

Energy-Efficient Cellular-Connected UAV Swarm Control Optimization

Yang Su, Hui Zhou, Yansha Deng and Mischa Dohler

Abstract

Cellular-connected unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) swarm is a promising solution for diverse applications, including cargo delivery and traffic control. However, it is still challenging to communicate with and control the UAV swarm with high reliability, low latency, and high energy efficiency. In this paper, we propose a two-phase command and control (C&C) transmission scheme in a cellular-connected UAV swarm network, where the ground base station (GBS) broadcasts the common C&C message in Phase I. In Phase II, the UAVs that have successfully decoded the C&C message will relay the message to the rest of UAVs via device-to-device (D2D) communications in either broadcast or unicast mode, under latency and energy constraints. To maximize the number of UAVs that receive the message successfully within the latency and energy constraints, we formulate the problem as a Constrained Markov Decision Process to find the optimal policy. To address this problem, we propose a decentralized constrained graph attention multi-agent Deep-Q-network (DCGA-MADQN) algorithm based on Lagrangian primal-dual policy optimization, where a PID-controller algorithm is utilized to update the Lagrange Multiplier. Simulation results show that our algorithm could maximize the number of UAVs that successfully receive the common C&C under energy constraints.

Index Terms

Cellular-connected UAV swarm network, D2D, multi-agent reinforcement learning, graph attention, Constrained Markov Decision Process

Yang Su, Hui Zhou and Yansha Deng are with the Department of Engineering, King's College London, London, WC2R 2LS, U.K. (email:{yang.2.su, hui.zhou, yansha.deng}@kcl.ac.uk). (Corresponding author: Yansha Deng). This paper was presented in part at the 2022 IEEE Global Communications Conference, December 2022 [1]. This work was supported by Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), U.K., under Grant EP/W004348/1.

Mischa Dohler is with the Advanced Technology Group, Ericsson Inc., Silicon Valley, US. (email: mischa.dohler@ericsson.com)

I. INTRODUCTION

Cellular-connected UAV (C-UAV) swarm network has been regarded as a promising solution to tackle various complicated tasks, including cargo delivery, aerial imaging, and traffic control [2]–[4]. This is because the cellular technology provides the following advantages: 1) due to the almost ubiquitous accessibility of cellular networks, cellular-connected UAVs provide the pilot with beyond line-of-sight control [5]; 2) based on the ultra-reliable low latency communications (URLLC) and massive machine type communications (mMTC) services, cellular-connected UAVs achieve significant performance improvements over conventional UAV communication technologies (such as WiFi and Bluetooth) regarding reliability, security, and data throughput [6]; and 3) positioning service in the cellular network provides UAVs with an extra dimension of localization. On the other hand, to overcome the stringent size, weight, and power (SWAP) limitations of a single UAV, a C-UAV swarm network has been proposed to fully exploit the potential of a C-UAV system in complicated tasks via a group of closely coordinated UAVs [7].

Two different architectures, namely infrastructure-based and infrastructure-assisted architectures, have been proposed. In infrastructure-based architecture [8], the cellular ground base station (GBS) receives the flight information from all UAVs in the swarm and transmits their coordination data back. Infrastructure-based architecture embraces the benefit of centralized coordination empowered by GBS with typically powerful computing capabilities. However, the lack of scalability in centralized coordination leads to high round-trip air-ground delay, especially when serving a large number of UAVs. Moreover, due to the fluctuated wireless channel and high mobility of UAVs, providing URLLC service to the whole UAV swarm simultaneously for downlink C&C communication in infrastructure-based architecture is exceptionally challenging [9]. To solve the issues in infrastructure-based architecture, infrastructure-assisted UAV-to-UAV (U2U) communication has been proposed for C-UAV swarm network [10]. In infrastructure-assisted U2U communication, UAVs are allowed to communicate with each other directly, and the GBS provides the backbone connectivity between the aerial network formed by the UAVs. Such architecture offers advantages in terms of spectrum and energy efficiency, extended cellular coverage, and decreased backhaul requirements.

To facilitate U2U communication, Device-to-Device (D2D) technical paradigm has been standardized in 3GPP specification [11]–[13]. The so-called "Sidelink" (PC5 radio interface) is a D2D technology in 5G standard and supports broadcast mode and unicast mode [14]. The broadcast

mode supports one-to-many compared to the unicast mode's one-to-one paradigm. Nevertheless, the unicast mode is more reliable and energy-saving due to having the following special features: 1) there is ACK/NACK mechanism in D2D unicast mode, which can guarantee the stringent reliability requirement [15]; 2) the link adaption is supported in the D2D unicast mode, where the Modulation and Coding Scheme (MCS) cannot be dynamically adjusted based on the quality of radio link [16]; 3) power control is supported for D2D unicast mode, the D2D transmitter could regulate its transmit power dynamically based on the pathloss between the D2D receiver [17].

Authors in [12] considered multiple GBSs broadcasting the C&C message to the UAV swarm, however, due to the strong interference from other interfering GBSs, a certain amount of UAVs fail to receive the message. Then, the UAVs that have successfully decoded the C&C message will broadcast the message to the rest of the UAVs via D2D broadcast communication. This work mainly focused on the analytical expression of the reliability performance and only considered one-round D2D communication, which fails to guarantee the high reliability and low latency in C&C transmission for all UAVs. Moreover, this work did not consider the effect of UAVs' high mobility and limited battery capacity. In [13], the authors investigated the packet delivery ratio (PDR) of a sidelink-assisted multihop U2U communication model for various scheduling parameters, which focused on the performance analysis without considering the interference from GBS and the power limitations of UAVs. To the best of knowledge, there is no research on the optimal D2D modes selection, i.e. D2D execution policy, based on the surrounding environment to maximize the final message coverage within a limited energy supply.

To deal with more complex communication environment and practical formulation, deep reinforcement learning (DRL) emerges as a promising tool to optimize the D2D execution policy, due to that it solely relies on the self learning of the environment interaction, without the need to derive explicit optimization solutions based on a complex mathematical model [18]. The DRL has been proposed to optimize the energy efficiency [19] and content caching in D2D networks [20]. Authors in [19] considered the energy efficiency problem in D2D-enabled heterogeneous cellular networks and proposed a single agent DRL-based method to optimize the communication mode selection (D2D mode or cellular mode) and resource allocation to maximize long-term energy efficiency. In [20], a dynamic and time-varying D2D offloading system was studied considering the uncertain and dynamic content requests, mobility, and the constrained cache capacity of nodes, where a single agent DQN-based solution was proposed to solve the content caching

optimization problem.

These work [19], [20] mainly focused on the single-agent DRL method, where its computational complexity and communication cost increase drastically with the number of user equipment. Hence, the single-agent DRL method is insufficient for large-scale networks requiring high scalability. Note that single-agent DRL method is optimized to maximize its own reward function and may not consider the impact of its actions on other agents in cooperative environments, leading to suboptimal behavior. In contrast, multi-agent DRL can learn to cooperate among multiple agents and adapt to changes [21], resulting in more effective and robust performance in complex and dynamic environments.

