

An MDP approach for radio resource allocation in urban Future Railway Mobile Communication System (FRMCS) scenarios

V. Corlay and J.-C. Sibel

Mitsubishi Electric R&D Centre Europe
Rennes, France

Email: {v.corlay, j.sibel}@fr.mercede.mee.com

Abstract—In the context of railway systems, the application performance can be very critical and the radio conditions not advantageous. Hence, the communication problem parameters include both a survival time stemming from the application layer and a channel error probability stemming from the PHY layer. This paper proposes to consider the framework of Markov Decision Process (MDP) to design a strategy for scheduling radio resources based on both application and PHY layer parameters. The MDP approach enables to obtain the optimal strategy via the value iteration algorithm. The performance of this algorithm can thus serve as a benchmark to assess lower complexity schedulers. We show numerical evaluations where we compare the value iteration algorithm with other schedulers, including one based on deep Q learning.

Index Terms—Scheduling, application-oriented systems, cross-layer, neural networks, Markov decision process.

I. INTRODUCTION

On the one hand, the automated train control is a crucial railway service use case and induces a change of communication paradigm compared to the current railway system: It might require at the same time a large throughput, a very high reliability, and a sufficient availability. On the other hand, the success of the 3GPP 5G NR standard for communication systems makes the underlying technology relevant for specific scenarios such as that of the railway systems. As a result, the Future Railway Mobile Communication Systems (FRMCS) propose mechanisms to take advantage of 5G-related aspects to offer specific railway services such as the automated train control [1].

Within this context, the scheduling of radio resources plays an important role to efficiently share the said resources between several users. The Round-Robin [2] and the Priority-Queue [3] are well-known schedulers whose computational complexity is very low but whose performance is not optimal with respect to application-level metrics. As a matter of fact, they do not take into account all the parameters impacting the application performance. For the current purpose, the objective is to consider both application-level parameters and lower layer parameters, such as the radio conditions, to adapt the scheduling strategy.

This approach is in line with the Release 19 of 3GPP [4] which specifies the service requirements for the 5G system. In this latter reference, it is explained that “the communication

service is considered unavailable if it does not meet the pertinent Quality of Service (QoS) requirements. For example, the communication service is unavailable if a message is not correctly received within a specified time, which is the sum of maximum allowed end-to-end latency and survival time”.

Recently, we introduced a new paradigm [5] for the design of a radio resource scheduler in a multi-agent setting. It takes into account in the meantime an application layer parameter, the survival time, and a PHY layer parameter, the channel error probability. To enhance the scheduler of [5], a low-complexity heuristic to approximately solve the scheduling optimization problem, we formalize in this paper the scheduling problem as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) [6], [7]. One advantage is that MDP provide an optimal solution for the optimization problem. Another advantage is that MDP have been widely experienced and give also access to many sub-optimal existing algorithms. More specifically, we shall consider the value iteration algorithm as well as the deep Q learning algorithm. The first algorithm optimally solves the scheduling problem but with a prohibitive complexity as the problem size grows. The second algorithms is sub-optimal but scales with the problem size, similarly to the heuristic proposed in [5]. Consequently, we compare these algorithms and discuss the performance complexity trade-off.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the scheduling problem in the scope of FRMCS, Section III describes the system, Section IV introduces MDP within the scheduling framework, and Section V exhibits numerical results to challenge MDP with other schedulers.

II. FRMCS CONTEXT

Within the various scenarios under the umbrella of the train control [1], we focus on the remote driving for train shutting yards. This implies a remote driver driving the train in order to bring it back to the train station. The data provided to the said driver is mainly made of images and videos to allow the driver to be aware, in real-time, of the train surrounding environment. In other words, the data to be transmitted involves a large quantity of payloads. Moreover, as this environment is shared with other trains, moving or not, remote driving raises a safety problem.

Combining a high throughput with a high reliability and a high availability is one of the 5G proposals, e.g., for the V2X scenarios [8] or the factory automation scenarios [9]. The application requirements provided by the 3GPP specifications embody the performance target for the access layer design through the QoS. The access layer is understood in this paper to comprise the PHY and MAC layers. For example, the QoS comprises a guaranteed bit-rate, a latency, etc. However, the metrics that are used as inputs and outputs for the mechanisms of the access layer are low-level metrics, e.g., the channel error probability, the frame error rate, the channel busy/occupancy ratio. Even though these metrics are helpful to underline the behaviour of a single layer, namely the access layer, they do not well reflect the expected synergy with the application layer.

