Outage Analysis of Cooperative NOMA in Millimeter Wave Vehicular Network at Intersections
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Abstract

In this paper, we study cooperative non-orthogonal multiple access scheme (NOMA) for millimeter wave (mmWave) vehicular networks at intersection roads. The intersection consists of two perpendicular roads. Transmissions occur between a source, and two destinations nodes with a help of a relay. We assume that the interference come from a set of vehicles that are distributed as a one dimensional homogeneous Poisson point process (PPP). Our analysis includes the effects of blockage from buildings at intersections. We derive closed form outage probability expressions for cooperative NOMA, and compare them with cooperative orthogonal multiple access (OMA). We show that cooperative NOMA offers a significant improvement over cooperative OMA, especially for high data rates. We also show that as the nodes reach the intersection, the outage probability increases. Counter-intuitively, we show that the non line of sigh (NLOS) scenario has a better performance than the line of sigh (LOS) scenario. The analysis is verified with Monte Carlo simulations.
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A. Motivation

Road traffic safety is a major issue, and more particularly at intersections \[1\]. Vehicular communications provide helpful applications for road safety and traffic management. These appli-
cations help to prevent accidents or alerting vehicles of accidents happening in their surroundings. Hence, these applications require high bandwidth and high spectral efficiency, to insure high reliability and low latency communications. In this context, non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) has been show to increase the data rate and spectral efficiency [2]. Unlike orthogonal multiple access (OMA), NOMA allows multiple users to share the same resource with different power allocation levels. On the other hand, the needs of vehicular communications for the fifth generation (5G) in terms of resources require a larger bandwidth. Since the spectral efficiency of sub-6 GHz bands has already reached the theoretical limits, millimeter wave (mmWave) frequency bands (20-100 GHz and beyond) offer a very large bandwidth [3].

B. Related Works

1) Cooperative NOMA: NOMA is an efficient multiple access technique for spectrum use. It has been shown that NOMA outperforms OMA [4]. However, few research investigates the effect of co-channel interference and their impact on the performance considering direct transmissions [5]–[7], and cooperative transmissions [8], [9].

2) Cooperative mmWave: In mmWave bands, few works studied cooperative communications using tools from stochastic geometry [10]–[13]. However, in [10]–[12], the effect of small-scale fading is not taken into consideration. In [13], the authors investigate the performance of mmWave relaying networks in terms of coverage probability with best relay selection.

3) Vehicular communications at intersections: Several works studied the effect of the interference at intersections, considering OMA. The performance in terms of success probability are derivated considering direct transmission in [14], [15]. The performance of vehicle to vehicle (V2V) communications are evaluated for multiple intersections schemes considering direct transmission in [16]. In [17], the authors derive the outage probability of a V2V communications with power control strategy of a direct transmission.

Following this line of research, we study the performance of vehicular communications at intersections in the presence of interference. However, at the best of the author’s knowledge, there are no prior works that consider both an intersection scenario with cooperative transmissions using NOMA and considering mmWave networks. Our analysis includes the effects of blockage from the building in intersections, and Nakagami-$m$ fading channels between the transmitting nodes with difference values of $m$ for LOS and NLOS are considered. Unlike other works that uses approximations, closed form expressions are obtained for Nakagami-$m$ fading channel.
Fig. 1: Cooperative NOMA system model for vehicular communications involving one relay two receiving node. The receiving nodes can be vehicles or as part of the communication infrastructure. For instance, S and D₁ are vehicles, and R and D₂ are infrastructures.

C. Contributions

The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We study the impact and the improvement of using cooperative NOMA on a mmWave vehicular network at intersection roads. Closed form expressions of the outage probability are obtained.
- Our analysis includes the effects of blockage from the building in intersections, and Nakagami-
  m fading channels with difference values of m for LOS and NLOS are considered.
- We evaluate the performance of NOMA for both intersection, and show that the outage
  probability increases when the vehicles move toward the intersections. We also show the
  effect of LOS and NLOS on the performance at the intersection.
- We compare all the results obtained with cooperative OMA, and show that cooperative
  NOMA is superior in terms of outage probability than OMA.

I. SYSTEM MODEL

A. Scenario Model

In this paper, we consider a mm-Wave vehicular network using a cooperative NOMA trans-
mission between a source, denoted S, and two destinations denoted D₁ and D₂ with the help of
a relay denoted \( R \). The set \( \{S, R, D_1, D_2\} \) denotes the nodes and their locations as depicted in Fig.1.

We consider, an intersection scenario involving two perpendicular roads, an horizontal road denoted by \( X \), and a vertical road denoted by \( Y \). In this paper, we consider both V2V and V2I communications\(^1\), hence, any node of the set \( \{S, R, D_1, D_2\} \) can be on the road or outside the roads. We denote by \( M \) the receiving node, and by \( m \) the distance between the node \( M \) and the intersection, where \( M \in \{ R, D_1, D_2 \} \) and \( m \in \{r, d_1, d_2\} \), as shown in Fig.1. The angle \( \theta_M \) is the angle between the node \( M \) and the \( X \) road (see Fig.1). Note that the intersection is the point where the \( X \) road and the \( Y \) road intersect. The set \( \{S, R, D_1, D_2\} \) is subject to interference that are originated from vehicles located on the roads.

