

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

Baha Eddine Youcef Belmekki^{1 2}, Abdelkrim Hamza¹, and Benoît Escrig²

¹LISIC Laboratory, Electronic and Computer Faculty, USTHB, Algiers, Algeria,
email: {bbelmekki, ahamza}@usthb.dz

²University of Toulouse, IRIT Laboratory, School of ENSEEIHT, Institut National Polytechnique de Toulouse, France, e-mail: {bahaeddine.belmekki, benoit.escrig}@enseeiht.fr

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 sight (NLOS) scenario has a better performance than the line of sight (LOS) scenario. The analysis is verified with Monte Carlo simulations.

Index Terms

5G, NOMA, mmWave, interference, outage probability, cooperative, vehicular communications.

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 shown 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 derived 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. In [18], the authors investigate the impact of a line of sight and non line of sight transmissions at intersections considering Nakagami- m fading channels. The authors in [19] study the effect of mobility of vehicular communications at road junctions. In [20]–[24], the authors respectively study the impact of non-orthogonal multiple access, cooperative non-orthogonal multiple access, and maximum ratio combining with NOMA at intersections. Following this line of research, we study the performance of VCs at intersections in the presence of interference.

Following this line of research, we study the performance of vehicular communications at intersections in the presence of interference. In this paper, the authors extend their work [25] to cooperative transmissions using NOMA 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.

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 transmission between a source, denoted S , and two destinations denoted D_1 and D_2 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 communications¹, hence, any node of the set $\{S, R, D_1, D_2\}$ can be on the road or outside the

¹The Doppler shift and time-varying effect of V2V and V2I channels is beyond the scope of this paper.




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 D_1 are vehicles, and R and D_2 are infrastructures.

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 θ_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 Φ_X^{LOS} (resp. on axis Y , denoted by Φ_Y^{LOS}) are modeled as a One-Dimensional Homogeneous Poisson Point Process (1D-HPPP), that is, $\Phi_X^{\text{LOS}} \sim \text{1D-HPPP}(\lambda_X^{\text{LOS}}, x)$ (resp. $\Phi_Y^{\text{LOS}} \sim \text{1D-HPPP}(\lambda_Y^{\text{LOS}}, y)$), where x and λ_X^{LOS} (resp. y and λ_Y^{LOS}) 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 Φ_X^{NLOS} (resp. on axis Y , denoted by Φ_Y^{NLOS}) are modeled as a One-Dimensional Homogeneous Poisson Point Process (1D-HPPP), that is, $\Phi_X^{\text{NLOS}} \sim \text{1D-HPPP}(\lambda_X^{\text{NLOS}}, x)$ (resp. $\Phi_Y^{\text{NLOS}} \sim \text{1D-HPPP}(\lambda_Y^{\text{NLOS}}, y)$), where x and λ_X^{NLOS} (resp. y and λ_Y^{NLOS}) 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 LOS_{ab} , and 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 β depends on the building size, shape and density [26].

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 α 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], [27]. 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 [28], where the directional gain, denoted $G(\omega)$, within the half power beamwidth ($\phi/2$) is G_{\max} and is G_{\min} in all other directions. The gain is then

expressed as

$$G(\omega) = \begin{cases} G_{max}, & \text{if } |\omega| \leq \frac{\phi}{2}; \\ G_{min}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

In this paper, we consider a perfect beam alignment between the nodes, hence $G_{eq} = G_{max}^2$. 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 χ_S is a mixture of the message intended to D_1 and D_2 . This can be expressed as

$$\chi_S = \sqrt{a_1}\chi_{D1} + \sqrt{a_2}\chi_{D2},$$

where a_i is the power coefficients allocated to D_i , and χ_{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