To solve the drawbacks mentioned above, in this paper, we develop a decentralized multi-agent deep reinforcement learning architecture adopting Graph Attention network (GAT) [22] structure. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a two-phase downlink C&C transmission protocol. In phase I, the GBS control center broadcasts the C&C message to UAV swarm, but part of UAVs fail to receive the message due to strong interference from other GBSs. In phase II, the UAVs that have received the C&C message successfully in phase I will execute multi-hop D2D communication to transmit the C&C message to the rest UAVs. We also consider D2D unicast, D2D broadcast, and hybrid D2D transmissions to fully exploit the D2D mode supported in 5G sidelink standard.
- To maximize the number of UAVs that receive the C&C message successfully after D2D phase within energy constraint, we formulate the problem as a Constrained Markov Decision Process (CMDP) problem, and propose a decentralized constrained graph attention multi-agent Deep-Q-network (DCGA-MADQN) algorithm based on Lagrangian primal-dual policy optimization to find the best policy during D2D communication phase. The UAV that has successfully received the C&C message will act as an agent, executing actions under D2D unicast, D2D broadcast, and D2D hybrid schemes to maximize the number of UAVs decoding message successfully within the latency and energy constraint. Specifically, we utilize GAT structure to exploit the UAV swarm topology, and PID-Controller algorithm to update the Lagrange multiplier.
- In the experiments, we develop a realistic simulation framework to evaluate the proposed learning framework under three D2D schemes with different energy constraints. The results show that DCGA-MADQN can maximize the number of UAVs that successfully receive

the C&C message within the energy constraint. It is noted that D2D broadcast and hybrid schemes achieve similar number of UAVs that successfully receive the message, but is much higher than that of D2D unicast scheme.

The rest of the papers are organized as follows. Section II presents the system model and problem formulation. Section III provides the detail of DCGA-MADQN algorithm. Section IV illustrates the simulation results. Finally, Section V concludes the paper.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION


As shown in Fig. 1(a), we consider the downlink C&C message transmission in a C-UAV swarm network, where the GBS control center sends the C&C message to the UAV swarm. It is noted that the interfering GBSs serve the ground user equipments (UEs) using the same frequency band. We assume that each UAV is equipped with a single omnidirectional antenna and each GBS employs K antennas, denoted by the antenna indexes set $\mathcal{K} = \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$.

The GBS control center will broadcast a common C&C message to the UAV swarm with the aim to provide flight guidance and cooperation instructions. We assume that there are N UAVs in the swarm, denoted by $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, which are located in a circular horizontal disk with radius R_U and height H . The 3D location of n_{th} UAV is denoted as $u_n \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$. We also assume that $(M+1)$ GBSs are located in a circular ground disk with radius R_G . Specially, the GBS control center, denoted as m_0 , is located at the center and just below the center of the UAV swarm, with its 3D location denoted by $\tilde{u}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$. The interfering GBSs are denoted as $\mathcal{M}_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$, and the corresponding 3D location is represented as $\tilde{u}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$.


A. System Model

Due to the substantial interference from M interfering GBSs, pathloss and channel fading, a certain amount of UAVs with low SINR cannot successfully receive the common C&C message from the GBS control center. To guarantee the successful transmission of C&C message to the UAV swarm within the latency requirement τ , we propose a two-phase C&C transmission protocol. In phase I, the GBS control center will broadcast the common control message to the UAV swarm within duration $\tau^{(I)} < \tau$. In Phase II, the UAVs that have decoded the message successfully will relay the message to other UAVs via multi-hop of D2D communication within remaining duration $\tau^{(II)} = \tau - \tau^{(I)}$.

In the following, we will describe the two-phase protocol.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 1. (a) Illustration of a two-phase protocol in cellular connected UAVs system. (b) The time division of two-phase protocol.

1) Phase I: Broadcast from GBS control center to UAV swarm

The GBS control center broadcasts the common control message over a specific frequency band, which is reused by interfering GBSs to serve the ground users. Taking into account the potential line-of-sight (LoS) and non-line-of-sight (NLoS) for flying UAVs, we adopt free-space path loss and Rayleigh fading [23], [24] to model the path loss from the k th antenna of m th

GBS to the n th UAV as

$$h_{m,n}^k = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{4\pi d_{m,n} f_c}{c} \right)^{\alpha_I} \eta_{\text{LoS}} \beta_{m,n}^k, & P_{\text{LoS}}^{m,n} \\ \left(\frac{4\pi d_{m,n} f_c}{c} \right)^{\alpha_I} \eta_{\text{NLoS}} \beta_{m,n}^k, & P_{\text{NLoS}}^{m,n} = 1 - P_{\text{LoS}}^{m,n}, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $d_{m,n}$ is the distance between the m th GBS and the n th UAV, f_c is the broadcast frequency, η_{LoS} and η_{NLoS} are the path loss coefficients in LoS and NLoS cases, c is the speed of light, and α_I is the path loss exponent. The $\beta_{m,n}^k$ is the small-scale Rayleigh fading from the k th antenna of m th GBS to the n th UAV, which follows $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$. In (1), we adopt the LoS probability of the broadcast transmission as [25]–[27]

$$P_{\text{LoS}}^{m,n} = \frac{1}{1 + a \exp(-b(\theta_{m,n} - a))}, \quad (2)$$

where $\theta_{m,n} = \frac{180}{\pi} \times \arcsin\left(\frac{H}{d_{m,n}}\right)$ is the elevation angle of the n th UAV, H is the height of the UAV, a and b are positive constants that depend on the environment.

Hence, based on (1) and (2), the channel from the k th antenna of m th GBS to n th UAV can be obtained as

$$h_{m,n}^k = (P_{\text{LoS}}^{m,n} \eta_{\text{LoS}} + P_{\text{NLoS}}^{m,n} \eta_{\text{NLoS}}) \left(\frac{4\pi d_{m,n} f_c}{c} \right)^{\alpha_I} \beta_{m,n}^k. \quad (3)$$

The transmitted signal of the GBS control center m_0 can be presented as

$$x_0^{(1)} = \sqrt{P} s_0, \quad (4)$$

where P is the identical maximal transmit power of GBSs, s_0 is the common control message with $\mathbb{E}\{|s_0|^2\} = 1$.

The transmitted signal of interfering GBS m is given by

$$x_m^{(1)} = \sqrt{P} s_m, \quad m \in \mathcal{M}_1, \quad (5)$$

where s_m is the transmitted message for serving ground user equipments, with $\mathbb{E}\{|s_m|^2\} = 1$.

The received signal of the n th UAV in Phase I can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} y_n^{(1)} &= \sqrt{P} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} h_{m_0,n}^k s_0 + \sqrt{P} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}_1} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} h_{m,n}^k s_m \\ &+ z_n^{(1)}, \quad n \in \mathcal{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $z_n^{(1)} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ is the additive white Gaussian noise at the n th UAV.

