws enormous attention as it is the main driver of the NextG systems. Channel estimation is executed by merging transmitted signal with pilots which gives the distortion information of the transmitted signal during the transmission. This information is then used to increase receiver's ability to correctly pick up the original signal. There are three main categories of channel estimation algorithms, i.e., blind channel estimation, semi-blind channel estimation, and most used training-based estimation method [30].

#### IV. SYSTEM MODEL

##### A. Dataset

The data used in this study benefits the MATLAB 5G Toolbox which provides wide range of NextG communication system samples. This tool support creation and customization of diverse communication modes, subcarrier spacing, number of subcarriers, waveforms, frequency, and channel models. The example from this toolbox, "Deep Learning Data Synthesis for 5G Channel Estimation", was used to generate the dataset for channel parameters in this study. Estimation of channel parameters are carried out by SISO benefitting CNN models. Channel estimation model is built using the PDSCH and DM-RS symbols. The dataset consists of 256 training examples,

each with 8568 data points converted into 4-D arrays for use in the CNN model, and is generated using various channel parameters such as delay profiles, delay spreads, doppler shifts and SNR changes. The training dataset is created by generating new channel characteristics utilizing diverse tapped delay line (TDL) profiles, delay spreads, SNR values and doppler shifts. These parameters are provided with their respective values in Table I. Perfect channel values and the DM-RS-based corresponding generated transmitted waveform are included in the dataset.

TABLE I  
EACH OF THE CHANNEL CHARACTERISTIC PARAMETERS AND VALUES

Channel Parameter	Value
Delay Profile	TDL-A, TDL-B, TDL-C, TDL-D, TDL-E
Delay Spread	1-300 ns
Maximum Doppler Shift	5-400 Hz
NFFT	1024
Sample Rate	30720000
Symbols Per Slot	14
Windowing	36
Slots Per Subframe	2
Slots Per Frame	20
Polarization	Co-Polar
Transmission Direction	Downlink
Num. Transmit Antennas	1
Num. Receive Antennas	1
Fading Distribution	Rayleigh
Modulation	16QAM

In order to prevent overfitting, the training dataset is divided into two sets: a validation set and a training set. Model training is done with the training set (80% of the dataset) whereas validation set (20% of the dataset) is utilized to evaluate how well neural network learnt the data distribution.

##### B. Approach

In this paper, we present a novel approach for channel estimation using a combination of traditional and deep learning techniques to improve the trustworthiness of next-generation communication systems. Specifically, our approach incorporates a Monte-Carlo Dropouts (MCDO) technique for uncertainty-aware prediction, which enhances the reliability of deep learning-based algorithms [7]. Moreover, we integrate the conventional pilot-based channel estimation technique as a prior in our deep learning model to leverage the advantages of both traditional and deep learning methods. This combination of techniques not only improves the accuracy of channel estimation but also enhances the transparency and interpretability of the resulting model, which is essential for ensuring the trustworthiness of our approach in practical applications.

The proposed uncertainty-aware trustworthy deep learning approach for channel estimation combines the advantages of both traditional and deep learning techniques. Our method is based on MCDO technique for uncertainty-aware prediction. Additionally, our approach leverages the traditional channel estimation framework by incorporating the conventional pilot-based channel estimation as a prior in the deep learning model. To improve the model's trustworthiness, we adopted

an adversarial retraining approach for the MCDO technique. Adversarial retraining uses an adversarial network to generate negative examples for the training set and then retrains the models with the generated adversarial examples. In our approach, we selected highly uncertain inputs to retrain the model iteratively. To compute the uncertainty of the model, we used the uncertainty wizard library. Algorithm 1 presents the proposed approach for channel estimation DL model retraining using highly uncertain inputs.

**Algorithm 1** Uncertainty Aware Trustworthy Deep Learning Approach for Channel Estimation.

- 1: **Inputs:** DL model, training set  $\mathcal{D}$ , validation set  $\mathcal{V}$ , max iterations  $T$ , tolerance  $\epsilon$
- 2: **Output:** Trained trustworthy DL model  $M$
- 3: Initialize DL model  $M$
- 4: **for**  $t \leftarrow 1$  to  $T$  **do**
- 5:   Compute uncertainty of the model  $M$  on the validation set  $\mathcal{V}$
- 6:   Select highly uncertain inputs from the validation set  $\mathcal{V}$
- 7:   Generate adversarial examples from the selected inputs
- 8:   Retrain the DL model  $M$  with  $\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{V}$
- 9:   Compute the loss of the DL model  $M$  on the validation set  $\mathcal{V}$
- 10:   **if** loss  $< \epsilon$  **then**
- 11:     **break**
- 12:   **end if**
- 13: **end for**
- 14: **return** Trained trustworthy DL model  $M$

Algorithm 1 is performed by using the uncertainty wizard library [31]. The library provides several uncertainty metrics, such as entropy, mutual information, and prediction variance. In this paper, we used entropy as the uncertainty metric.