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_R = & h_{SR} \sqrt{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_{LOS}}} \Upsilon \chi_S \mathbb{1}(\text{LOS}_{SR}) + h_{SR} \sqrt{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}}} \Upsilon \chi_S \mathbb{1}(\text{NLOS}_{SR}) \\ & + \sum_{x \in \Phi_{\chi_R}^{\text{LOS}}} h_{Rx} \sqrt{r_{Rx}^{-\alpha_{LOS}}} \Upsilon \chi_x + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{\chi_R}^{\text{LOS}}} h_{Ry} \sqrt{r_{Ry}^{-\alpha_{LOS}}} \Upsilon \chi_y \\ & + \sum_{x \in \Phi_{\chi_R}^{\text{NLOS}}} h_{Rx} \sqrt{r_{Rx}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}}} \Upsilon \chi_x + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{\chi_R}^{\text{NLOS}}} h_{Ry} \sqrt{r_{Ry}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}}} \Upsilon \chi_y. \end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_{D_i} = & h_{RD_i} \sqrt{r_{RD_i}^{-\alpha}} \Upsilon \chi_R \mathbb{1}(\text{LOS}_{RD_i}) + h_{RD_i} \sqrt{r_{RD_i}^{-\alpha}} \Upsilon \chi_R \mathbb{1}(\text{NLOS}_{RD_i}) \\ & + \sum_{x \in \Phi_{\chi_{D_i}}^{\text{LOS}}} h_{Dix} \sqrt{r_{D_i x}^{-\alpha_{LOS}}} \Upsilon \chi_x + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{\chi_{D_i}}^{\text{LOS}}} h_{Diy} \sqrt{r_{D_i y}^{-\alpha_{LOS}}} \Upsilon \chi_y \\ & + \sum_{x \in \Phi_{\chi_{D_i}}^{\text{NLOS}}} h_{Dix} \sqrt{r_{D_i x}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}}} \Upsilon \chi_x + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{\chi_{D_i}}^{\text{NLOS}}} h_{Diy} \sqrt{r_{D_i y}^{-\alpha_{NLOS}}} \Upsilon \chi_y, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{Y}_M is the signal received by M , and χ_R is the message transmitted by R . The messages transmitted by the interfere node x and y , are denoted respectively by χ_x and χ_y . The term

$\Upsilon = G_{eq}\eta^2/(4\pi)^2$ models the directional gain, the reference path loss at one meter, and η is the wavelength of the operating frequency.

The coefficients h_{SR} , and h_{RD_i} 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

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

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

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

$$f_{|h_u|^2}(x) = \left(\frac{m}{\mu}\right)^m \frac{x^{m-1}}{\Gamma(m)} e^{-\frac{m}{\mu}x}. \quad (3)$$

The fading coefficients $h_{Rx}, h_{Ry}, h_{D_i x}$ and $h_{D_i y}$ 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 [29]. Thus, the power fading coefficients $|h_{Rx}|^2$, $|h_{Ry}|^2$, $|h_{D_i x}|^2$ and $|h_{D_i y}|^2$, are distributed according to an exponential distribution with unit mean.

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

$$I_{X_M} = I_{X_M}^{\text{LOS}} + I_{X_M}^{\text{NLOS}} = \sum_{x \in \Phi_{X_M}^{\text{LOS}}} |h_{Mx}|^2 r_{Mx}^{-\alpha_{\text{LOS}}} \Upsilon + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{X_M}^{\text{NLOS}}} |h_{My}|^2 r_{My}^{-\alpha_{\text{NLOS}}} \Upsilon, \quad (4)$$

where $I_{X_M}^{\text{LOS}}$ denotes the aggregate interference from the X road that are in a LOS with M , and $I_{X_M}^{\text{NLOS}}$ denotes the aggregate interference from the X road that are in a NLOS with M . Similarly, $\Phi_{X_M}^{\text{LOS}}$ and $\Phi_{X_M}^{\text{NLOS}}$, 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_{Y_M} , is expressed as

$$I_{Y_M} = I_{Y_M}^{\text{LOS}} + I_{Y_M}^{\text{NLOS}} = \sum_{y \in \Phi_{Y_M}^{\text{LOS}}} |h_{My}|^2 r_{My}^{-\alpha_{\text{LOS}}} \Upsilon + \sum_{y \in \Phi_{Y_M}^{\text{NLOS}}} |h_{My}|^2 r_{My}^{-\alpha_{\text{NLOS}}} \Upsilon, \quad (5)$$

where $I_{Y_M}^{\text{LOS}}$ denotes the aggregate interference from the Y road that are in a LOS with M , and $I_{Y_M}^{\text{NLOS}}$ denotes the aggregate interference from the Y road that are in a NLOS with M . Similarly, $\Phi_{Y_M}^{\text{LOS}}$ and $\Phi_{Y_M}^{\text{NLOS}}$, 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) [30], 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 $\text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(\alpha)}$, is expressed as

$$\text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(\alpha)} = \frac{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon a_1}{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon a_2 + I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}}. \quad (6)$$