From another perspective, some companies provide in [10] results of radio performance for NR railway systems considering a system-level framework. Within this framework, the scheduler plays an important role to efficiently share the radio resources between the various users. The said companies only consider the Round-Robin scheduler [2], a scheduler that assigns equal amount of resources to each user, regardless of the channel quality or performance requirements for the applications. Among other consequences, a user with a high channel quality achieves a much higher throughput than what it needs while, at the same time, a user with a low channel quality cannot achieve the required throughput. Furthermore, a proportional-fair strategy would bring only limited benefits as it does not consider the application parameters. Consequently, following the scope in [5], we orient the current paper on the scheduling problem taking into account application aspects as well as access layer aspects.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE SYSTEM

This section presents the scheduling problem by defining the application traffic model, the radio resources used by the scheduler and the application behaviour, similarly to [5, Sec. II.A]. The difference with [5] is the inclusion of the payload size, and the division of the payload in several packets.

A. Traffic model

We consider a discrete-time system divided in time slots whose length is dt , e.g., $dt = 1$ msec. Let N be the number of agents in the system. Two main traffic models for the application layer are commonly proposed in the literature [11]:

- *Full buffer traffic model*: The buffers of an agent have always an unlimited amount of data to transmit.
- *Finite buffer traffic model*: An agent is assigned a finite payload to transmit when it arrives. The agent leaves the system when the payload reception is completed.

In this study, we consider a *full-finite buffer traffic model*. An agent A_k is assigned a finite payload of size P_k to transmit. As soon as the payload has been fully received, the application buffer of A_k is immediately refilled with a payload of the same size. In this model, all the agents are always active as they have always a payload in their buffer.

B. Scheduling resource & Payload aspect

We consider a single radio resource per time slot t . All agents simultaneously compete for the resource at t and only one agent finally obtains it. The channel error probability p_k is the probability for the agent A_k that a transmission at any time t fails because of the channel. It is assumed to be constant over time.

We assume that only a packet of size Γ_k can be transmitted in one time slot for A_k . The payload is thus necessarily split into C_k packets at the scheduler level, i.e., $P_k = C_k \Gamma_k$. The payload is transmitted once the associated packets have all been successfully transmitted.

C. Application behaviour and performance metric

The application is monitored according to three events for any agent. We assume that the agents use the same application, i.e., they have the same survival time τ :

- The event *survival time failure* for an agent (E1): “No payload is successfully transmitted during the last τ time slots” where τ is a strictly positive integer. For an agent A_k at time t , we accordingly introduce $\tau_k(t)$ as the remaining time before (E1). This means that $0 \leq \tau_k(t) \leq \tau$ and $\tau_k(t)$ is a decreasing function of t .
- The micro-event *successful transmission of a packet at time t* (e0).
- The macro-event *successful transmission of a payload at time t* (E0): This event is the result of C_k events (e0) required to transfer a whole message.

With both the events (E0) and (E1) for any agent A_k at time t , $\tau_k(t)$ is immediately set to its maximum value τ .

For a single agent A_k , at any time t , the quantity $V_k(t)$ is the number of failures (E1) met by A_k until time t . The performance metric is chosen as the failure rate $F(t)$:

$$F(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N V_k(t)}{t}. \quad (1)$$

Given that several agents might fail at a single time slot, the value of the failure rate can be greater than one. This is to expect for very small values of the survival time τ .

IV. FRAMEWORK OF THE MARKOV DECISION PROCESS

We consider the infinite-horizon MDP with discounted sum-reward criterion, as presented in [6, Chap. 6], to model the scheduling problem.

A. Model

As for a standard MDP, we use four variables to model the scheduling problem:

- *State* $\mathbf{S}_t \in \mathbb{N}^{N \times 2}$: The element $\mathbf{S}_t(k, 1)$ is the number $\tau_k(t)$ of remaining time slots at time t before meeting a failure for agent A_k . The element $\mathbf{S}_t(k, 2)$ is the number $c_k(t)$ of remaining packets at time t before the application message is fully transmitted. As $0 \leq \tau_k(t) \leq \tau$ and $1 \leq c_k(t) \leq C_k$, the state \mathbf{S}_t belongs to a state space \mathcal{S} whose size is $|\mathcal{S}| = (\tau + 1)^N \prod_{k=1}^N C_k$.