As a result, the SINR of the received signal at n th UAV is

$$\text{SINR}_n^{(1)} = \frac{P \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} h_{m_0,n}^k \right|^2}{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}_1} P \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} h_{m,n}^k \right|^2 + \sigma^2}, \quad n \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (7)$$

It is noted that the n th UAV can successfully decode the common C&C if the SINR is higher than the threshold γ_I . Therefore, the N UAVs can be divided into two groups \mathcal{N}_s and \mathcal{N}_f .

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{N}_s = \{n \mid n \in \mathcal{N}, \text{SINR}_n^{(I)} \geq \gamma_I\} \\ \mathcal{N}_f = \mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}_s \end{cases}, \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{N}_s represents the UAVs that have successfully decoded the broadcasted common C&C message, and has a total number of N_s UAVs; and \mathcal{N}_f represents the UAVs that fail to decode the broadcasted common C&C message, and has a total number of N_f UAVs. Since \mathcal{N}_s and \mathcal{N}_f represent the initial UAVs set before the D2D unicast transmission, we also refer them to \mathcal{N}_s^0 and \mathcal{N}_f^0 , respectively.

2) Phase II: D2D communication among UAVs

After the broadcast of the GBS control center, the initial UAVs \mathcal{N}_s^0 which have received the common control message successfully will transmit the message to the rest of UAVs \mathcal{N}_f^0 via multiple cycles of D2D communication within latency constraint. The duration of Phase II $\tau^{(II)}$ could contain L time slots, where each time slot occupies Δt . Hence, the cumulative duration of all time slots is $t_{\text{slots}} = L\Delta t$. In each time slot, the successful UAV will execute one cycle of D2D communication, which includes two possible operation modes: unicast mode and broadcast mode. We define $\mu_{i,u}^t$ and $\mu_{i,b}^t$ as the operation mode indicator of the i th UAV ($i \in \mathcal{N}_s^{t-1}$) in t th time slot,

$$\mu_{i,u}^t = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{unicast mode} \\ 0, & \text{broadcast or idle mode} \end{cases}, \quad (9)$$

$$\mu_{i,b}^t = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{broadcast mode} \\ 0, & \text{unicast or idle mode} \end{cases}, \quad (10)$$

$$\mu_{i,u}^t + \mu_{i,b}^t \leq 1. \quad (11)$$

Depending on the selection of operation mode, the UAVs in the set of \mathcal{N}_s^{t-1} could be further divided into three groups:

$$\begin{cases} \Theta_u^t = \{n \mid n \in \mathcal{N}_s^{t-1}, \mu_{n,u}^t = 1\} \\ \Theta_b^t = \{n \mid n \in \mathcal{N}_s^{t-1}, \mu_{n,b}^t = 1\} \\ \Theta_{\text{idle}}^t = \{n \mid n \in \mathcal{N}_s^{t-1}, \mu_{n,u}^t = 0 \ \& \ \mu_{n,b}^t = 0\} \end{cases}, \quad (12)$$

where Θ_u^t represents the UAVs working at unicast mode in t th time slot, Θ_b^t represents the UAVs working at broadcast mode in t th time slot and Θ_{idle}^t represents the UAVs that remain idle in t th time slot. It is noted that when the i th UAV in set Θ_u^t chooses the n th UAV from the set \mathcal{N}_f^{t-1} as the D2D unicast receiver and connects successfully, then the target n th UAV will be removed from \mathcal{N}_f^{t-1} , and added to \mathcal{N}_s^{t-1} , which becomes part of sets \mathcal{N}_s^t and \mathcal{N}_f^t in t th time slot.

Under D2D unicast mode, the i th UAV utilizes the power control algorithm to compensate the path loss following [28], [29], which is shown as

$$\tilde{P}_{i,u} = \min\{\xi d_{i,n}^{\alpha_{\text{II}}}, \tilde{P}_{\max}\}, \quad i \in \Theta_u^t, n \in \mathcal{N}_s^{t-1}, \quad (13)$$

where ξ is the power parameter, $d_{i,n}$ is the distance between the D2D unicast pairs, α_{II} is the pathloss exponent and \tilde{P}_{\max} is the maximum transmit power of UAV.

The received signal of the n th UAV from the i th UAV can be derived as

$$y_{n,u}^{(\text{II})} = \sqrt{\tilde{P}_{i,u}} h_{i,n} s_0 + z_n^{(\text{II})}, \quad (14)$$

where the path loss $h_{i,n} = d_{i,n}^{-\alpha_{\text{II}}} \beta_{i,n}$, and $\beta_{i,n}$ is the Rayleigh fading following $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$. The $z_n^{(\text{II})} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ is the additive white Gaussian noise at the n th UAV.

Therefore, we derive the received SINR at the n th UAV as

$$\text{SINR}_{n,u}^{(\text{II})} = \frac{\tilde{P}_{i,u} |h_{i,n}|^2}{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}_1} P \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} h_{m,n}^k \right|^2 + \sigma^2}. \quad (15)$$

When $\text{SINR}_{n,u}^{(\text{II})}$ is above the threshold γ_{II} , the D2D unicast transmission between UAV i and UAV n is identified as successful, and the n th UAV will send back an ACK signal to UAV i to indicate the success of transmission.

The total energy consumed by the D2D unicast communication in time slot t is calculated as,

$$E_{i,u} = \left(\kappa \tilde{P}_{i,u} + \tilde{P}_{i,o} \right) \Delta t, \quad i \in \Theta_u^t, \quad (16)$$

where κ is the conversion factor of the power amplifier from electric power to RF power and $\tilde{P}_{i,o}$ is the electronic power consumption overhead incurred in the communication module to encode the common control message [30].

We consider that all the UAVs in Θ_b^t will broadcast the signal at the same subchannel, and the interior clock is synchronized through GNSS. In D2D broadcast mode, the maximum transmit power is utilized to enlarge the coverage as

$$\tilde{P}_{i,b} = \tilde{P}_{\max}, \quad i \in \Theta_b^t, n \in \mathcal{N}_s^{t-1}. \quad (17)$$

The received signal of the n th UAV can be derived as

$$y_{n,b}^{(\text{II})} = \sum_{i \in \Theta_b^t} \sqrt{\tilde{P}_{i,b}} h_{i,n} s_0 + z_n^{(\text{II})}, \quad (18)$$

The corresponding SINR of the n th UAV is

$$\text{SINR}_{n,b}^{(\text{II})} = \frac{\tilde{P}_{i,b} \left| \sum_{i \in \Theta_b^t} h_{i,n} \right|^2}{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}_1} P \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} h_{m,n}^k \right|^2 + \sigma^2}. \quad (19)$$

When $\text{SINR}_{n,b}^{(\text{II})}$ is above the threshold γ_{II} , UAV n will receive D2D broadcast signal successfully.