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 $\text{SIR}_{R_2}^{(\alpha)}$, is expressed as ²

$$\text{SIR}_{R_2}^{(\alpha)} = \frac{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon a_2}{I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}}. \quad (7)$$

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

$$\text{SIR}_{D_1}^{(\alpha)} = \frac{|h_{RD1}|^2 r_{RD1}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon a_1}{|h_{RD1}|^2 r_{RD1}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon a_2 + I_{X_{D1}} + I_{Y_{D1}}}. \quad (8)$$

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 $\text{SIR}_{D_{2-1}}^{(\alpha)}$, is expressed as

$$\text{SIR}_{D_{2-1}}^{(\alpha)} = \frac{|h_{RD2}|^2 r_{RD2}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon a_1}{|h_{RD2}|^2 r_{RD2}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon a_2 + I_{X_{D2}} + I_{Y_{D2}}}. \quad (9)$$

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

$$\text{SIR}_{D_2}^{(\alpha)} = \frac{|h_{RD2}|^2 r_{RD2}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon a_2}{I_{X_{D2}} + I_{Y_{D2}}}. \quad (10)$$

B. Outage Event Expressions

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

$$O_{R_1} \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(\alpha_Z)} < \Theta_1) \right\}, \quad (11)$$

²Perfect SIC is considered in this work, that is, no fraction of power remains after the SIC process.

where $\Theta_1 = 2^{2\mathcal{R}_1} - 1$, and \mathcal{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

$$O_{D_1} \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \left\{ Z_{RD_1} \cap (\text{SIR}_{D_1}^{(\alpha_Z)} < \Theta_1) \right\}, \quad (12)$$

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

$$O_{(1)} \triangleq \left[O_{R_1} \cup O_{D_1} \right], \quad (13)$$

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

$$O_{R_2} \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \bigcup_{i=1}^2 \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{R_i}^{(\alpha_Z)} < \Theta_i) \right\}, \quad (14)$$

where $\Theta_2 = 2^{2\mathcal{R}_2} - 1$ ($i = 2$), and \mathcal{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

$$O_{D_2} \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \bigcup_{i=1}^2 \left\{ Z_{RD_2} \cap (\text{SIR}_{D_{2-i}}^{(\alpha_Z)} < \Theta_i) \right\}, \quad (15)$$

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

$$O_{(2)} \triangleq \left[O_{R_2} \cup O_{D_2} \right]. \quad (16)$$

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)

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{(1)}) = 1 - \left\{ \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \Lambda\left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon}\right) \times \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{RD_1}) \Lambda\left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{RD_1}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon}\right) \right\}, \quad (17)$$

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

$$\Lambda\left(\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon}\right) = \prod_{K \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left(-\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon} \right)^k \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_{X_b}^K} \left(\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon} \right) d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_{Y_b}^K} \left(\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon} \right)}{d^{k-n} \left(\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon} \right) d^n \left(\frac{m \Psi}{\mu r_{ab}^{-\alpha} \Upsilon} \right)}. \quad (18)$$

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

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)}) = 1 - \left\{ \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \Lambda\left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_{\max}}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon}\right) \times \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{RD_2}) \Lambda\left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_{\max}}{\mu r_{RD_2}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon}\right) \right\}, \quad (19)$$




Fig. 2: Outage probability as function of λ considering cooperative NOMA, for LOS transmission, NLOS, and LOS/NLOS (the equation (17) and (19)).

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 $\mathcal{L}_{I_{XM}^K}$, and from the Y road at the receiving node denoted by M , denoted $\mathcal{L}_{I_{YM}^K}$. 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

$$\mathcal{L}_{I_{XM}^K}(s) = \exp\left(\frac{-p\lambda_X^K s\pi}{\sqrt{[m \sin(\theta_M)]^2 + s}}\right), \quad (20)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_{I_{YM}^K}(s) = \exp\left(\frac{-p\lambda_Y^K s\pi}{\sqrt{[m \cos(\theta_M)]^2 + s}}\right). \quad (21)$$

Proof: See Appendix B. ■




Fig. 3: Outage probability as a function of $\|S - D_1\| = \|S - D_2\|$. The relay R is always at mid distance between the source and the destination.