The set of interfering vehicles located on the \( X \) road that are in a LOS with \( \{S, R, D_1, D_2\} \), denoted by \( \Phi^\text{LOS}_X \) (resp. on axis \( Y \), denoted by \( \Phi^\text{LOS}_Y \)) are modeled as a One-Dimensional Homogeneous Poisson Point Process (1D-HPPP), that is, \( \Phi^\text{LOS}_X \sim 1\text{D-HPPP}(\lambda^\text{LOS}_X, x) \) (resp.\( \Phi^\text{LOS}_Y \sim 1\text{D-HPPP}(\lambda^\text{LOS}_Y, y) \), where \( x \) and \( \lambda^\text{LOS}_X \) (resp. \( y \) and \( \lambda^\text{LOS}_Y \)) are the position of the LOS interferer vehicles and their intensity on the \( X \) road (resp. \( Y \) road).

Similarly, the set of interfering vehicles located on the \( X \) road that are in a NLOS with \( \{S, R, D_1, D_2\} \), denoted by \( \Phi^\text{NLOS}_X \) (resp. on axis \( Y \), denoted by \( \Phi^\text{NLOS}_Y \)) are modeled as a One-Dimensional Homogeneous Poisson Point Process (1D-HPPP), that is, \( \Phi^\text{NLOS}_X \sim 1\text{D-HPPP}(\lambda^\text{NLOS}_X, x) \) (resp.\( \Phi^\text{NLOS}_Y \sim 1\text{D-HPPP}(\lambda^\text{NLOS}_Y, y) \), where \( x \) and \( \lambda^\text{NLOS}_X \) (resp. \( y \) and \( \lambda^\text{NLOS}_Y \)) are the position of the NLOS interferer vehicles and their intensity on the \( X \) road (resp. \( Y \) road). The notation \( x \) and \( y \) denotes both the interferer vehicles and their locations.

### B. Blockage Model

At the intersection, the mmWave signals cannot penetrate the buildings and other obstacles, which causes the link to be in LOS, or in NLOS. The event of a link between a node \( a \) and \( b \) is in a LOS and NLOS, are respectively defined as \( \text{LOS}_{ab} \) and \( \text{NLOS}_{ab} \). The LOS probability function \( \mathbb{P}(\text{LOS}_{ab}) \) is used, where the link between \( a \) and \( b \) has a LOS probability \( \mathbb{P}(\text{LOS}_{ab}) = \exp(-\beta r_{ab}) \) and NLOS probability \( \mathbb{P}(\text{NLOS}_{ab}) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\text{LOS}_{ab}) \), where the constant rate \( \beta \) depends on the building size, shape and density \(^{18}\).

\(^1\)The Doppler shift and time-varying effect of V2V and V2I channels is beyond the scope of this paper.
C. Transmission and Decoding Model

The transmission is subject to a path loss, denoted by $r_{ab}^{-\alpha}$ between the nodes $a$ and $b$, where $r_{ab} = \|a - b\|$, and $\alpha$ is the path loss exponent. The path exponent $\alpha \in \{\alpha_{\text{LOS}}, \alpha_{\text{NLOS}}\}$, where $\alpha = \alpha_{\text{LOS}}$, when the transmission is in LOS, whereas $\alpha = \alpha_{\text{NLOS}}$, when transmission is in NLOS.

We consider slotted ALOHA protocol with parameter $p$, i.e., every node accesses the medium with a probability $p$.

We use a Decode and Forward (DF) decoding strategy, i.e., $R$ decodes the message, re-encodes it, then forwards it to $D_1$ and $D_2$. We also use a half-duplex transmission in which a transmission occurs during two phases. Each phase lasts one time slot. During the first phase, $S$ broadcasts the message to $R$ ($S \rightarrow R$). During the second phase, $R$ broadcasts the message to $D_1$ and $D_2$ ($R \rightarrow D_1$ and $R \rightarrow D_2$).

D. NOMA Model

We consider, in this paper, that the receiving nodes, $D_1$ and $D_2$, are ordered according to their quality of service (QoS) priorities [9], [19]. We consider the case when node $D_1$ needs a low data rate but has to be served immediately, whereas node $D_2$ requires a higher data rate but can be served later. For instance, $D_1$ can be a vehicle that needs to receive safety data information about an accident in its surrounding, whereas $D_2$ can be a user that accesses the internet connection.

E. Directional Beamforming Model

We model the directivity similar to in [20], where the directional gain, denoted $G(\omega)$, within the half power beamwidth ($\phi/2$) is $G_{\text{max}}$ and is $G_{\text{min}}$ in all other directions. The gain is then expressed as

$$G(\omega) = \begin{cases} G_{\text{max}}, & \text{if } |\omega| \leq \frac{\phi}{2}; \\ G_{\text{min}}, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

In this paper, we consider a perfect beam alignment between the nodes, hence $G_{\text{eq}} = G_{\text{max}}^2$. The impact of beam misalignment is beyond the scope of this paper.
F. Channel and Interference Model

We consider an interference limited scenario, that is, the power of noise is set to zero ($\sigma^2 = 0$). Without loss of generality, we assume that all nodes transmit with a unit power. The signal transmitted by $S$, denoted $\chi_S$ is a mixture of the message intended to $D_1$ and $D_2$. This can be expressed as

$$\chi_S = \sqrt{a_1} \chi_{D_1} + \sqrt{a_2} \chi_{D_2},$$

where $a_i$ is the power coefficients allocated to $D_i$, and $\chi_{D_i}$ is the message intended to $D_i$, where $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Since $D_1$ has higher power than $D_2$, that is $a_1 \geq a_2$, then $D_1$ comes first in the decoding order. Note that, $a_1 + a_2 = 1$.