The total energy consumed by the D2D broadcast communication in time slot t is calculated as,

$$E_{i,b} = \left(\kappa \tilde{P}_{i,b} + \tilde{P}_{i,o} \right) \Delta t, \quad i \in \Theta_b^t. \quad (20)$$

Apart from Transmitting state (TX), i.e., unicast mode or broadcast mode mentioned above, each UAV can also be in Receiving state (RX) or idle state. The corresponding energy consumption is given by

$$E_{i,r} = \tilde{P}_{i,r} \Delta t, \quad i \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (21)$$

$$E_{i,\text{idle}} = \tilde{P}_{i,\text{idle}} \Delta t, \quad i \in \Theta_{\text{idle}}^t, \quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{P}_{i,r}$ and $\tilde{P}_{i,\text{idle}}$ are constant power of receiving state and idle state. Hence, the energy consumption of UAV i in time slot t during Phase II is calculated as,

$$E_i(t) = \begin{cases} \mu_{i,u}^t E_{i,u} + \mu_{i,b}^t E_{i,b}, & \text{transmitting state} \\ E_{i,r}, & \text{receiving state} \\ E_{i,\text{idle}}, & \text{idle state} \end{cases}. \quad (23)$$

B. Mobility Model

The widely applied random waypoint (RWP) mobility model [31] is adopted to model each UAV's mobility. Each node starts by pausing for a fixed number of seconds, called the pause period. When the pause period is elapsed, the node chooses a random end position within the area of simulation and moves towards the end position with a randomly chosen speed. Upon arrival at the end position, it stops and waits for a moment before starting its journey to a newly chosen end position. This procedure is repeated until the simulation period is elapsed. Due to the stringent latency requirement, we assume the UAVs are static during the execution of Phase I and Phase II, which include GBS broadcasting, and UAV D2D unicast.

C. Problem Formulation

In this paper, we consider three D2D communication schemes: Unicast, Broadcast, and Hybrid schemes. In Unicast scheme, each UAV can only perform D2D unicast transmission or remain idle in each time slot. In Broadcast scheme, each UAV can only operate in D2D broadcast mode or remain idle during each cycle. For hybrid scheme, each UAV can choose D2D unicast transmission, D2D broadcast transmission or keep idle during each round.

We focus on the downlink C&C transmission from the GBS control center to the UAV swarm in the mission area with the aim to maximize the number of UAVs that successfully receive the common C&C message under the overall energy consumption constraint and latency constraint τ . The problem can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\pi(A^t|O^t)} \quad & \sum_{k=t}^{\infty} \gamma^{k-t} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [N_s^k] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & C^k \leq E_c, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where π is the policy that maps the current observation O^t to the probabilities of actions, $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ is the discount factor for the performance in future slots, E_c is the overall energy constraint, C^k is the overall energy cost of all UAVs from time slot 0 to time slot k and represented as

$$C^k = \sum_{h=0}^k \sum_{i=1}^N E_i(h). \quad (25)$$

The problem in (24) is a constrained Markov Decision Process (C-MDP) problem [32] and can be transformed into the following unconstrained form based on the Lagrangian primal-dual policy optimization technique,

$$\min_{\lambda \geq 0} \max_{\pi} \sum_{k=t}^{\infty} \gamma^{k-t} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [N_s^k] - \lambda (E_c - C^k), \quad (26)$$

where λ is the lagrange multiplier, and π is the policy.

III. MULTI AGENT REINFORCEMENT LEARNING BASED ON GRAPH ATTENTION NETWORK

In this section, we will introduce a decentralized constrained multi-agent deep reinforcement learning algorithm to solve the optimization problem in (26). The architecture of the multi-agent deep reinforcement learning is shown in Fig. 2, during each time slot of the D2D communication phase, the UAVs that fail to receive the message will not have any action and will wait for other UAVs' D2D connection. Once the UAVs receive the message successfully, they will act as agents,




Fig. 2. The framework of Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning.

acquire the observation from the environment and execute different actions based on different D2D communication schemes.

Observation: For all of the three schemes, we assume that each agent has a global view of the entire operational environment, including the locations, message receiving statuses and energy consumption of all other agents. The local observation of agent i encompasses the aforementioned information and is represented as $O_i^t = (\mu_i^t, \varphi_i^t, e_i^t)$. Specifically, we denote μ_i^t as all UAVs' 3D locations with $\mu_i^t = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}, n \in \mathcal{N}$. The message receiving status of all UAVs from the view of agent i will be represented as $\varphi_i^t = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_n\}, n \in \mathcal{N}$, where

$$\varphi_n = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{failure} \\ 1, & \text{success} \end{cases}. \quad (27)$$

The e_i^t is utilized to represent the value difference between the overall energy constraint and the energy consumed by UAVs until t th time slot, where

$$e_i^t = E_c - C^{t-1}. \quad (28)$$

Action: The action space for the three D2D communication schemes are presented in detail as follows.

1) Unicast scheme: During each time slot of phase II, agent i will choose one UAV from the remaining $N - 1$ UAVs as the target to connect, or it will take no action and remain idle in this time slot. The size of action space is N , and the action of agent i in t th time slot is expressed as

$$A_i^t = \{\text{unicast}, \text{idle}\}. \quad (29)$$

2) Broadcast scheme: agent i is required to make a decision about whether executing broadcast in each time slot of phase II, therefore, its action space size is 2. During t th time slot, the action of agent i can be denoted as

$$A_i^t = \{\text{broadcast}, \text{idle}\} \quad (30)$$

3) Hybrid scheme: During each time slot of phase II, agent i needs to first choose the operating mode: D2D broadcast mode, D2D unicast mode or idle mode. If agent i chooses to work at unicast mode, it needs to make decisions further, which means select one UAV from the remaining $N - 1$ UAVs as the target to connect. Hence, the size of action space is $N + 1$. The action of agent i in t th time slot is written as

$$A_i^t = \{\text{unicast}, \text{broadcast}, \text{idle}\}. \quad (31)$$

Reward: We consider three D2D communication schemes adopting the same reward design. As our goal is to maximize the number of UAVs that successfully receive the C&C message under latency constraints, the reward function should be defined according to the additional number of UAVs that receive the message successfully in the current t th time slot compared to the $(t - 1)$ th time slot, which is expressed as

$$R_i^t = N_{add}^t, \quad (i \in \mathcal{N}_s^{t-1}). \quad (32)$$

A. Constrained Multi-Agent Deep Q Network

We adopt a decentralized constrained multi-agent deep Q-network to solve the optimization problem, where each agent is trained based on its own local observation. Each agent i has its own Q-network, target Q-network, and replay memory D_i . For different agents, the architecture of their own Q-network and target Q-network is the same. However, they will not share the parameters considering the stringent time requirement and communication cost in a wireless environment. We use the $\epsilon - greedy$ algorithm to balance the exploration and exploitation; the