- *Action* $a_t \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$: The index of the agent who gets the resource at time t . The action a_t belongs to an action space \mathcal{A} whose size is the number of agent N .
- *Short-term reward* $r_t \in \{-N, \dots, -1, 0\}$: Minus the number of events (E1) at time t .
- *Transition probability*: If $a_t = k$, the packet for A_k is well received with probability $1 - p_k$. Hence, a_t leads to only two states \mathbf{S}_{t+1} with the non-zero transition probability $p(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}_t, a_t)$.

The MDP introduces the *long-term reward* or *gain* G_t at time t defined as:

$$G_t = \sum_{t'=t}^{\infty} \lambda^{t'-t} r_{t'}, \quad (2)$$

where $\lambda < 1$ is the *discount factor*. If λ is close to 1, this quantity is almost the same as the (unnormalized) failure rate (1). The goal for the scheduling problem is thus to find a *policy* π , being the time sequence of allocation decisions, that maximizes the expected gain $\mathbb{E}[G_t]$.

The MDP then defines $v^\pi(\mathbf{S})$ the *value of the state* \mathbf{S} under the policy π as the expected gain given that $\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}$:

$$v^\pi(\mathbf{S}) = \mathbb{E}[G_t | \mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}]. \quad (3)$$

Then, a policy π^* is optimal if:

$$v^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{S}) \geq v^\pi(\mathbf{S}), \quad \forall \mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \forall \pi \neq \pi^*. \quad (4)$$

Under the optimal policy, the value of the state \mathbf{S} can be expressed via the Bellman's equation as:

$$v^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{S}) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q(\mathbf{S}, a), \quad (5)$$

where $Q(\mathbf{S}, a)$ is the *state-action value* computed as:

$$Q(\mathbf{S}, a) = \sum_{\mathbf{S}' \in \mathcal{S}} p(\mathbf{S}'|\mathbf{S}, a) \left(r(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{S}) + \lambda v^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{S}') \right), \quad (6)$$

where $r(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{S})$ is the reward obtained when going from \mathbf{S} to \mathbf{S}' . Given an optimal policy π^* , the optimal action to take when in a state \mathbf{S} is obtained as:

$$a^* = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q(\mathbf{S}, a). \quad (7)$$

B. Value iteration

One standard approach to obtain (3) under π^* is to operate the *Value Iteration* algorithm (VI) that consists in computing the state values in an iterative manner. Let us define $v^{(i)}(\mathbf{S})$ as the approximate of $v^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{S})$ at iteration i . We accordingly define the approximate of $Q(\mathbf{S}, a)$ at iteration i as:

$$Q^{(i)}(\mathbf{S}, a) = \sum_{\mathbf{S}' \in \mathcal{S}} p(\mathbf{S}'|\mathbf{S}, a) \left(r(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{S}) + \lambda v^{(i)}(\mathbf{S}') \right), \quad (8)$$

which leads to:

$$v^{(i+1)}(\mathbf{S}) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^{(i)}(\mathbf{S}, a), \quad (9)$$

where $v^{(i)}(\mathbf{S})$ converges to $v^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{S})$ for all \mathbf{S} [6]. The optimal action is then chosen as $a^{(I)}(\mathbf{S}) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^{(I)}(\mathbf{S}, a)$, where I denotes the index of the last iteration.

As already mentioned, the VI finds the optimal policy with respect to $\mathbb{E}[G_t]$. Hence, modelling the scheduling problem in the MDP framework enables to get the optimal performance in the cases where the VI is tractable. As a direct consequence, the VI can be used as a benchmark to assess the performance of less complex heuristics.

C. Deep Q learning

Even though the VI provides the optimal estimate of the states value, it suffers from significant computational complexity and memory consumption as it needs to cover all the states in \mathcal{S} of size $|\mathcal{S}| = (\tau + 1)^N \prod_{k=1}^N C_k$. A practical alternative to the VI is the temporal-difference learning [7, Chap. 6] on which Q -learning and deep Q learning rely.