The signal received at $R$ during the first time slot is expressed as

$$\mathcal{Y}_R = h_{SR} \sqrt{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_{LOS}}} \chi_S \mathbb{I}(LOS_{SR}) + h_{SR} \sqrt{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}}} \chi_S \mathbb{I}(NLOS_{SR}) + \sum_{x \in \Phi_{X_R}^{LOS}} h_{Rx} \sqrt{r_{Rx}^{-\alpha_{LOS}}} \chi_x + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{Y_R}^{LOS}} h_{Ry} \sqrt{r_{Ry}^{-\alpha_{LOS}}} \chi_y$$

$$+ \sum_{x \in \Phi_{X_R}^{NLOS}} h_{Rx} \sqrt{r_{Rx}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}}} \chi_x + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{Y_R}^{NLOS}} h_{Ry} \sqrt{r_{Ry}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}}} \chi_y,$$

The signal received at $D_i$ during the second time slot is expressed as

$$\mathcal{Y}_{Di} = h_{RD_i} \sqrt{r_{RD_i}^{-\alpha}} \chi_S \mathbb{I}(LOS_{RD_i}) + h_{RD_i} \sqrt{r_{RD_i}^{-\alpha}} \chi_S \mathbb{I}(NLOS_{RD_i})$$

$$+ \sum_{x \in \Phi_{X_{Di}}^{LOS}} h_{Dix} \sqrt{r_{Dix}^{-\alpha_{LOS}}} \chi_x + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{Y_{Di}}^{LOS}} h_{Diy} \sqrt{r_{Diy}^{-\alpha_{LOS}}} \chi_y$$

$$+ \sum_{x \in \Phi_{X_{Di}}^{NLOS}} h_{Dix} \sqrt{r_{Dix}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}}} \chi_x + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{Y_{Di}}^{NLOS}} h_{Diy} \sqrt{r_{Diy}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}}} \chi_y,$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_M$ is the signal received by $M$. The messages transmitted by the interfere node $x$ and $y$, are denoted respectively by $\chi_x$ and $\chi_y$. The term $\mathcal{Y} = G_{eq}\eta^2/(4\pi)^2$ models the directional gain, the reference path loss at one meter, and $\eta$ is the wavelength of the operating frequency.
The coefficients $h_{SR}$, and $h_{RD}$, denote the fading of the link $S - R$, and $R - D_i$. The fading coefficients are distributed according to a Nakagami-$m$ distribution with parameter $m_{13}$, that is

$$f_{h_u}(x) = 2\left(\frac{m}{\mu}\right)^{m} \frac{x^{2m-1}}{\Gamma(m)} e^{-\frac{x}{\mu}}$$

where $u \in \{SR, RD\}$. The parameter $m \in \{m_{LOS}, m_{NLOS}\}$, where $m = m_{LOS}$ when $u$ is in a LOS, whereas $m = m_{NLOS}$, when $u$ is in a NLOS. The parameter $\mu$ is the average received power.

Hence, the power fading coefficients $|h_{SR}|^2$, and $|h_{RD}|^2$ are distributed according to a gamma distribution, that is,

$$f_{|h_u|^2}(x) = \left(\frac{m}{\mu}\right)^{m} \frac{x^{m-1}}{\Gamma(m)} e^{-\frac{x}{\mu}}.$$  

The fading coefficients $h_{Rx}, h_{Ry}, h_{D_{ix}}$ and $h_{D_{iy}}$ denote the fading of the link $R - x$, $R - y$, $D_i - x$, and $D_i - y$. The fading coefficients are modeled as Rayleigh fading [21]. Thus, the power fading coefficients $|h_{Rx}|^2$, $|h_{Ry}|^2$, $|h_{D_{ix}}|^2$ and $|h_{D_{iy}}|^2$, are distributed according to an exponential distribution with unit mean.

The aggregate interference is defined as from the $X$ road at $M$, denoted $I_{XM}$, is expressed as

$$I_{XM} = I_{X_M}^{LOS} + I_{X_M}^{NLOS} = \sum_{x \in \Phi_{X_M}^{LOS}} |h_{Mx}|^2 r_{Mx}^{-\alpha_{LOS}} + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{X_M}^{NLOS}} |h_{Mx}|^2 r_{Mx}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}} Y,$$

where $I_{X_M}^{LOS}$ denotes the aggregate interference from the $X$ road that are in a LOS with $M$, and $I_{X_M}^{NLOS}$ denotes the aggregate interference from the $X$ road that are in a NLOS with $M$. Similarly, $\Phi_{X_M}^{LOS}$ and $\Phi_{X_M}^{NLOS}$, denote respectively, the set of the interferers from the $X$ road at $M$ in a LOS, and in NLOS.

In the same way, the aggregate interference is defined as from the $Y$ road at $M$, denoted $I_{YM}$, is expressed as

$$I_{YM} = I_{Y_M}^{LOS} + I_{Y_M}^{NLOS} = \sum_{y \in \Phi_{Y_M}^{LOS}} |h_{My}|^2 r_{My}^{-\alpha_{LOS}} Y + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{Y_M}^{NLOS}} |h_{My}|^2 r_{My}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}} Y,$$

where $I_{Y_M}^{LOS}$ denotes the aggregate interference from the $X$ road that are in a LOS with $M$, and $I_{Y_M}^{NLOS}$ denotes the aggregate interference from the $Y$ road that are in a NLOS with $M$. Similarly, $\Phi_{Y_M}^{LOS}$ and $\Phi_{Y_M}^{NLOS}$, denote respectively, the set of the interferers from the $Y$ road at $M$ in a LOS, and in NLOS.
II. COOPERATIVE NOMA OUTAGE EXPRESSIONS