Algorithm 1 Constrained Multi-Agent Deep-Q-network

```

1: Initialization:
2: for all  $i \in N$  do
3:   Initialize replay memory  $D_i$  to capacity  $N_D$ , current Q-network  $Q_i(O_i, A_i; \theta_i)$ , target Q-
   network  $\hat{Q}_i(O'_i, A'_i; \hat{\theta}_i)$ , Lagrange Multiplier  $\lambda_i$ 
4: end for
5: while not at max_episode do
6:   for each agent  $i \in \mathcal{N}_s$  do
7:     Achieve local observation  $O_i$ 
8:     if with probability  $1 - \epsilon$  then
9:        $A_i = \max_A Q_i(O_i, A_i; \theta_i)$ 
10:    else
11:      Select random action  $A_i$ 
12:    end if
13:    Update the reward  $R_i$ 
14:    Achieve the next local observation  $O'_i$ 
15:    Store transition  $(O_i, A_i, R_i, O'_i, c_i)$  in the replay memory  $D_i$ 
16:    Sample a mini-batch of  $M$  transitions from  $D_i$ 
17:    if  $O'_i$  is terminal then
18:       $y_i = R_i$ 
19:    else
20:       $y_i = R_i + \gamma \max_{A'_i} \hat{Q}_i(O'_i, A'_i; \hat{\theta}_i) - \lambda_i c_i$ 
21:    end if
22:    Using stochastic gradient to minimize the loss
23:     $L = (y_i - Q_i(O_i, A_i; \theta_i))^2$ 
24:    Update the target Q-network  $\hat{Q}_i$  and Lagrange Multiplier  $\lambda_i$ 
25:  end for
26: end while

```

agent chooses the optimal target with a high probability $1 - \epsilon$ or selects a random target with probability ϵ . For each agent i , it samples a random minibatch of M samples from replay memory D_i and uses a stochastic gradient to minimize the Q-loss. The replay memory could make more efficient use of the experiences during the training, prevent the forgetting of previous experiences and diminish the correlation between experiences. The weights of the target Q-network \hat{Q}_i will be updated by slowly track the learned Q-network Q_i :

$$\hat{\theta}_i = \beta\theta_i + (1 - \beta)\hat{\theta}_i, \quad (33)$$

where the β is an interpolation parameter and much less than 1. This slow update method could greatly improve the stability of learning.

The state action value for each UAV i is calculated as

$$Q_i(O_i, A_i) = R_i + \gamma \max_{A'_i} Q_i(O'_i, A'_i) - \lambda_i c_i(O_i, A_i) \quad (34)$$

where O_i is current state, A_i is current action, R_i is reward, O'_i is next state, A'_i is next action, λ_i is Lagrange multiplier, c_i is energy cost of current action, γ is the discount factor, which determines the balance between the current state-action value and future state-action values.

In this study, we adopt a control-theoretic approach to update the Lagrange multiplier λ in the learning algorithm [33]. This is achieved by interpreting the overall learning process as a dynamical system and utilizing the Proportional-Integral-Derivative (PID) control rule. The implementation details are outlined in Algorithm 2.

The cumulative energy cost of all UAVs, as perceived by UAV i , in the last time slot of the D2D phase II is represented by C_i^L . The PID update rule allows for fine-tuned control of the Lagrange multiplier λ by considering three key components: proportional control, integral control, and derivative control. The proportional control term $K_P\Delta_i$ is proportional to the difference value Δ_i between the current energy cost and the energy constraint. This term accelerates the response to constraint breaches and reduces oscillations in the system. The integral control term $K_I I_i$ considers the accumulated past values of Δ_i , and the derivative control term $K_D D_i$ is an estimate of the future trend of Δ_i . This term acts against increasing energy costs while allowing for decreases, projected as $(.)_+$.

The utilization of the PID control rule in this study is motivated by the need for precise control of the Lagrange multiplier λ in the learning algorithm. The Lagrange multiplier λ acts as a weight that balances the trade-off between maximizing the system's objective function and

satisfying the energy constraint. Specifically, it penalizes the objective function when the energy consumption of the system exceeds the specified energy budget. The penalty is proportional to the amount by which the energy consumption exceeds the energy budget. By adjusting the value of λ , the learning algorithm can control the energy consumption of the system. A higher value of λ results in a larger penalty on the objective function for exceeding the energy constraint, thereby enforcing a stricter energy constraint. In contrast, a lower value of λ results in a smaller penalty and a more relaxed energy constraint. The PID control rule provides a physical interpretation of the learning process, allowing for fine-tuned control of the Lagrange multiplier λ and enabling optimization of the overall system performance.

Algorithm 2 PID-Controller Lagrange Multiplier

```

1: Select tuning parameters:  $K_P, K_I, K_D \geq 0$ 
2: for all  $i \in N$  do
3:   Integral:  $I_i \leftarrow 0$ 
4:   Previous Cost  $C_{i,prev} \leftarrow 0$ 
5: end for
6: while not at max_episode do
7:   for each agent  $i$  do
8:     Receive cost  $C_i^L$ 
9:      $\Delta_i \leftarrow C_i^L - E_c$ 
10:     $D_i \leftarrow (C_i^L - C_{i,prev}^L)_+$ 
11:     $I_i \leftarrow (I_i + \Delta_i)_+$ 
12:     $\lambda_i \leftarrow (K_P \Delta_i + K_I I_i + K_D D_i)_+$ 
13:     $C_{i,prev}^L \leftarrow C_i^L$ 
14:   end for
15: end while

```

B. Graph Attention Network Architecture

The local observation of each agent is represented as a fully-connected graph, where different nodes represent different UAVs containing corresponding raw information, and there exists an undirected edge between any two nodes.




Fig. 3. The architecture of neural network in DQN of agent i .

We employ a graph attention network to approximate the Q-values. The observation O_i of agent i can be decomposed into $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n, n \in \mathcal{N}$, where $\phi_n = \{u_n, \varphi_n, e_i\}$. The ϕ_n corresponds to the raw information of node n in the graph, where u_n represents the 3D location of node n , φ_n denotes the message receiving status of node n , and e_i represents the difference between the overall energy constraint and the energy consumed by the UAVs.

In order to expedite the convergence of the neural network model during training, we normalize the observation data by scaling. Normalization is often employed in machine learning to facilitate the optimization process by ensuring that the input data is consistent and comparable across different features. In our case, as the UAVs are constrained to move in a circular region with a radius of R_U and height H , we scale the 3D location data u_n by dividing it by R_U and H . This ensures that the scale of the input features is similar, which can improve the convergence speed and increase the model's stability.

$$u_n = \{x_n, y_n, z_n\} \rightarrow u'_n = \left\{ \frac{x_n}{R_U}, \frac{y_n}{R_U}, \frac{z_n}{H} \right\} \quad (35)$$

When a UAV implements D2D communication, broadcast mode incurs the highest energy cost because it utilizes its maximum transmit power. Hence, for the energy difference value e_i , we adopt $E_{i,b}$ as the scale factor.

$$e_i \rightarrow e'_i = \frac{e_i}{E_{i,b}} \quad (36)$$

Then, we could obtain newly normalized data $\phi'_n = \{n, u'_n, \varphi_n, e'_i\}$, where u'_n is given in (35), e'_i is given in (36).

As shown in Fig. 3, the architecture of the neural network consists of four parts: one encoder layer, two multi-head graph attention network layer and one dense layer. The node information ϕ'_i will be encoded into a feature vector h_i by Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP). Then first graph attention layer will integrate the feature vectors of node i and other $n - 1$ nodes and generate the latent feature vector h'_i . The second graph attention layer will extract feature vector h''_i further. Finally, inspired by DenseNet, the features of the preceding layers are concatenated and input into a dense layer to get the estimated Q value for each action.