Fig. 1. DL Model

V. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

A. Experiment Setup

We conducted experiments to evaluate the performance and trustworthiness of our proposed approach for channel estimation in 5G scenarios. Our proposed approach was compared to the traditional and deep learning-based approaches. The conventional approach is based on pilot-based channel

estimation, while the deep learning-based process is a CNN model. All the models were implemented using the Python programming language, and the TensorFlow framework.

The dataset for the experiments was generated using the MATLAB 5G Toolbox. The parameters of the channel estimation scenario are given in Table I. The models were trained with the generated dataset using the Adam optimizer. The training was stopped when the validation loss stopped decreasing and improving the model. The learning rate was set to 0.001, and the batch size was set to 64.

B. Results and Discussion

Figure 2 shows the initial mean squared error (MSE) and Uncertainty correlations of the traditional and deep learning-based models. It can be seen that the deep learning-based model has a lower MSE compared to the conventional model, which indicates better channel estimation accuracy. This is because the deep learning-based model can extract more information from the received signal than the traditional model.




Fig. 2. Initial MSE and uncertainty correlations of the traditional and deep learning-based models.

Figure 3 shows the MSE and uncertainty correlations of the retrained DL model. It can be seen that the retrained DL model has lower MSE compared to the initial DL model, which indicates better channel estimation accuracy. This is because the retrained DL model can exploit the uncertainties in the validation set to improve the model’s performance. Furthermore, the uncertainty correlations are enhanced after the retraining, which indicates that the DL model is more trustworthy.

Figure 4 shows MSE improvements in each iteration for training and validation sets of the retrained DL model. It can be seen that the MSE is improved with each iteration in both training and validation sets. This indicates that our proposed approach is able to improve the channel estimation accuracy of the DL model.




Fig. 3. Retrained MSE and uncertainty correlations of the DL model.




Fig. 4. MSE improvements in each iteration of the retrained DL model.

## VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

NextG technologies, such as 5G and beyond, have received significant attention from the industry and academia to meet the growing demand for high-speed data transmission, low latency, and increased reliability. Advanced information and computing methods, such as channel estimation and machine learning, have been applied to NextG technologies to achieve these requirements. However, the trustworthiness of using machine learning methods in NextG technologies remains a crucial concern.

In this study, we proposed an uncertainty-aware trustworthy deep learning approach for channel estimation that combines the benefits of traditional and deep learning techniques. Our approach leverages the traditional pilot-based channel estimation framework as a prior in the deep learning model and uses MCDO technique for uncertainty-aware prediction. Additionally, we adopted an adversarial retraining approach to improve the model's trustworthiness by selecting highly uncertain inputs for iterative retraining. The experimental results showed that our approach outperforms conventional and deep

learning-based approaches in performance and trustworthiness.

In future work, we plan to investigate the generalization capability of our proposed approach to different channel environments and evaluate its performance in various scenarios. We also aim to explore alternative techniques for uncertainty estimation and investigate their effectiveness in improving the trustworthiness of deep learning-based channel estimation. Moreover, we will consider further integrating our approach with other communication systems components, such as resource allocation and power control, to enhance the overall system performance. Ultimately, the proposed approach can contribute to developing more trustworthy and reliable NextG communication systems.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Sridhar Iyer, Anita Patil, Shilpa Bhairanatti, Soumya Halagatti, and Rahul Jashvantbhai Pandya. A survey on technological trends to enhance spectrum-efficiency in 6g communications. *Transactions of the Indian National Academy of Engineering*, 7(4):1093–1120, 2022.
- [2] IIMT Union. Imt traffic estimates for the years 2020 to 2030. *Report ITU*, 2370, 2015.
- [3] Ferhat Ozgur Catak, Murat Kuzlu, Salih Sarp, Evren Catak, and Umit Cali. Mitigating attacks on artificial intelligence-based spectrum sensing for cellular network signals. In *2022 IEEE Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps)*, pages 1371–1376, 2022.
- [4] Osvaldo Simeone. A very brief introduction to machine learning with applications to communication systems. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, 4(4):648–664, 2018.
- [5] X Li, H Xiong, X Li, X Wu, X Zhang, J Liu, J Bian, and D Dou. Interpretable deep learning: Interpretation, interpretability, trustworthiness, and beyond. arXiv 2021. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10689*.
- [6] Chen Li, Weisi Guo, Schyler Chengyao Sun, Saba Al-Rubaye, and Antonios Tsourdos. Trustworthy deep learning in 6g-enabled mass autonomy: From concept to quality-of-trust key performance indicators. *IEEE Vehicular Technology Magazine*, 15(4):112–121, 2020.
- [7] Yarin Gal. Uncertainty in deep learning. *University of Cambridge*, 1(3), 2016.
- [8] Francesco Verdoja and Ville Kyrki. Notes on the behavior of mc dropout, 2020.
- [9] Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Alexander Pritzel, and Charles Blundell. Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS'17*, page 6405–6416, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2017. Curran Associates Inc.
- [10] Wei Ma, Mike Papadakis, Anestis Tsakmalis, Maxime Cordy, and Yves Le Traon. Test selection for deep learning systems. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, 30(2), January 2021.
- [11] Ian J. Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and Harnessing Adversarial Examples. *arXiv e-prints*, 1(1):arXiv:1412.6572, December 2014.
- [12] Biraja Ghoshal and Allan Tucker. Estimating uncertainty and interpretability in deep learning for coronavirus (covid-19) detection, 2020.
- [13] Marius Schubert, Karsten Kahl, and Matthias Rottmann. Metadetector: Uncertainty quantification and prediction quality estimates for object detection, 2020.
- [14] Chuan Zhang, Yeong-Luh Ueng, Christoph Studer, and Andreas Burg. Artificial intelligence for 5g and beyond 5g: Implementations, algorithms, and optimizations. *IEEE Journal on Emerging and Selected Topics in Circuits and Systems*, 10(2):149–163, 2020.
- [15] Raouf Abozariba, Muhammad Kamran Naeem, Md Asaduzzaman, and Mohammad Patwary. Uncertainty-aware ran slicing via machine learning predictions in next-generation networks. In *2020 IEEE 92nd Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2020-Fall)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2020.
- [16] Ferhat Ozgur Catak, Tao Yue, and Shaikat Ali. Prediction surface uncertainty quantification in object detection models for autonomous driving. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Testing (AITest)*, pages 93–100, 2021.