A. Signal-to-Interference Ratio (SIR) Expressions

We define the outage probability as the probability that the signal-to-interference ratio (SIR) at the receiver is below a given threshold. According to successive interference cancellation (SIC) [22], $D_1$ will be decoded first at the receiver since it has the higher power allocation, and $D_2$ message will be considered as interference. The SIR at $R$ to decode $D_1$, denoted $\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{R_1}$, is expressed as

$$\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{R_1} = \frac{|h_{SR}|^2 r^{-a} a Y a_1}{|h_{SR}|^2 r^{-a} a_2 + I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}}.$$  

Since $D_2$ has a lower power allocation, $R$ has to decode $D_1$ message, then decode $D_2$ message. The SIR at $R$ to decode $D_2$ message, denoted $\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{R_2}$, is expressed as

$$\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{R_2} = \frac{|h_{SR}|^2 r^{-a} Y a_2}{I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}}.$$  

The SIR at $D_1$ to decode its intended message, denoted $\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{D_1}$, is given by

$$\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{D_1} = \frac{|h_{RD_1}|^2 r^{-a} a Y a_1}{|h_{RD_1}|^2 r^{-a} a_2 + I_{X_{D_1}} + I_{Y_{D_1}}}.$$  

In order for $D_2$ to decode its intended message, it has to decode $D_1$ message. The SIR at $D_2$ to decode $D_1$ message, denoted $\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{D_{2-1}}$, is expressed as

$$\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{D_{2-1}} = \frac{|h_{RD_2}|^2 r^{-a} a Y a_1}{|h_{RD_2}|^2 r^{-a} a_2 + I_{X_{D_2}} + I_{Y_{D_2}}}.$$  

The SIR at $D_2$ to decode its intended message, denoted $\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{D_2}$, is expressed as

$$\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{D_2} = \frac{|h_{RD_2}|^2 r^{-a} Y a_2}{I_{X_{D_2}} + I_{Y_{D_2}}}.$$  

B. Outage Event Expressions

The outage event that $R$ does not decode $D_1$ message, denoted $O_{R_1}$, is given by

$$O_{R_1} \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}^{(a)}_{R_1} < \Theta_1) \right\},$$  

$^2$Perfect SIC is considered in this work, that is, no fraction of power remains after the SIC process.
where $\Theta_1 = 2^{R_1} - 1$, and $R_1$ is the target data rate of $D_1$.

Also, the outage event that $D_1$ does not decode its intended message, denoted $O_{D_1}$, is given by

$$O_{D_1} \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS},\text{NLOS}\}} \{Z_{RD_1} \cap (\text{SIR}_{D_1}^{(a_1)} < \Theta_1)\},$$

Then, the overall outage event related to $D_1$, denoted $O_{(1)}$, is given by

$$O_{(1)} \triangleq [O_{R_1} \cup O_{D_1}],$$

The outage event that $R$ does not decode $D_2$ message, denoted $O_{R_2}$, is given by

$$O_{R_2} \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS},\text{NLOS}\}} \{Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{D_2}^{(a_2)} < \Theta_2)\},$$

where $\Theta_2 = 2^{R_2} - 1 (i = 2)$, and $R_2$ is the target data rate of $D_2$. Also, the outage event that $D_2$ does not decode its intended message, denoted $O_{D_2}$, is given by

$$O_{D_2} \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS},\text{NLOS}\}} \{Z_{RD_2} \cap (\text{SIR}_{D_2}^{(a_2)} < \Theta_2)\},$$

Finally, the overall outage event related to $D_2$, denoted $O_{(2)}$, is given by

$$O_{(2)} \triangleq [O_{R_2} \cup O_{D_2}].$$

### C. Outage Probability Expressions

In the following, we will express the outage probability related to $O_{(1)}$ and $O_{(2)}$. The probability $\mathbb{P}(O_{(1)})$ is given, when $\Theta_1 < \frac{a_1}{a_2}$, by (17)

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{(1)}) = 1 - \left\{ \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS},\text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \Lambda\left(\frac{m \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-a_2}}\right) \times \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS},\text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{RD_1}) \Lambda\left(\frac{m \Psi_1}{\mu r_{RD_1}^{-a_2}}\right) \right\},$$

where $\Psi_1 = \Theta_1/(a_1 - \Theta_1 a_2)$. The expression of $\Lambda\left(\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-a}}\right)$ is given by

$$\Lambda\left(\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-a}}\right) =$$

$$\prod_{K \in \{\text{LOS},\text{NLOS}\}} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-a}}\right)^k \sum_{n=0}^{k} \binom{k}{n} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_K}(n)\left(\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-a}}\right)}{d^n \left(\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-a}}\right)}.$$  

The probability $\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)})$ is given, when $\Theta_1 < \frac{a_1}{a_2}$, by (19)

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)}) = 1 - \left\{ \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS},\text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \Lambda\left(\frac{m \Psi_{\text{max}}}{\mu r_{SR}^{-a_2}}\right) \times \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS},\text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{RD_2}) \Lambda\left(\frac{m \Psi_{\text{max}}}{\mu r_{RD_2}^{-a_2}}\right) \right\},$$
where $\Psi_{\max} = \max(\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$, and $\Psi_2 = \Theta_2/a_2$.

Proof: See Appendix A.