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, $\lambda_X^{\text{LOS}} = \lambda_Y^{\text{LOS}} = \lambda_X^{\text{NLOS}} = \lambda_Y^{\text{NLOS}} = \lambda$. $S = (0, 0)$, $R = (50, 0)$, $D_1 = (100, 10)$, $D_2 = (100, -10)$, $\beta = 9.5 \times 10^3$ [26], $\mu = 1$. We set $\alpha_{\text{LOS}} = 2$, $\alpha_{\text{NLOS}} = 4$, $m_{\text{LOS}} = 2$, and $m_{\text{NLOS}} = 1$. Finally, we set $G_{\max} = 18$ dBi, $\eta = 30$ GHz.

Fig. 2 plots the outage probability as function of λ 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 $\{S, R, D_1, D_2\}$, 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 can see that the




Fig. 4: Outage probability as a function of λ 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 λ 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 ($R_1 = 1.2\text{bits/s}$ and $R_2 = 4\text{bits/s}$), the gap of performance between NOMA and OMA increases. This is because, as the data rates increases, the decoding threshold of OMA increases dramatically ($\Theta_{\text{OMA}} = 2^{4R} - 1$). The increase of the threshold becomes larger for D_2 , since it has a higher data rate than D_1 .




Fig. 5: Outage probability as a function of the distance from the intersection considering cooperative NOMA and cooperative OMA, for LOS scenario and NLOS scenario.

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 is because when the nodes are far from the intersection, only the interferers in the same road segment contribute to the aggregate interference, but as the nodes 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 increase 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 segments contribute to 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 decrease 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 $\mathbb{P}(O_{(1)}^C)$, where $\mathbb{P}(O_{D_1}^C)$ is expressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{(1)}) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(O_{(1)}^C), \quad (22)$$

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

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{(1)}^C) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(O_{R_1}^C \cap O_{D_1}^C) = \mathbb{P}(O_{R_1}^C)\mathbb{P}(O_{D_1}^C), \quad (23)$$

where

$$O_{R_1}^C \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(\alpha_Z)} \geq \Theta_1) \right\} \quad (24)$$

$$O_{D_1}^C \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \left\{ Z_{RD_1} \cap (\text{SIR}_{D_1}^{(\alpha_Z)} \geq \Theta_1) \right\}. \quad (25)$$

We calculate The probability $\mathbb{P}(O_{R_1}^C)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(O_{R_1}^C) &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(\alpha_Z)} \geq \Theta_1) \right\} \right] \\ &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ \text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(\alpha_Z)} \geq \Theta_1 \right\} \right] \\ &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon a_1}{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon a_2 + I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}} \geq \Theta_1 \right\} \right] \\ &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ |h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon (a_1 - \Theta_1 a_2) \geq \Theta_1 [I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}] \right\} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

We can notice from (26) that, when $\Theta_1 \geq a_1/a_2$, the success probability $\mathbb{P}(O_{R_1}^C)$ is always zero, that is, $\mathbb{P}(O_{R_1}) = 1$. Then, when $\Theta_1 < a_1/a_2$, and after setting $\Psi_1 = \Theta_1/(a_1 - \Theta_1 a_2)$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{R_1}^C) = \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ |h_{SR}|^2 \geq \frac{\Psi_1}{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} [I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}] \right\} \right].$$

Since $|h_{SR}|^2$ follows a gamma distribution, its complementary cumulative distribution function (CCDF) is given by

$$\bar{F}_{|h_{SR}|^2}(X) = \mathbb{P}(|h_{SR}|^2 > X) = \frac{\Gamma(m_Z, \frac{m_Z}{\mu} X)}{\Gamma(m_Z)}, \quad (27)$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(O_{R_1}^C) &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\frac{\Gamma\left(m_Z, \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} (I_{X_R}^{\text{LOS}} + I_{Y_R}^{\text{LOS}})\right)}{\Gamma(m_Z)} \right] \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\frac{\Gamma\left(m_Z, \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} (I_{X_R}^{\text{NLOS}} + I_{Y_R}^{\text{NLOS}})\right)}{\Gamma(m_Z)} \right] \\ &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \prod_{K \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\frac{\Gamma\left(m_Z, \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} (I_{X_R}^K + I_{Y_R}^K)\right)}{\Gamma(m_Z)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