Instead of looping over all the states to estimate $v^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{S})$, these algorithms walk across a few states within \mathcal{S} . In the standard approach, the system is in state \mathbf{S}_t at t and an action a_t is done. One then gets a reward $r(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{S}')$ and the new state \mathbf{S}' of the system at time $t + 1$. It is therefore a Monte Carlo approach. The model to estimate $Q^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{S}, a)$ is updated via an error signal Δ_t , obtained from two estimates of $Q^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{S}, a)$:

$$\Delta_t = \hat{Q}(\mathbf{S}, a) - \hat{Q}'(\mathbf{S}, a) \quad (10)$$

where:

- $\hat{Q}'(\mathbf{S}, a) = r(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{S}') + \lambda \max_{a'} \hat{Q}(\mathbf{S}', a')$ is a first estimate of $Q^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{S}, a)$ based on the observed reward and the subsequent state \mathbf{S}' obtained when taking the action a in state \mathbf{S} , and where $\hat{Q}(\mathbf{S}', a')$ is obtained via the current model.
- $\hat{Q}(\mathbf{S}, a)$ is a second estimate of $Q^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{S}, a)$ obtained via the current model.

With deep Q learning the model is a neural network which is trained via the gradient of the error signal with respect to the parameters of the neural network [12].

V. NUMERICAL EVALUATIONS

This section presents some performance results of the VI and deep Q learning algorithms, and compare them with other schedulers.

A. Challengers

We compare the MDP-based algorithms with three other schedulers:

- *Round-Robin* (RR). It consists in allocating the resource to the N agents following a buffer of the agents index. The said buffer is a random permutation of $[0, \dots, N-1]$. After N allocations, the RR replaces its buffer with a new random permutation of $[0, \dots, N-1]$. This randomization prevents an agent from being always out at each period of the RR. The RR is a low complexity algorithm.
- *Priority-queue* (PQ). It consists in allocating the resource to the agent whose number of remaining time slots before meeting a failure is the lowest, i.e.,: $a_t = \arg \min_k \tau_k(t)$. This scheduler is very easy to implement with no concern neither on the computational complexity nor on the memory consumption. Nevertheless, it does not use

the channel error probabilities p_k and the number of remaining packets $c_k(t)$. The PQ is a low complexity algorithm.

- *On-line* (OL) [5]. It uses a heuristic $f_r(t, k)$ to estimate a probability of survival time failure for every agent A_k . The agent to allocate is then selected to minimize a subsequent global probability of failure. In [5], there is no notion of division of the payload in C_k packets. Therefore, we need to slightly modify the heuristic $f_r(t, k) = p_k^{\tau_k(t)}$ with:

$$f_r(t, k) = p_k^{\frac{\tau_k(t)}{c_k(t)}}. \quad (11)$$

The OL is a moderately low complexity algorithm.

B. Scenario and assumptions

We consider a small-sized scenario with $N = 3$ agents and with τ spanning from N to 12. We assume the channel error probabilities to be $p_1 = 10^{-3}, p_2 = 10^{-2}, p_3 = 10^{-1}$, i.e., such that A_1 has a very good channel, A_3 suffers from a difficult channel, and A_2 is in between. Several situations are studied regarding the number of packets C_1, C_2, C_3 per payload for the agents denoted by the set $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$: $\{1, 1, 2\}$, $\{1, 1, 3\}$, $\{2, 2, 2\}$ and $\{2, 2, 3\}$. Consequently, the size of the state space varies from 128 to 26364 elements. In these configurations, the system has the greatest channel error probability on the agent with the greatest number of packets per payload. This is a way to stress the scheduler by setting difficult situations. The purpose of the evaluations is to observe the performance dependence on the values of $\{C_k\}_k$ given $\{p_k\}_k$. We let all the schedulers run for a time duration of 10^6 time slots to be able to observe failure rates up to around 10^{-5} . We recall that several failures might occur at a given time slot according to (1). Hence, the performance metric is $F = F(10^6)$ (see (1)).

The challengers are then compared taking the value of F for each of them, namely F_{RR} for the Round-Robin, F_{PQ} for the Priority-Queue, F_{OL} for the On-Line, F_{VI} for the VI, F_{DQ} for the deep Q learning. To simplify the wording here after, we denote by $F_X(\{a, b, c\})$ the value of the failure rate for the scheduler $X \in \{RR, PQ, OL, VI\}$ with the configuration $C_1 = a, C_2 = b, C_3 = c$.