The graph attention mechanism in this study employs the multi-head dot-product attention approach [34]. This approach involves transforming the input feature of each node into query, key, and value representations by each attention head. For attention head m , the relationship between nodes i and j in the set \mathcal{N} is calculated as follows:

$$\alpha_{ij}^m = \frac{\exp(\Psi \cdot \mathbf{W}_q^m h_i \cdot (\mathbf{W}_k^m h_j)^T)}{\sum_{z \in \mathcal{N}} \exp(\Psi \cdot \mathbf{W}_q^m h_i \cdot (\mathbf{W}_k^m h_z)^T)}, \quad (37)$$

where the weight matrices \mathbf{W}_q^m and \mathbf{W}_k^m in the graph attention layer are utilized to project the input feature of each node onto query and key representations respectively. The factor Ψ is used to scale the dot-product of the query and key representations to ensure that the magnitude of the output is controlled. This scaling factor is typically set to the square root of the dimensionality of the query and key vectors, which is known to improve the performance of the attention mechanism.

The outputs of the M attention heads for node i are concatenated and then processed by the function σ , which is a one-layer MLP with ReLU non-linearities. The resulting output is given by:

$$h'_i = \sigma \left(\text{Concatenate} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \alpha_{ij}^m \mathbf{W}_v^m h_j, \forall m \in M \right] \right), \quad (38)$$

where \mathbf{W}_v^m is another weight matrix, which is used to map the feature vector of each neighboring node to a new space that emphasizes different aspects of the node's relationship with the target node. The *Concatenate* operation is used to combine the outputs of the M attention heads into a single vector. The multi-head dot-product attention mechanism allows for the consideration of multiple aspects of the relationships between nodes in the graph, leading to a more nuanced representation of these relationships. The final output h'_i is a representation of node i that incorporates information from its relationships with all other nodes in the graph.

C. Computational Complexity

In this subsection, we present the computational complexity of multi-head graph attention network layer. Take the first multi-head graph attention network layer as an example, the input feature matrix is $h = \{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n\}^T$, $h_i \in \mathbb{R}^F$, where n is the number of nodes and F is the number of features in each node. The dimension of input feature matrix is (n, F) . The weight matrix \mathbf{W}_q , \mathbf{W}_k , \mathbf{W}_v is calculated from the feature matrix h by multiplying three learned matrix with shape (F, F) . The computation complexity of this operation is $O(nF^2)$. The calculation in (37) refers to the matrix multiplication with shape (n, F) and (F, n) , therefore, this operation has the computation complexity $O(n^2F)$. Eventually, the total complexity of multi-head graph attention network layer is $O(K(nF^2 + n^2F))$, where K is the number of the head. Overall, the computational complexity of the multi-head graph attention network layer scales quadratically with the number of nodes in the graph and the number of features per node, and linearly with the number of attention heads.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we evaluate the performance of our proposed transmission protocol optimized via the DRL algorithm using simulations. In the simulation, one GBS control center is located at the center of a circular ground area with a radius $R_G = 300$ m, along with four fixed interfering GBSs at $(\pm 105, \pm 105, 0)$ m. The UAV swarm move in a circular aerial area with radius $R_U = 60$ m and height $H = 300$ m. Detailed parameters are given in Table I.

The hyperparameters for the GAT-based MADQN are listed in Table II. Our model has been trained over 2000 episodes, where each episode consists of 200 rounds of C&C message

TABLE I
SIMULATION PARAMETERS

UAV number N	5	Power parameter ξ	1e-3
Receiving power of UAV $\tilde{P}_{i,r}$	50 mW	Electronic power consumption $\tilde{P}_{i,o}$	50 mW
Idle power of UAV $\tilde{P}_{i,\text{idle}}$	0 mW	Maximum transmit power of UAV \tilde{P}_{max}	23 dBm
Transmission power of GBSs P_G	43 dBm	Number of GBS antenna	4
Path loss exponent α_I	-2	The broadcast frequency f_c	2 GHz
The path loss coefficients in LoS η_{LoS}	$10^{-0.1}$	The path loss coefficients in NLoS η_{NLoS}	10^{-2}
Conversion factor of power amplifier κ	2.857	Path loss exponent α_{II}	4
The received SINR threshold γ_I, γ_{II}	0 dBm	Duration of time τ	1ms
Duration of time $\tau^{(I)}$	0.125 ms	Duration of time $\tau^{(II)}$	0.875 ms
Duration of each time slot Δt	0.25 ms	Noise power σ^2	-90 dBm

TABLE II
LEARNING PARAMETERS

Total episode	2000	The number of GNN head	8
Learning rate α	0.001	Discount rate γ	0.98
Interpolation parameter β	0.01	Replay Memory D_i Capacity	2000
Minimum exploration rate ϵ	0.01	Minibatch size	32
Optimizer	AdamOptimizer	Activation function	ReLU

transmission. In each C&C message transmission round, the proposed transmission protocol and DRL algorithm are simulated, where the position of the UAV swarm is assumed to be fixed during each round of C&C transmission. The initial value of the exploration rate is set to be 0.6 and linearly decreased to 0.01 by multiplying 0.996 after each episode. It's noted that the proposed algorithm is fully decentralized, where each agent will train its model based on local Replay Memory. Hence, we set the capacity of Replay Memory to be 2000 to alleviate the memory burden.

A. The state of UAV in phase I

Fig. 4 plots the moving trajectory of a UAV in an episode and the corresponding common C&C message receiving status of the UAV after the broadcasting of the GBS control center. We observe that the UAV cannot receive the message successfully in most locations due to the substantial interference from other GBSs, pathloss, and channel fading.




Fig. 4. The moving trajectory of a UAV and corresponding common C&C message receiving status after the broadcasting of the GBS control center.

B. The performance of D2D broadcast, unicast and hybrid schemes under different energy constraints

Fig. 5 presents a comprehensive performance evaluation of the D2D broadcast, unicast, and hybrid schemes under varying energy constraints during the training process. To improve readability, we normalize the energy with respect to the broadcast mode energy consumption $E_{i,b}$. Specifically, we denote a normalized energy consumption requirement of $E_c = 1$ as indicating that the energy consumption requirement is lower than the energy required for a one-time broadcast transmission.

During our experimental study, we have observed that the mean number of UAVs successfully receiving the C&C message in various schemes display a consistent trend in their variation during the training process. Specifically, this trend entails a gradual decrease in the mean number of successful UAVs followed by a subsequent rise until convergence. We attribute this trend to the initial training process, where the UAV policy resulted in a high overall energy consumption that exceeded the energy constraint. However, with the implementation of the DCGA-MADQN algorithm, the UAV policy learned to consume less energy, which led to a reduction in the mean number of successful UAVs. As the energy consumption reduced to below the energy constraint, the DCGA-MADQN algorithm learned a policy that maximized the final mean number of UAVs receiving the C&C message, resulting in a gradual increase in the mean number related curve




Fig. 5. (a)(c)(e) The mean number of UAVs that successfully receive the common C&C within latency constraints in the broadcast, unicast, and hybrid schemes under different energy constraints. (b)(d)(f) The energy consumption of the broadcast, unicast, and hybrid scheme under different energy constraints during the training process.

until convergence.