III. LAPLACE TRANSFORM EXPRESSIONS

We present the Laplace transform expressions of the interference from the X road at the receiving node denoted by $M$, denoted $\mathcal{L}_{I^K}^{X_M}$, and from the Y road at the receiving node denoted by $M$, denoted $\mathcal{L}_{I^K}^{Y_M}$. We only present the case when $\alpha_K = 2$ due to the lack of space. The Laplace transform expressions of the interference at the node $M$ for an intersection scenario, when $\alpha_K = 2$ are given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{I^K}^{X_M} (s) = \exp\left(-\frac{p\lambda^K_X s\pi}{m \sin(\theta_M)^2 + s}\right),$$  
(20)

and

$$\mathcal{L}_{I^K}^{Y_M} (s) = \exp\left(-\frac{p\lambda^K_Y s\pi}{m \cos(\theta_M)^2 + s}\right).$$  
(21)

Proof: See Appendix B.
IV. Simulations and Discussions

In this section, we evaluate the performance of cooperative NOMA at road intersections. In order to verify the accuracy of the theoretical results, Monte Carlo simulations are carried out by averaging over 10,000 realizations of the PPPs and fading parameters. In all figures, Monte Carlo simulations are presented by marks, and they match perfectly the theoretical results, which validates the correctness of our analysis. We set, without loss of generality, $\lambda_\text{LOS}^X = \lambda_\text{LOS}^Y = \lambda_\text{NLOS}^X = \lambda_\text{NLOS}^Y = \lambda$. $\mathbf{S} = (0, 0)$, $\mathbf{R} = (50, 0)$, $\mathbf{D}_1 = (100, 10)$, $\mathbf{D}_2 = (100, -10)$, $\beta = 9.5 \times 10^3$ [18], $\mu = 1$. We set $\alpha_\text{LOS} = 2$, $\alpha_\text{NLOS} = 4$, $m_\text{LOS} = 2$, and $m_\text{NLOS} = 1$. Finally, we set $G_{\text{max}} = 18$ dBi, $\eta = 30$ GHz.

Fig. 2 plots the outage probability as function of $\lambda$ considering cooperative NOMA, for LOS transmission, NLOS, and LOS/NLOS. We can see that LOS scenario has the highest outage probability. This is because, when the interference are in direct line of sight with the set $\{ \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{D}_1, \mathbf{D}_2 \}$, the power of aggregate interference increases, hence reducing the SIR and increasing the outage. on the other hand, the NLOS scenario has the smallest outage, since the interference are in non line of sight with the transmitting nodes. The model for this paper include a blockage model that includes both LOS and NLOS. Therefore, we wan see that the
Fig. 4: Outage probability as a function of $\lambda$ considering cooperative NOMA and cooperative OMA.

performance are between the LOS scenario and NLOS scenario, which are two extreme cases.

Fig.3 plots the outage probability as a function of the distance between the source and the destinations. Without loss of generality, we set $R$ at mid distance between $S$ and the two destinations $D_1$ and $D_2$. We can see that cooperative NOMA outperforms cooperative OMA when $a_1 = 0.8$ for both $D_1$ and $D_2$. However, this is not the case for $a_1 = 0.6$, when NOMA outperforms OMA only for $D_2$. This is because when $a_1$ decreases, less power is allocated to $D_1$, hence it increases the outage probability. We can also see from Fig.3 that the outage probability increases until 200 m for $D_1$ (100 m for $D_2$). This because, as the distance between the transmitting and the receiving nodes increases, the LOS probability decreases, and the NLOS probability increases, hence decreasing the outage probability.

Fig.4 plots the outage probability as a function of $\lambda$ considering cooperative NOMA and cooperative OMA for several values of data rates. We can see that NOMA outperforms OMA. We can also see that $D_1$ has a better performance than $D_2$. This is because $D_1$ has a smaller target data rate, since $D_1$ need to be served quickly (e.g., alert message). We can also see that, as the data rates increases ($R_1 = 1.2$ bits/s and $R_2 = 4$ bits/s), the gap of performance between NOMA and OMA increases. This is because, as the data rates increases, the decoding threshold of OMA increases dramatically ($\Theta_{OMA} = 2^{4R} - 1$). The increase of the threshold becomes larger for $D_2$, since it has a higher data rate that $D_1$. 
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Fig. 5 plots the outage probability of the distance from the intersection considering cooperative NOMA and cooperative OMA, for LOS scenario and NLOS scenario. Without loss of generality, we set $R$ at mid distance between $S$ and the two destinations $D_1$ and $D_2$. We notice from Fig. 5 that as nodes approach the intersection, the outage probability increases. This because when the nodes are far from the intersection, only the interferes in the same road segment contribute to the aggregate interference, but as the node approach the intersection, both road segments contribute to the aggregate interference. However, we can see that $D_2$ has a severe outage in LOS scenario compared to NLOS, and that the increases of the outage for $D_2$ in LOS, when the nodes move toward the intersection is negligible. This is because, in a LOS scenario, the interferers from both road segment contributes the aggregate interference, whether the nodes are close or far away from the intersection.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we studied cooperative NOMA for mmWave vehicular networks at intersection roads. The analysis was conducted using tools from stochastic geometry and was verified with Monte Carlo simulations. We derived closed form outage probability expressions for cooperative NOMA, and compared them with cooperative OMA. We showed that cooperative NOMA
exhibited a significant improvement compared to cooperative OMA, especially for high data rates. However, data rates have to respect a given condition, if not, the performance of cooperative NOMA will decreases drastically. We also showed that as the nodes reach the intersection, the outage probability increased. Counter-intuitively, we showed that NLOS scenario has a better performance than LOS scenario.