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

$$e_{(m_Z)} = \sum_{k=0}^{m_Z-1} \frac{(\frac{m_Z}{\mu} X)^k}{k!} = e^X \frac{\Gamma(m_Z, \frac{m_Z}{\mu} X)}{\Gamma(m_Z)}, \quad (29)$$

then

$$\frac{\Gamma(m_Z, \frac{m_Z}{\mu} X)}{\Gamma(m_Z)} = e^{-\frac{m_Z}{\mu} X} \sum_{k=0}^{m_Z-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\frac{m_Z}{\mu} X \right)^k. \quad (30)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(I_X, I_Y) &= \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} (I_{X_R}^K + I_{Y_R}^K)\right) \times \sum_{k=0}^{m_Z-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} (I_{X_R}^K + I_{Y_R}^K) \right)^k \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{m_Z-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)^k \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} (I_{X_R}^K + I_{Y_R}^K)\right) (I_{X_R}^K + I_{Y_R}^K)^k \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Applying the binomial theorem in (31), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(I_X, I_Y) &= \sum_{k=0}^{m_Z-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)^k \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} [I_{X_R}^K + I_{Y_R}^K]\right) \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} (I_{X_R}^K)^{k-n} (I_{Y_R}^K)^n \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{m_Z-1} \frac{1}{k!} \Omega^k \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\exp\left(-\Omega [I_{X_R}^K + I_{Y_R}^K]\right) \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} (I_{X_R}^K)^{k-n} (I_{Y_R}^K)^n \right], \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $\Omega = \frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon}$. To calculate the expectation in (32) we process as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[e^{-\Omega I_{X_R}^K} e^{-\Omega I_{Y_R}^K} \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} (I_{X_R}^K)^{k-n} (I_{Y_R}^K)^n \right] &= \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[e^{-\Omega I_{X_R}^K} e^{-\Omega I_{Y_R}^K} (I_{X_R}^K)^{k-n} (I_{Y_R}^K)^n \right] \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} \mathbb{E}_{I_X} \left[e^{-\Omega I_{X_R}^K} (I_{X_R}^K)^{k-n} \right] \mathbb{E}_{I_{Y_R}^K} \left[e^{-\Omega I_{Y_R}^K} (I_{Y_R}^K)^n \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} (-1)^{k-n} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_{X_R}^K}(\Omega)}{d^{k-n} \Omega} (-1)^n \frac{d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_{Y_R}^K}(\Omega)}{d^n \Omega} \\
&= (-1)^k \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_{X_R}^K}(\Omega)}{d^{k-n} \Omega} \frac{d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_{Y_R}^K}(\Omega)}{d^n \Omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where (a) stems from the following property

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

Finally, the expectation becomes

$$\sum_{k=0}^{m_Z-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left(-\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)^k \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_{X_R}^K} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)}{d^{k-n} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)} \frac{d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_{Y_R}^K} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)}{d^n \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)}. \tag{35}$$

Then plugging (35) in (28) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(O_{R_1}^C) &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \times \\
&\prod_{K \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_L-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left(-\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)^k \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_{X_R}^K} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)}{d^{k-n} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)} \frac{d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_{Y_R}^K} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)}{d^n \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_1}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)}
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

The expression of $d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_X^K}(s)/d^{k-n}(s)$ and $d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_Y^K}(s)/d^n(s)$ are given by (53) and (54). The probability $\mathbb{P}(O_{D_1}^C)$ 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 $\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)}^C)$, where $\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)}^C)$ is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)}) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(O_{(2)}^C). \tag{37}$$

The probability $\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)}^C)$ is expressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{(2)}^C) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(O_{R_2}^C \cap O_{D_2}^C) = \mathbb{P}(O_{R_2}^C)\mathbb{P}(O_{D_2}^C), \quad (38)$$

where

$$O_{R_2}^C \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \bigcap_{i=1}^2 \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{R_i}^{(\alpha_Z)} \geq \Theta_i) \right\} \quad (39)$$

$$O_{D_2}^C \triangleq \bigcup_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \bigcap_{i=1}^2 \left\{ Z_{RD_2} \cap (\text{SIR}_{D_{2-i}}^{(\alpha_Z)} < \Theta_i) \right\}. \quad (40)$$