We observe that our DCGA-MADQN algorithm effectively suppresses the overall energy consumption of the UAV swarm system below the predefined energy constraints during the later episodes of the training process, regardless of the energy constraint setting. Additionally, a more relaxed energy constraint setting led to an increased number of successfully receiving UAVs. This is because more energy allows for more transmission operations, whether broadcast or unicast, thereby increasing the chances of successful message transmission. However, it is shown that the mean number of successfully receiving UAVs can not be further increased after a relatively high energy constraint, this is because the policy learned by our DCGA-MADQN algorithm has explored the maximum success performance that can be achieved in the system.

C. The variation of Lagrange Multiplier




Fig. 6. The variation of Lagrange Multiplier in the broadcast scheme.

Our proposed DCGA-MADQN algorithm integrates a PID-Controller algorithm to dynamically adjust the Lagrange Multiplier, which is based on the energy consumption status of the UAV swarm and the energy constraint requirement during the training process. To illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed method, we take the broadcast scheme as an example, and plot the corresponding Lagrange Multiplier variation curve Fig. 6.

Fig. 5 (b) depicts the energy consumption of the UAV swarm under different energy constraints during the training process. It is evident that at the start of the training process, the energy

consumption of the UAV swarm significantly exceeds the energy constraint. The proposed PID-Controller Lagrange multiplier update algorithm effectively regulates the Lagrange multiplier λ , which gradually increases from its initial value of 0. The increase in λ has a direct impact on the target state-action value depicted in Algorithm 1 and indirectly influences the learned policy of each agent. As a result of this effective control mechanism, the energy consumption curve exhibits a gradual decline. Notably, we have observed that for varying energy constraints, the rate of increase of the Lagrange multiplier λ is variable, whereby the speed of increase is positively correlated with the disparity between energy consumption and the energy constraint. Specifically, a larger discrepancy between energy consumption and the energy constraint results in a higher rate of increase for λ .

As the energy consumption of the UAV swarm gradually approaches the energy constraint, the Lagrange multiplier reaches its maximum value. Once the energy consumption of the UAV swarm satisfies the energy constraint, and the Lagrange multiplier λ does not increase any further. Due to the inertia of the learned policy, the energy consumption of the UAV swarm continues to decline, leading to a reduction in the value of λ . When λ falls to a small value, it reaches an equilibrium state and fluctuates around this value. This fluctuation occurs because the controller continues to adjust the value of λ to maintain a balance between the energy consumption and the energy constraint. Specifically, the controller increases the value of λ if the energy consumption exceeds the energy constraint, and decreases the value of λ if the energy consumption falls below the energy constraint. Meanwhile, as the energy consumption satisfies the energy requirement, the DCGA-MADQN algorithm adapts a policy that maximizes the ultimate mean number of UAVs that receive the C&C message. This policy optimization process elicits a slight elevation in energy consumption, albeit one that remains compliant with the energy constraint.

D. The comparison of different PID-Controller parameters

In Fig. 7, we evaluate the impact of various proportional, integral, and derivative coefficients of the PID-Controller Lagrange Multiplier algorithm on the performance of the broadcast scheme with energy constraint $E_c = 3$. Specifically, we establish a baseline set of parameters and generate three additional sets by adjusting a single coefficient of proportionality, integration, or differentiation at a time. Our findings indicate that regardless of which coefficient is larger, the energy consumption curve exhibits a fast initial decrease, as demonstrated in the partial enlargement of Fig. 7 (a). This is due to the larger coefficients resulting in a larger Lagrange




Fig. 7. (a) The influence of different PID parameters for the broadcast scheme under energy constraint $E_c = 3$. (b) The variation of Lagrange Multiplier for different PID parameters (c) The influence of different PID Parameters for the average number of UAVs that successfully receive the message within latency constraint under energy constraint $E_c = 3$.

Multiplier λ , which has a greater influence on the agents' learned policy. Moreover, we also note that an increase in the coefficients can lead to a discrepancy between the final convergence value of the energy consumption and the energy constraint. Additionally, as depicted in Fig. 7 (c), a decrease in the final convergence value of the mean number of UAVs that successfully receive the common C&C is observed when larger coefficients are utilized. Furthermore, our results suggest that the integral (I) parameter has a more significant impact on the system's performance

compared to the proportional (P) and derivative (D) parameters. This is attributed to the I parameter's ability to accumulate error over time, leading to a larger impact on the system's performance.




Fig. 8. (a) The energy consumption of different schemes under constraint $E_c = 3$. (b) The mean number of UAVs that successfully receive the message within latency constraint in different schemes under constraint $E_c = 3$.

E. The comparison of D2D broadcast, unicast and hybrid schemes under the same energy constraint

We compare the energy consumption and the mean number of UAVs that successfully receive the common C&C under the energy constraint $E_c = 3$ using the broadcast, unicast, and hybrid schemes, as shown in Fig. 8. We observe that during the initial training process, the hybrid scheme has a lower energy consumption compared with unicast and broadcast schemes, as shown in Fig. 8 (a). This is because the hybrid scheme violates the energy constraint to a greater extent during the initial training process. This violation results in the DCGA-MADQN algorithm promoting the development of a policy that prioritizes the reduction of energy consumption. Furthermore, our results also show that the mean number of UAVs that successfully receive the common C&C in the broadcast and hybrid schemes is almost the same and significantly higher than that of the unicast scheme, as illustrated in Fig. 8 (b). It also shows that the hybrid scheme can exploit the optimal actions that maximize the mean number of UAVs that successfully receive the common C&C signal.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed a two-phase protocol to transmit the common C&C to the UAV swarm under latency and energy constraints. To make the UAVs execute the optimal policies under the proposed three D2D schemes (unicast, broadcast, and hybrid), we design a decentralized constrained multi-agent Deep-Q-network algorithm based on the Lagrangian relaxation. Graph Attention network is utilized to learn the latent representation effectively under a highly dynamic wireless environment caused by the movement of UAVs and the change of channel state. A PID-controller method is adopted to update the Lagrange Multiplier. Simulation results show that our algorithm could effectively limit the energy consumption to the energy constraint and maximize the mean number of UAVs that successfully receive the common C&C sent from GBS.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Su, H. Zhou, and Y. Deng, "D2D-Based Cellular-Connected UAV Swarm Control Optimization via Graph-Aware DRL," in *Proc. IEEE Global Commun. Conf. (GLOBECOM)*, Dec. 2022, pp. 1326–1331.
- [2] M. Mozaffari, W. Saad, M. Bennis, Y.-H. Nam, and M. Debbah, "A tutorial on UAVs for wireless networks: Applications, challenges, and open problems," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 2334–2360, 3rd Quart., 2019.
- [3] H. Shakhatareh, A. H. Sawalmeh, A. Al-Fuqaha, Z. Dou, E. Almaita, I. Khalil, N. S. Othman, A. Khreishah, and M. Guizani, "Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs): A survey on civil applications and key research challenges," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 48 572–48 634, Apr. 2019.
- [4] H. Zhou, F. Hu, M. Juras, A. B. Mehta, and Y. Deng, "Real-Time Video Streaming and Control of Cellular-Connected UAV System: Prototype and Performance Evaluation," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 1657–1661, Apr. 2021.
- [5] X. Lin, V. Yajnanarayana, S. D. Muruganathan, S. Gao, H. Asplund, H.-L. Maattanen, M. Bergstrom, S. Euler, and Y.-P. E. Wang, "The sky is not the limit: LTE for unmanned aerial vehicles," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 204–210, Apr. 2018.
- [6] Y. Zeng, J. Lyu, and R. Zhang, "Cellular-Connected UAV: Potential, Challenges, and Promising Technologies," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 120–127, Sep. 2019.
- [7] Y. Zeng, Q. Wu, and R. Zhang, "Accessing From the Sky: A Tutorial on UAV Communications for 5G and Beyond," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 107, no. 12, pp. 2327–2375, Dec. 2019.
- [8] M. Campion, P. Ranganathan, and S. Faruque, "A review and future directions of UAV swarm communication architectures," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Electr. Eng. Inform. Commun. Technol. (EIT)*, May. 2018, pp. 0903–0908.
- [9] W. Mei and R. Zhang, "Uplink cooperative NOMA for cellular-connected UAV," *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Signal Process.*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 644–656, June 2019.
- [10] M. M. Azari, G. Geraci, A. Garcia-Rodriguez, and S. Pollin, "UAV-to-UAV Communications in Cellular Networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 9, pp. 6130–6144, June 2020.
- [11] R. I. Ansari, C. Chrysostomou, S. A. Hassan, M. Guizani, S. Mumtaz, J. Rodriguez, and J. J. P. C. Rodrigues, "5G D2D Networks: Techniques, Challenges, and Future Prospects," *IEEE Syst. J.*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 3970–3984, Dec. 2018.