**APPENDIX A**

To calculate $\mathbb{P}(O_{(1)})$, we express it as a function of a success probability $\mathbb{P}(O_{C(1)})$, where $\mathbb{P}(O_{D(1)})$ is expressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{(1)}) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(O_{(1)}),$$

(22)

The probability $\mathbb{P}(O_{(1)})$ is expressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{(1)}) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(O_{C(1)} \cap O_{D(1)}) = \mathbb{P}(O_{C(1)}) \mathbb{P}(O_{D(1)}),$$

(23)

where

$$O_{C(1)} \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(a_2)} \geq \Theta_1) \right\},$$

(24)

$$O_{D(1)} \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \left\{ Z_{RD_1} \cap (\text{SIR}_{D_1}^{(a_2)} \geq \Theta_1) \right\}.$$  

(25)

We calculate The probability $\mathbb{P}(O_{C(1)})$ as

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{C(1)}) = \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} E_{I_{X}, I_{Y}} \left[ \mathbb{P} \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(a_2)} \geq \Theta_1) \right\} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) E_{I_{X}, I_{Y}} \left[ \mathbb{P} \left\{ \text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(a_2)} \geq \Theta_1 \right\} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) E_{I_{X}, I_{Y}} \left[ \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-a_2} Y a_1}{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-a_2} Y a_2 + I_{X_1} + I_{Y_1}} \geq \Theta_1 \right\} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) E_{I_{X}, I_{Y}} \left[ \mathbb{P} \left\{ |h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-a_2} Y (a_1 - \Theta_1 a_2) \geq \Theta_1 \left| I_{X_1} + I_{Y_1} \right| \right\} \right].$$

(26)

We can notice from (26) that, when $\Theta_1 \geq a_1/a_2$, the success probability $\mathbb{P}(O_{C(1)})$ is always zero, that is, $\mathbb{P}(O_{C(1)}) = 1$. Then, when $\Theta_1 < a_1/a_2$, and after setting $\Psi_1 = \Theta_1/(a_1 - \Theta_1 a_2)$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{C(1)}) = \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) E_{I_{X}, I_{Y}} \left[ \mathbb{P} \left\{ |h_{SR}|^2 \geq \frac{\Psi_1}{r_{SR}^{-a_2} Y} \left| I_{X_1} + I_{Y_1} \right| \right\} \right].$$
Since $|h_{SR}|^2$ follows a gamma distribution, its complementary cumulative distribution function (CCDF) is given by

$$
\tilde{F}_{|h_{SR}|^2}(X) = \mathbb{P}(|h_{SR}|^2 > X) = \frac{\Gamma(m_Z, \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2} X)}{\Gamma(m_Z)},
$$

hence

$$
\mathbb{P}(O_{R_1}^C) = \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[ \frac{\Gamma \left( m_Z, \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2} (I_{X_R}^\text{LOS} + I_{Y_R}^\text{LOS}) \right)}{\Gamma(m_Z)} \right] 
\times \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[ \frac{\Gamma \left( m_Z, \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2} (I_{X_R}^\text{NLOS} + I_{Y_R}^\text{NLOS}) \right)}{\Gamma(m_Z)} \right]
= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \prod_{k \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[ \frac{\Gamma \left( m_Z, \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2} (I_{X_R}^k + I_{Y_R}^k) \right)}{\Gamma(m_Z)} \right].
$$

The exponential sum function when $m_Z$ is an integer is defined as

$$
e^{(m_Z, \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu} X)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{m_Z - 1}{\Psi_1}} \frac{(m_Z X)^k}{k!} = e^{\frac{m_Z}{\mu} X} \frac{\Gamma(m_Z, \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu} X)}{\Gamma(m_Z)},
$$

then

$$
\frac{\Gamma(m_Z, \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu} X)}{\Gamma(m_Z)} = e^{-\frac{m_Z}{\mu} X} \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{m_Z - 1}{\Psi_1}} \frac{1}{k!} \left( \frac{m_Z X}{\mu} \right)^k.
$$

We denote the expectation in equation (28) by $\mathcal{E}(I_X, I_Y)$, then $\mathcal{E}(I_X, I_Y)$ equals

$$
\mathcal{E}(I_X, I_Y) = \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[ \exp \left( - \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2} (I_{X_R}^k + I_{Y_R}^k) \right) \times \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{m_Z - 1}{\Psi_1}} \frac{1}{k!} \left( \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2} (I_{X_R}^k + I_{Y_R}^k) \right)^k \right]
= \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{m_Z - 1}{\Psi_1}} \frac{1}{k!} \left( \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2} (I_{X_R}^k + I_{Y_R}^k) \right)^k \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[ \exp \left( - \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2} (I_{X_R}^k + I_{Y_R}^k) \right) \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{m_Z - 1}{\Psi_1}} \frac{1}{n!} \left( I_{X_R}^k \right)^n \left( I_{Y_R}^k \right)^n \right].
$$

Applying the binomial theorem in (31), we get

$$
\mathcal{E}(I_X, I_Y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{m_Z - 1}{\Psi_1}} \frac{1}{k!} \left( \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2} (I_{X_R}^k + I_{Y_R}^k) \right)^k \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[ \exp \left( - \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2} (I_{X_R}^k + I_{Y_R}^k) \right) \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{m_Z - 1}{\Psi_1}} \frac{1}{n!} \left( I_{X_R}^k \right)^n \left( I_{Y_R}^k \right)^n \right]
= \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{m_Z - 1}{\Psi_1}} \frac{1}{k!} \Omega^k \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[ \exp \left( - \Omega \left[ I_{X_R}^k + I_{Y_R}^k \right] \right) \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{m_Z - 1}{\Psi_1}} \frac{1}{n!} \left( I_{X_R}^k \right)^n \left( I_{Y_R}^k \right)^n \right],
$$

where $\Omega = \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}} \frac{m}{2}$. To calculate the expectation in (32) we process as follows.
Then plugging (35) in (28) yields