To calculate $\mathbb{P}(O_{R_2}^C)$ we proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(O_{R_2}^C) &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ \bigcap_{i=1}^2 \left\{ Z_{SR} \cap (\text{SIR}_{R_i}^{(\alpha_Z)} \geq \Theta_i) \right\} \right\} \right] \\ &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ \bigcap_{i=1}^2 \text{SIR}_{R_i}^{(\alpha_Z)} \geq \Theta_i \right\} \right] \\ &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ \text{SIR}_{R_1}^{(\alpha_Z)} \geq \Theta_1 \cap \text{SIR}_{R_2}^{(\alpha_Z)} \geq \Theta_2 \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

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

$$\mathbb{P}(O_{R_2}^C) = \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon a_1}{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon a_2 + I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}} \geq \Theta_1, \frac{|h_{SR}|^2 r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon a_2}{I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}} \geq \Theta_2 \right\} \right].$$

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

then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(O_{R_2}^C) &= \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ |h_{SR}|^2 \geq \frac{\Psi_1}{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} [I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}], |h_{SR}|^2 \geq \frac{\Psi_2}{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} [I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}] \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{I_X, I_Y} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ |h_{SR}|^2 \geq \frac{\max(\Psi_1, \Psi_2)}{r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} [I_{X_R} + I_{Y_R}] \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(O_{R_2}^C) &= \sum_{Z \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_{SR}) \times \\ &\quad \prod_{K \in \{\text{LOS}, \text{NLOS}\}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_L-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left(-\frac{m_Z \Psi_{\max}}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)^k \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_{X_R}^K} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_{\max}}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right) d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_{Y_R}^K} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_{\max}}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)}{d^{k-n} \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_{\max}}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right) d^n \left(\frac{m_Z \Psi_{\max}}{\mu r_{SR}^{-\alpha_Z} \Upsilon} \right)} \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where $\Psi_{\max} = \max(\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$. 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

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{L}_{I_{X_M}^K}(s) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-s I_{X_M}^K \right) \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(- \sum_{x \in \Phi_{X_M}^K} s |h_{Mx}|^2 r_{Mx}^{-\alpha_K} \right) \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{x \in \Phi_{X_M}^K} \exp \left(-s |h_{Mx}|^2 r_{Mx}^{-\alpha_K} \right) \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{x \in \Phi_{X_M}^K} \mathbb{E}_{|h_{Mx}|^2, p} \left\{ \exp \left(-s |h_{Mx}|^2 r_{Mx}^{-\alpha_K} \right) \right\} \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{x \in \Phi_{X_M}^K} \frac{p}{1 + s r_{Mx}^{-\alpha_K}} + 1 - p \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \exp \left(-\lambda_X^K \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[1 - \left(\frac{p}{1 + s r_{Mx}^{-\alpha_K}} + 1 - p \right) \right] dx \right) \\
 &= \exp \left(-p \lambda_X^K \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1 + 1/s r_{Mx}^{-\alpha_K}} dx \right) \tag{43}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= \exp \left(-p \lambda_X^K \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1 + r_{Mx}^{\alpha_K}/s} dx \right), \tag{44}$$

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 interferers; (c) follows from the probability generating functional (PGFL) of a PPP. The expression of $\mathcal{L}_{I_{Y_M}^K}(s)$ 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

$$\mathcal{L}_{I_{X_M}^K}(s) = \exp \left(-p \lambda_X^K \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1 + \|x - M\|^{\alpha_K}/s} dx \right), \tag{45}$$

where

$$\|x - M\| = \sqrt{\left[m \sin(\theta_M) \right]^2 + \left[x - m \cos(\theta_M) \right]^2}. \tag{46}$$