- [12] Y. Han, L. Liu, L. Duan, and R. Zhang, "Towards reliable UAV swarm communication in D2D-enhanced cellular networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 1567–1581, Mar. 2020.
- [13] D. Mishra, A. Trotta, M. Di Felice, and E. Natalizio, "Performance Analysis of Multi-hop Communication based on 5G Sidelink for Cooperative UAV Swarms," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Mediterr. Conf. Commun. Netw. (MeditCom)*, Sep. 2021, pp. 395–400.
- [14] S.-Y. Lien, D.-J. Deng, C.-C. Lin, H.-L. Tsai, T. Chen, C. Guo, and S.-M. Cheng, "3GPP NR sidelink transmissions toward 5G V2X," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 35 368–35 382, Feb. 2020.
- [15] M. H. C. Garcia, A. Molina-Galan, M. Boban, J. Gozalvez, B. Coll-Perales, T. Şahin, and A. Kousaridas, "A tutorial on 5G NR V2X communications," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, 3rd Quart., 2021.
- [16] M. Nakamura, Y. Awad, and S. Vadgama, "Adaptive control of link adaptation for high speed downlink packet access (HSDPA) in W-CDMA," in *Proc. Int. Symp. Wire. Pers. Multimed. Commun. (WPMC)*, Oct. 2002, pp. 382–386.
- [17] S. A. Ashraf, R. Blasco, H. Do, G. Fodor, C. Zhang, and W. Sun, "Supporting Vehicle-to-Everything Services by 5G New Radio Release-16 Systems," *IEEE Commun. Stand. Mag.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 26–32, Mar. 2020.
- [18] K. Arulkumaran, M. P. Deisenroth, M. Brundage, and A. A. Bharath, "Deep Reinforcement Learning: A Brief Survey," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 26–38, Nov. 2017.
- [19] T. Zhang, K. Zhu, and J. Wang, "Energy-Efficient Mode Selection and Resource Allocation for D2D-Enabled Heterogeneous Networks: A Deep Reinforcement Learning Approach," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 1175–1187, Feb. 2021.
- [20] H. Zhou, T. Wu, H. Zhang, and J. Wu, "Incentive-Driven Deep Reinforcement Learning for Content Caching and D2D Offloading," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 2445–2460, 2021.
- [21] K. Zhang, Z. Yang, and T. Başar, "Multi-agent reinforcement learning: A selective overview of theories and algorithms," *Handbook of reinforcement learning and control*, pp. 321–384, 2021.
- [22] P. Veličković, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Lio, and Y. Bengio, "Graph attention networks," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Learn. Represent. (ICLR)*, Apr. 2018, pp. 1–12.
- [23] F. Hu, Y. Deng, and A. H. Aghvami, "Cooperative Multigroup Broadcast 360° Video Delivery Network: A Hierarchical Federated Deep Reinforcement Learning Approach," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 4009–4024, Nov. 2022.
- [24] M. Mozaffari, W. Saad, M. Bennis, and M. Debbah, "Mobile Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) for Energy-Efficient Internet of Things Communications," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 11, pp. 7574–7589, Sep. 2017.
- [25] R. I. Bor-Yaliniz, A. El-Keyi, and H. Yanikomeroglu, "Efficient 3-D placement of an aerial base station in next generation cellular networks," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. (ICC)*, May. 2016, pp. 1–5.
- [26] A. Al-Hourani, S. Kandeepan, and S. Lardner, "Optimal LAP altitude for maximum coverage," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 569–572, Dec. 2014.
- [27] M. Mozaffari, W. Saad, M. Bennis, and M. Debbah, "Unmanned Aerial Vehicle With Underlaid Device-to-Device Communications: Performance and Tradeoffs," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 3949–3963, Feb. 2016.
- [28] H. Zhou, Y. Deng, L. Feltrin, A. Höglund, and M. Dohler, "Novel Random Access Schemes for Small Data Transmission," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Commun. Conf. (ICC)*, May. 2022, pp. 1992–1997.
- [29] N. Jiang, Y. Deng, X. Kang, and A. Nallanathan, "Random Access Analysis for Massive IoT Networks Under a New Spatio-Temporal Model: A Stochastic Geometry Approach," *IEEE Trans Commun.*, vol. 66, no. 11, pp. 5788–5803, July 2018.
- [30] Y. Zhao, Y. Li, H. Zhang, N. Ge, and J. Lu, "Fundamental tradeoffs on energy-aware D2D communication underlying cellular networks: A dynamic graph approach," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 864–882, Apr. 2016.

- [31] E. Hytiä and J. Virtamo, “Random waypoint mobility model in cellular networks,” *Wirel. Netw.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 177–188, Apr. 2007.
- [32] E. Altman, *Constrained Markov decision processes: stochastic modeling*. Routledge, 1999.
- [33] A. Stooke, J. Achiam, and P. Abbeel, “Responsive safety in reinforcement learning by pid lagrangian methods,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn. (ICML)*, Apr. 2020, pp. 9133–9143.
- [34] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” in *Proc. Conf. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NIPS)*, Dec. 2017, pp. 5998–6008.