\[
\mathbb{E}_{I_x,I_y} \left[ e^{-\Omega I_x^k} e^{-\Omega I_y^k} \sum_{n=0}^{k} \binom{k}{n} (I_x^k)^{k-n} (I_y^k)^n \right] = \sum_{n=0}^{k} \binom{k}{n} \mathbb{E}_{I_x,I_y} \left[ e^{-\Omega I_x^k} e^{-\Omega I_y^k} (I_x^k)^{k-n} (I_y^k)^n \right]
\]

\[= \sum_{n=0}^{k} \binom{k}{n} \mathbb{E}_{I_x} \left[ e^{-\Omega I_x^k} \right] \mathbb{E}_{I_y} \left[ e^{-\Omega I_y^k} (I_x^k)^{k-n} (I_y^k)^n \right]
\]

\[= \left( (-1)^k \sum_{n=0}^{k} \binom{k}{n} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_x}^k (\Omega)}{d^{k-n} \Omega} \frac{d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_y}^k (\Omega)}{d^n \Omega} \right) \frac{d^n \mathcal{L}_{I} (\Omega)}{d^n \Omega}.
\]

where (a) stems form the following property

\[
\mathbb{E}_I \left[ e^{-\Omega I} I^N \right] = (-1)^N \frac{d^N \mathbb{E}_I \left[ e^{-\Omega I} \right]}{d^N \Omega} = (-1)^N \frac{d^N \mathcal{L}_I (\Omega)}{d^N \Omega}, \tag{34}
\]

Finally, the expectation becomes

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{m_z-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left( - \frac{m_z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-a_z Y}} \right)^k \sum_{n=0}^{k} \binom{k}{n} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_x}^k (\Omega)}{d^{k-n} \Omega} \frac{d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_y}^k (\Omega)}{d^n \Omega} \frac{m_z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-a_z Y}}.
\]

Then plugging (35) in (28) yields

\[
\mathbb{P}(O^C_{R_1}) = \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS},\text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \times \prod_{K \in \{\text{LOS},\text{NLOS}\}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_z-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left( - \frac{m_z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-a_z Y}} \right)^k \sum_{n=0}^{k} \binom{k}{n} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_x}^k (\Omega)}{d^{k-n} \Omega} \frac{d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_y}^k (\Omega)}{d^n \Omega} \frac{m_z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-a_z Y}}.
\]

The expression of \(d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_x}(s)/d^{k-n}(s)\) and \(d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_y}(s)/d^n(s)\) are given by (53) and (54). The probability \(\mathbb{P}(O^C_{R_1})\) can be calculated following the same steps above.

In the same way we express \(\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)})\) as a function of a success probability \(\mathbb{P}(O^C_{(2)})\), where \(\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)})\) is given by

\[
\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)}) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(O^C_{(2)}), \tag{37}
\]
The probability \( P(O_{(2)}^c) \) is expressed as

\[
P(O_{(2)}^c) = 1 - P(O_{R_2}^c \cap O_{D_2}^c) = P(O_{R_2}^c)P(O_{D_2}^c),
\]

(38)

where

\[
O_{R_2}^c \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \bigcap_{i=1}^{2} \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{R_i}^{(\alpha_z)} \geq \Theta) \right\}
\]

(39)

\[
O_{D_2}^c \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \bigcap_{i=1}^{2} \left\{ Z_{RD_2} \cap (\text{SIR}_{D_2-i}^{(\alpha_z)} < \Theta) \right\}
\]

(40)

To calculate \( P(O_{R_2}^c) \) we proceed as follows

\[
P(O_{R_2}^c) = \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} E_{I_x,I_y} \left[ P \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^{2} \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{R_i}^{(\alpha_z)} \geq \Theta) \right\} \right) \right]
\]

\[
= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} P(Z_{SR}) E_{I_x,I_y} \left[ P \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^{2} \text{SIR}_{R_i}^{(\alpha_z)} \geq \Theta \right) \right]
\]

\[
= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} P(Z_{SR}) E_{I_x,I_y} \left[ P \left( \text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(\alpha_z)} \geq \Theta_1 \cap \text{SIR}_{R_2}^{(\alpha_z)} \geq \Theta_2 \right) \right]
\]

(41)

Following the same steps as for \( P(O_{R_1}^c) \), we get

\[
P(O_{R_2}^c) = E_{I_x,I_y} \left[ P \left( \frac{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha_z} Y_a_1}{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha_z} Y_a_2 + I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}} \geq \Theta_1, \frac{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha_z} Y_a_2}{I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}} \geq \Theta_2 \right) \right].
\]

When \( \Theta_1 > a_1/a_2 \), then \( P(O_{R_2}^c) = 1 \), otherwise we continue the derivation. We set \( \Psi_2 = \Theta_2/a_2 \), then

\[
P(O_{R_2}^c) = E_{I_x,I_y} \left[ P \left( |h_{SR}|^2 \geq \frac{\Psi_1}{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_z} Y} \left[ I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R} \right], |h_{SR}|^2 \geq \frac{\Psi_2}{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_z} Y} \left[ I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R} \right] \right) \right]
\]

\[
= E_{I_x,I_y} \left[ P \left( |h_{SR}|^2 \geq \frac{\max(\Psi_1,\Psi_2)}{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_z} Y} \left[ I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R} \right] \right) \right].
\]

Following the same steps above, \( P(O_{R_2}^c) \) equals

\[
P(O_{R_2}^c) = \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} P(Z_{SR}) \times
\]

\[
\prod_{K \in \{\text{LOS, NLOS}\}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_{\Psi_\text{max}}} \left( -\frac{m_{\Psi_\text{max}}}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_z} Y} \right)^k \sum_{n=0}^{k} \binom{k}{n} d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_x} \left( \frac{m_{\Psi_\text{max}}}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_z} Y} \right) d^{n} \mathcal{L}_{I_y} \left( \frac{m_{\Psi_\text{max}}}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_z} Y} \right)
\]

(42)
where \( \Psi_{\text{max}} = \max(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) \). The probability \( \mathbb{P}(O_{D_2}^C) \) can be calculated following the same steps above.