The Laplace transform of the interference originating from the Y road at M is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{I_{YM}^K}(s) = \exp\left(-p\lambda_Y^K \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1 + \|y - M\|^{\alpha_K}/s} dy\right), \quad (47)$$

where

$$\|y - M\| = \sqrt{\left[m \cos(\theta_M)\right]^2 + \left[y - m \sin(\theta_M)\right]^2}, \quad (48)$$

where θ_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 $\alpha_K = 2$. Let us take $m_x = m \cos(\theta_M)$, and $m_y = m \sin(\theta_M)$, then (45) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{I_{XM}^K}(s) &= \exp\left(-p\lambda_X^K \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1 + m_y^2 + (x - m_x)^2/s} dx\right), \\ &= \exp\left(-p\lambda_X^K s \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{s + m_y^2 + (x - m_x)^2} dx\right), \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

and the integral inside the exponential in (49) equals

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{s + m_y^2 + (x - m_x)^2} dx = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{m_y^2 + s}}. \quad (50)$$

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

$$\mathcal{L}_{I_{XM}^K}(s) = \exp\left(-\frac{p\lambda_X^K s \pi}{\sqrt{m^2 \sin^2(\theta_M) + s}}\right). \quad (51)$$

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

$$\mathcal{L}_{I_{YM}^K}(s) = \exp\left(-\frac{p\lambda_Y^K s \pi}{\sqrt{m^2 \cos^2(\theta_M) + s}}\right). \quad (52)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^{k-n} \mathcal{L}_{I_{XM}^K}(s)}{d^{k-n} s} &= \left[-\frac{p\lambda_X^K \pi}{\sqrt{m^2 \sin^2(\theta_M) + s}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{p\lambda_X^K \pi s}{(m^2 \sin^2(\theta_M) + s)^{3/2}} \right]^{k-n} \\ &\quad \times \exp\left(-\frac{p\lambda_X^K \pi s}{\sqrt{m^2 \sin^2(\theta_M) + s}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

$$\frac{d^n \mathcal{L}_{I_{YM}^K}(s)}{d^n s} = \left[-\frac{p\lambda_Y^K \pi}{\sqrt{m^2 \cos(\theta_M)^2 + s}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{p\lambda_Y^K \pi s}{(m^2 \cos(\theta_M)^2 + s)^{3/2}} \right]^n \times \exp\left(-\frac{p\lambda_Y^K \pi s}{\sqrt{m^2 \cos(\theta_M)^2 + s}}\right). \quad (54)$$

REFERENCES

- [1] U.S. Dept. of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, “Traffic safety facts 2015,” Jan. 2017.
- [2] Z. Ding, Y. Liu, J. Choi, Q. Sun, M. Elkashlan, I. Chih-Lin, and H. V. Poor, “Application of non-orthogonal multiple access in lte and 5g networks,” *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 185–191, 2017.
- [3] W. Roh, J.-Y. Seol, J. Park, B. Lee, J. Lee, Y. Kim, J. Cho, K. Cheun, and F. Aryanfar, “Millimeter-wave beamforming as an enabling technology for 5g cellular communications: Theoretical feasibility and prototype results,” *IEEE communications magazine*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 106–113, 2014.
- [4] Z. Mobini, M. Mohammadi, H. A. Suraweera, and Z. Ding, “Full-duplex multi-antenna relay assisted cooperative non-orthogonal multiple access,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.03919*, 2017.
- [5] K. S. Ali, H. ElSawy, A. Chaaban, M. Haenggi, and M.-S. Alouini, “Analyzing non-orthogonal multiple access (noma) in downlink poisson cellular networks,” in *Proc. of IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC18)*, 2018.
- [6] Z. Zhang, H. Sun, R. Q. Hu, and Y. Qian, “Stochastic geometry based performance study on 5g non-orthogonal multiple access scheme,” in *Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM), 2016 IEEE*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2016.
- [7] H. Tabassum, E. Hossain, and J. Hossain, “Modeling and analysis of uplink non-orthogonal multiple access in large-scale cellular networks using poisson cluster processes,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 65, no. 8, pp. 3555–3570, 2017.
- [8] Y. Liu, Z. Qin, M. Elkashlan, A. Nallanathan, and J. A. McCann, “Non-orthogonal multiple access in large-scale heterogeneous networks,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 2667–2680, 2017.
- [9] Z. Ding, H. Dai, and H. V. Poor, “Relay selection for cooperative noma,” *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 416–419, 2016.
- [10] S. Biswas, S. Vuppala, J. Xue, and T. Ratnarajah, “On the performance of relay aided millimeter wave networks,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 576–588, 2016.
- [11] S. Wu, R. Atat, N. Mastrorade, and L. Liu, “Coverage analysis of d2d relay-assisted millimeter-wave cellular networks,” in *2017 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2017.
- [12] K. Belbase, C. Tellambura, and H. Jiang, “Two-way relay selection for millimeter wave networks,” *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 201–204, 2018.
- [13] K. Belbase, Z. Zhang, H. Jiang, and C. Tellambura, “Coverage analysis of millimeter wave decode-and-forward networks with best relay selection,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 22670–22683, 2018.
- [14] E. Steinmetz, M. Wildemeersch, T. Q. Quek, and H. Wymeersch, “A stochastic geometry model for vehicular communication near intersections,” in *Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps), 2015 IEEE*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2015.
- [15] M. Abdulla, E. Steinmetz, and H. Wymeersch, “Vehicle-to-vehicle communications with urban intersection path loss models,” in *Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps), 2016 IEEE*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2016.
- [16] J. P. Jeyaraj and M. Haenggi, “Reliability analysis of v2v communications on orthogonal street systems,” in *GLOBECOM 2017-2017 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2017.
- [17] T. Kimura and H. Saito, “Theoretical interference analysis of inter-vehicular communication at intersection with power control,” *Computer Communications*, 2017.