C. Details for Deep Q learning

We consider deep Q learning for the case $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\} = \{2, 2, 3\}$. We consider two neural networks whose input is the state \mathbf{S}_t . The first network $NN^{(1)}$ is trained with the true situation $p_1 = 10^{-3}, p_2 = 10^{-2}, p_3 = 10^{-1}$ considering $\tau = 10$. With such parameters, A_1 and A_2 encounter errors at a very low frequency, which may be an issue as deep Q learning is a Monte Carlo algorithm (analysis validated by the experiments, see the next section). To mitigate this issue, we train a second network $NN^{(2)}$ in a situation with $p_1 = 10^{-2}, p_2 = 10^{-1}, p_3 = 0.5$ such that A_1 and A_2 have more channel errors, while keeping the hierarchy $p_1 < p_2 < p_3$. In other words, we introduce a model mismatch for the training.

Deep Q learning with $NN^{(1)}$ is called $DQ^{(1)}$ and $DQ^{(2)}$ with $NN^{(2)}$.

The neural network used in the simulation is a residual neural network of 22 layers comprising a total of 26200 parameters. Note however that a smaller neural network with only 3000 parameters yields similar results. Such a large network is considered such that its size is not the performance bottleneck.

D. Simulation results

The results are displayed in Fig. 1. First of all, we observe that all schedulers have similar performance with large values of F for low values of τ . Unsurprisingly, a larger τ is required to reduce the failure rate. Moreover, the challenging zone for discriminating between the schedulers is then for middle or large values of τ , e.g., for $\tau \geq 4$ with $\{1, 1, 2\}$, for $\tau \geq 5$ with $\{1, 1, 3\}$, for $\tau \geq 7$ with $\{2, 2, 2\}$, and for $\tau \geq 8$ with $\{2, 2, 3\}$.

Then, we observe that for such challenging zones, F_{RR} is far beyond F_{PQ}, F_{OL} and F_{VI} . This is expected as RR is the only scheduler which does not consider any agent parameter. Another common observation in every figure is that:

$$F_{VI} \leq F_{OL} \leq F_{PQ} \leq F_{RR}, \quad (12)$$

This confirms that the VI is the reference scheduler. This also shows that the low complexity schedulers PQ and OL perform better than the naive RR. Consequently, the analysis will focus on the performance of OL and PQ in comparison with that of VI.

The configurations $\{1, 1, 2\}, \{2, 2, 2\}$ result in $F_{OL} \approx F_{PQ}$ whereas the other configurations $\{1, 1, 3\}, \{2, 2, 3\}$ result in $F_{OL} < F_{PQ}$ in a more obvious manner. As an example, at $\tau = 10$, $F_{PQ}(\{1, 1, 3\}) = 3F_{OL}(\{1, 1, 3\})$ and at $\tau = 12$, $F_{PQ}(\{2, 2, 3\}) = 4F_{OL}(\{2, 2, 3\})$. Also, the y-distance between F_{OL} and F_{PQ} increases when increasing τ in a faster way with $C_3 = 3$ than with $C_3 = 2$. For example, $F_{PQ}(\{2, 2, 2\}) \approx 1.5F_{OL}(\{2, 2, 2\})$ at $\tau = 10$ and $F_{PQ}(\{2, 2, 2\}) \approx F_{OL}(\{2, 2, 2\})$ at $\tau = 6$ while $F_{PQ}(\{2, 2, 3\}) \approx 2.6F_{OL}(\{2, 2, 3\})$ at $\tau = 10$ and $F_{PQ}(\{2, 2, 3\}) \approx F_{OL}(\{2, 2, 3\})$ at $\tau = 6$. This expansion effect is also observed between OL and VI, e.g., $F_{OL}(\{2, 2, 3\}) \approx 4.2F_{VI}(\{2, 2, 3\})$ at $\tau = 10$ and $F_{OL}(\{2, 2, 3\}) \approx F_{VI}(\{2, 2, 3\})$ at $\tau = 6$. As $F_{OL} \leq F_{PQ}$, though, OL can be said to be more robust than PQ when increasing the payload of the worse channel agent. In other words, enlarging the payload of the worse channel agent leads to select OL rather than PQ.