**APPENDIX B**

The Laplace transform of the interference originating from the X road at \( M \) is expressed as

\[
\mathcal{L}_{I_{KM}^X}(s) = \mathbb{E}\left[ \exp\left( -s I_{KM}^X \right) \right]
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}\left[ \exp\left( - \sum_{x \in \Phi_{KM}^X} s|h_{Mx}|^2 r_{KMx}^{-\alpha_k} \right) \right]
\]

\[
= \prod_{x \in \Phi_{KM}^X} \mathbb{E}_{|h_{Mx}|^2} \left\{ \exp\left( -s|h_{Mx}|^2 r_{KMx}^{-\alpha_k} \right) \right\}
\]

\[
\stackrel{(a)}{=} \prod_{x \in \Phi_{KM}^X} \mathbb{E}_{|h_{Mx}|^2} \left\{ \exp\left( -s|h_{Mx}|^2 r_{KMx}^{-\alpha_k} \right) \right\}
\]

\[
= \prod_{x \in \Phi_{KM}^X} \frac{p}{1 + s r_{KMx}^{-\alpha_k}} + 1 - p
\]

\[
= \exp\left( -\lambda_{KM}^X \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{p}{1 + s r_{KMx}^{-\alpha_k}} + 1 - p \right) \right] \text{d}x \right)
\]

\[
= \exp\left( -p \lambda_{KM}^X \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1 + s r_{KMx}^{-\alpha_k}} \text{d}x \right), \quad (43)
\]

\[
= \exp\left( -p \lambda_{KM}^X \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1 + r_{KMx}^{-\alpha_k} / s} \text{d}x \right) \quad (44)
\]

where (a) follows from the independence of the fading coefficients; (b) follows from performing the expectation over \( |h_{Mx}|^2 \) which follows an exponential distribution with unit mean, and performing the expectation over the set of interferes; (c) follows from the probability generating functional (PGFL) of a PPP. The expression of \( \mathcal{L}_{I_{KM}^X}(s) \) can be acquired by following the same steps. The Laplace transform of the interference originating from the X road at the received node denoted \( M \), is expressed as

\[
\mathcal{L}_{I_{KM}^{X,M}}(s) = \exp\left( -p \lambda_{KM}^X \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1 + \|x - M\|^{-\alpha_k} / s} \text{d}x \right), \quad (45)
\]

where

\[
\|x - M\| = \sqrt{m \sin(\theta_M)^2 + (x - m \cos(\theta_M))^2}. \quad (46)
\]
The Laplace transform of the interference originating from the Y road at \( M \) is given by

\[
\mathcal{L}_{I_{YM}}(s) = \exp \left( -p \lambda_Y^K \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1 + \|y - M\|^{\kappa_K} / s} dy \right),
\]

(47)

where

\[
\|y - M\| = \sqrt{\left[ m \cos(\theta_M) \right]^2 + \left[ y - m \sin(\theta_M) \right]^2},
\]

(48)

where \( \theta_M \) is the angle between the node \( M \) and the X road.

In order to calculate the Laplace transform of interference originated from the X road at the node \( M \), we have to calculate the integral in (45). We calculate the integral in (45) for \( K = 2 \).

Let us take \( m_x = m \cos(\theta_M) \), and \( m_y = m \sin(\theta_M) \), then (45) becomes

\[
\mathcal{L}_{I_{XM}}(s) = \exp \left( -p \lambda_X^K \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1 + m_y^2 + (x - m_x)^2 / s} dx \right),
\]

(49)

and the integral inside the exponential in (49) equals

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{s + m_y^2 + (x - m_x)^2} dx = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{m_y^2 + s}}.
\]

(50)

Then, plugging (50) into (49), and substituting \( m_y \) by \( m \sin(\theta_M) \) we obtain

\[
\mathcal{L}_{I_{XM}}(s) = \exp \left( -p \lambda_X^K s \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{m^2 \sin(\theta_M)^2 + s}} \right).
\]

(51)

Following the same steps above, and without details for the derivation with respect to \( s \), we obtain

\[
\mathcal{L}_{I_{YM}}(s) = \exp \left( -p \lambda_Y^K \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{m^2 \cos(\theta_M)^2 + s}} \right).
\]

(52)

Then, when compute the derivative of (51) and (52), we obtain

\[
\frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_{XM}}(s)}{d^{k-n}s} = \left[ -\frac{p \lambda_X^K \pi}{\sqrt{t^2 \sin(\theta_M)^2 + s}} + \frac{p \lambda_X^K \pi s}{2 (m^2 \sin(\theta_M)^2 + s)^{3/2}} \right]^{k-n} \times \exp \left( -\frac{p \lambda_X^K \pi s}{\sqrt{m^2 \sin(\theta_M)^2 + s}} \right).
\]

(53)
\[
\frac{d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_{LM}}^k(s)}{d^n s} = \left[ -\frac{p \lambda_k^M \pi}{\sqrt{m^2 \cos(\theta_M)^2 + s}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{p \lambda_k^M \pi s}{(m^2 \cos(\theta_M)^2 + s)^{3/2}} \right]^n \times \exp \left( -\frac{p \lambda_k^M \pi s}{\sqrt{m^2 \cos(\theta_M)^2 + s}} \right). \tag{54}
\]
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