- [18] B. E. Y. Belmekki, A. Hamza, and B. Escrig, "Cooperative vehicular communications at intersections over nakagami-m fading channels," *Vehicular Communications*, p. doi:10.1016/j.vehcom.2019.100165, 07 2019.
- [19] B. E. Y. Belmekki, A. Hamza, and B. Escrig, "Performance analysis of cooperative communications at road intersections using stochastic geometry tools," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.08532*, 2018.
- [20] B. E. Y. Belmekki, A. Hamza, and B. Escrig, "Outage performance of NOMA at road intersections using stochastic geometry," in *2019 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC) (IEEE WCNC 2019)*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2019.
- [21] B. E. Y. Belmekki, A. Hamza, and B. Escrig, "On the outage probability of cooperative 5g noma at intersections," in *2019 IEEE 89th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2019-Spring)*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2019.
- [22] B. E. Y. Belmekki, A. Hamza, and B. Escrig, "Outage analysis of cooperative noma using maximum ratio combining at intersections," in *IEEE 15th Int. Conf. Wireless Mobile Comput. Netw. Commun. (WiMob)*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2019.
- [23] B. E. Y. Belmekki, A. Hamza, and B. Escrig, "On the performance of 5g non-orthogonal multiple access for vehicular communications at road intersections," *Vehicular Communications*, p. doi:10.1016/j.vehcom.2019.100202, 2019.
- [24] B. E. Y. Belmekki, A. Hamza, and B. Escrig, "Performance analysis of cooperative noma at intersections for vehicular communications in the presence of interference," *Ad hoc Networks*, p. doi:10.1016/j.adhoc.2019.102036, 2019.
- [25] B. E. Y. Belmekki, A. Hamza, and B. Escrig, "Non-orthogonal multiple access performance for millimeter wave in vehicular communications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12392*, 2019.
- [26] T. Bai, R. Vaze, and R. W. Heath, "Analysis of blockage effects on urban cellular networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 13, no. 9, pp. 5070–5083, 2014.
- [27] Z. Ding, L. Dai, and H. V. Poor, "Mimo-noma design for small packet transmission in the internet of things," *IEEE access*, vol. 4, pp. 1393–1405, 2016.
- [28] S. Singh, M. N. Kulkarni, A. Ghosh, and J. G. Andrews, "Tractable model for rate in self-backhauled millimeter wave cellular networks," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 33, no. 10, pp. 2196–2211, 2015.
- [29] N. Deng and M. Haenggi, "The meta distribution of the sinr in mm-wave d2d networks," in *GLOBECOM 2017-2017 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2017.
- [30] M. O. Hasna, M.-S. Alouini, A. Bastami, and E. S. Ebbini, "Performance analysis of cellular mobile systems with successive co-channel interference cancellation," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 29–40, 2003.