Alternatively, we can compare the schedulers with respect to the survival time they require to reach a target failure rate F_{trgt} . As τ is an integer, we round τ to the nearest greater integer for comparison purpose. For example, when fixing $F_{trgt} = 10^{-4}$, we see that for $\{1, 1, 2\}, \{1, 1, 3\}, \{2, 2, 2\}, \{2, 2, 3\}$, respectively, VI fulfills the target with $\tau = 7, 8, 9, 10$, OL fulfills the target with $\tau = 7, 9, 9, 11$, and PQ fulfills the target with $\tau = 8, 9, 10, 12$. PQ is then always one time slot ahead from VI whereas OL may reach the same survival time.




Fig. 1. Simulation results in several scenarios with $p_1 = 10^{-3}$, $p_2 = 10^{-2}$, $p_3 = 10^{-1}$.

Consequently, OL provides nearly optimal performance with less constrains on the application compared with PQ.

Finally, we focus on the curves showing the performance of deep Q learning with $\{2,2,3\}$. We observe that $F_{DQ^{(1)}}$, $F_{DQ^{(2)}}$ are both greater than F_{VI} , i.e., they do not reach the optimal policy. However, when $\tau \geq 11$, we see that $F_{DQ^{(2)}} \leq F_{PQ}$ and $F_{DQ^{(2)}} \leq F_{OL}$. Extrapolating the curves to $\tau \geq 12$, we expect $DQ^{(1)}$ and $DQ^{(2)}$ to perform even better than PQ and OL. In other words, when going further than the τ value used for training, DQ seems to well behave whereas running DQ for τ values lower than that of training, DQ is clearly suboptimal. We also observe that $DQ^{(2)}$, trained with the model mismatch, performs better than the standard training $DQ^{(1)}$. This highlights that the rare channel errors is indeed a problem for deep Q learning, and having a model mismatch for the training

improves the performance. Nevertheless, this raises a new problem: How to chose the most adequate model parameters for the training? These preliminary performance results also indicate, though, that it might be possible to approach the VI performance provided good training parameters. Therefore, as DQ is less complex than VI and less memory consuming than VI, this opens the room for scaling the scheduling problem to a larger state space, e.g., with more agents, with greater values of τ , and with greater values of C_k .

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we formalized the scheduling problem in the framework of MDP and we showed how to find the optimal scheduling strategy. This enables to assess the performance of candidate lower complexity schedulers. Indeed, the optimal scheduler suffers from complexity and storage issues. Among the lower complexity scheduler, the deep Q learning approach based on neural networks is investigated. We observed that training the neural network is not straightforward because of the scarcity of error events of some agents. Nevertheless, the performance can be improved by introducing a model mismatch for the training step. These preliminary results indicate that it may be possible to approach the optimal performance with this lower complexity scheduler. This may offer the possibility to scale the scheduler and therefore address larger systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] TS22.289 *Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Mobile Communication System for Railways; Stage 1 (Release 17)*, 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), December 2019, v17.0.0.
- [2] R. H. Arpaci-Dusseau and A. C. Arpaci-Dusseau, *Operating Systems: Three Easy Pieces*, 1st ed. Arpaci-Dusseau Books, August 2018.
- [3] J. Liebeherr and D. Wrege, "Priority queue schedulers with approximate sorting in output-buffered switches," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 1127–1144, 1999.
- [4] TS22.261 *Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Service requirements for the 5G system; Stage 1 (Release 19)*, 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), December 2022, v19.1.0.
- [5] J.-C. Sibel, N. Gresset, and V. Corlay, "An application-oriented scheduler," in *2023 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, March 2023, to appear. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.09926>
- [6] M. L. Puterman, *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*, 1st ed. USA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1994.
- [7] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. Cambridge, MA, USA: A Bradford Book, 2018.
- [8] TS22.886 *Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Study on enhancement of 3GPP Support for 5G V2X Services (Release 16)*, 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), December 2018, v16.2.0.
- [9] TS22.104 *Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Service requirements for cyber-physical control applications in vertical domains; Stage 1 (Release 18)*, 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), December 2021, v18.3.0.
- [10] TR103.554-2 *Technical Report; Rail Telecommunications (RT); Next Generation Communication System; Radio performance simulations and evaluations in rail environment; Part 2: New Radio (NR)*. European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), February 2021, v1.1.1.
- [11] P. Ameigeiras, Y. Wang, J. Navarro-Ortiz, P. E. Mogensen, and J. M. Lopez-Soler, "Traffic models impact on ofdma scheduling design," *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, no. 61, 2012.
- [12] M. et al., "Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning," *Nature*, vol. 518, no. 7540, p. 529–533, 2015.