- [17] Betty HC Cheng, Pete Sawyer, Nelly Bencomo, and Jon Whittle. A goal-based modeling approach to develop requirements of an adaptive system with environmental uncertainty. In *International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems*, pages 468–483. Springer, 2009.
- [18] Luciano Baresi, Liliana Pasquale, and Paola Spoletini. Fuzzy goals for requirements-driven adaptation. In *2010 18th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference*, pages 125–134. IEEE, 2010.
- [19] Man Zhang, Tao Yue, Shaukat Ali, Bran Selic, Oscar Okariz, Roland Norgre, and Karnele Intxausti. Specifying uncertainty in use case models. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 144:573–603, 2018.
- [20] Man Zhang, Shaukat Ali, Tao Yue, Roland Norgren, and Oscar Okariz. Uncertainty-wise cyber-physical system test modeling. *Software & Systems Modeling*, 18(2):1379–1418, 2019.
- [21] Man Zhang, Shaukat Ali, Tao Yue, and Roland Norgre. Uncertainty-wise evolution of test ready models. *Information and Software Technology*, 87:140–159, 2017.
- [22] Rosa Arnaldo Valdés, Victor Fernando Gomez Comendador, Javier Alberto Perez Castan, Alvaro Rodriguez Sanz, Luis Perez Sanz, Francisco Javier Saez Nieto, and Eduardo Sanchez Aira. Bayesian inference in safety compliance assessment under conditions of uncertainty for ans providers. *Safety science*, 116:183–195, 2019.
- [23] Tao Ma, Shaukat Ali, and Tao Yue. Testing self-healing cyber-physical systems under uncertainty with reinforcement learning: an empirical study. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 26(3):1–54, 2021.
- [24] Matteo Camilli, Carlo Bellettini, Angelo Gargantini, and Patrizia Scandurra. Online model-based testing under uncertainty. In *2018 IEEE 29th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*, pages 36–46. IEEE, 2018.
- [25] Xiyue Zhang. Uncertainty-guided testing and robustness enhancement for deep learning systems. In *2020 IEEE/ACM 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings (ICSE-Companion)*, pages 101–103, 2020.
- [26] Omer Faruk Tuna, Ferhat Ozgur Catak, and M. Taner Eskil. Closeness and uncertainty aware adversarial examples detection in adversarial machine learning. *Computers and Electrical Engineering*, 101:107986, 2022.
- [27] Rhiannon Michelmores, Marta Kwiatkowska, and Yarin Gal. Evaluating uncertainty quantification in end-to-end autonomous driving control. *CoRR*, abs/1811.06817, 2018.
- [28] Y. Li, J. Chen, and L. Feng. Dealing with uncertainty: A survey of theories and practices. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 25(11):2463–2482, 2013.
- [29] D. Feng, L. Rosenbaum, and K. Dietmayer. Towards safe autonomous driving: Capture uncertainty in the deep neural network for lidar 3d vehicle detection. In *2018 21st International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 3266–3273. IEEE, 2018.
- [30] Olutayo O Oyerinde and Stanley H Mneney. Review of channel estimation for wireless communication systems. *IETE Technical review*, 29(4):282–298, 2012.
- [31] Michael Weiss and Paolo Tonella. Fail-safe execution of deep learning based systems through uncertainty monitoring. In *2021 14th IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST)*, pages 24–35. IEEE, 2021.