

We Rock the Hizzle and Stuff

Matteo Ciprian[†], Tommy Azzino[†]

Abstract—Future vehicular communication networks call for new solutions to support their capacity demands, by leveraging the potential of the millimeter-wave (mm-wave) spectrum. Mobility, in particular, poses severe challenges in their design, and as such shall be accounted for. A key question in mm-wave vehicular networks is how to optimize the trade-off between directive Data Transmission (DT) and directional Beam Training (BT), which enables it. In this paper, learning tools are investigated to optimize this trade-off. In the proposed scenario, a Base Station (BS) uses BT to establish a mm-wave directive link towards a Mobile User (MU) moving along a road. To control the BT/DT trade-off, a Partially Observable (PO) Markov Decision Process (MDP) is formulated, where the system state corresponds to the position of the MU within the road link. The goal is to maximize the number of bits delivered by the BS to the MU over the communication session, under a power constraint. The resulting optimal policies reveal that adaptive BT/DT procedures significantly outperform common-sense heuristic schemes, and that specific mobility features, such as user position estimates, can be effectively used to enhance the overall system performance and optimize the available system resources.

This is a sample abstract, just to show as an abstract should be. It is 204 words long, I would say an abstract should not be longer than 250 words. Here, you should briefly state: 1) technical scenario and its importance, 2) what you do in the report / paper and why it is important, 3) if possible, summarize the main results. The abstract should be written in a way that motivates the reader to delve into the paper, but at the same time it should contain enough information to deliver the main message about the paper, so that the reader will now what can be found within the paper even without reading it (as it is the case most of the times). The abstract is a mini-paper on its own and, as such, is a major endeavor to write.

Index Terms—Mm-Wave, Vehicular Networks, Optimization, Beam Training, Data Transmission, Partially Observable MDP. A list of keywords defining the tools and the scenario. I would not go beyond six keywords.

I. INTRODUCTION

Maximum length for the whole report is 9 pages. Abstract, introduction and related works should take max two pages.

Research in the field of Human Activity Recognition (HAR) has gained momentum during the recent years thanks to the spread and widely adoption of powerful mobile devices, smart-watches, smart-bands and other wearable or non-wearable equipments that together create a rich sensory input to be analyzed. Indeed, the main goal behind HAR is the automatic recognition of activities leveraging data acquired by sensors. HAR can be applied in many hot-topic fields such as smart-homes [1], rehabilitation [2] and recreation applications [3]. Moreover, recognizing human activities such as walking

or sitting and their relative context is essential in assistive living technologies [4]. Typically, a HAR system involves two fundamental steps: data acquisition and classification. Therefore the raw data gathered from sensors, which has the shape of a time series, is classified by identifying the type of activity performed in a particular time interval. One key aspect when dealing with such classification regards the model's ability to distinguish each class from the *Null* class (i.e. no activity), which is the most recurrent over the time sequence in real applications. Moreover, despite many proposed recognition systems employ "engineered" features extracted from the input signals, the need of avoid this technique arises due to its lack of scalability and its time consuming nature. Therefore, the classification task is most of the time carried out by deep learning algorithms (i.e artificial neural networks) that, exploiting several layers of nonlinear processing units arranged in a hierarchical structure, can learn more abstract and complex patterns characterizing the input data. Also, deep learning based methods have been shown to outperform many standard algorithms in as many applications.

From a machine learning point of view, the activity recognition task is pretty challenging since it typically involves high-dimensional data and several multimodal channels.

A good way of structuring the introduction is as follows:

- one paragraph to introduce your work, describing the scenario *at large*, its relevance, to prepare the reader to what follows and convince her/him that the paper focuses on an important setup / problem.
- a second paragraph where you immediately delve into the specific problem that is still to be faced, starting to point the finger towards your contribution. Here, you describe the importance of such problem, providing examples (through references) of previous solutions attempts, and of why these failed *to provide a complete answer*. This second paragraph should not be too long, as otherwise the reader will get bored and will abandon your paper... It should be concisely written, something like 4 to 5 lines.
- a third paragraph where you state what you do in the paper, this should also be concisely written and to the point. A good rule of thumb is to make it max 10 lines. Here, you should state up front 1) the problem you solve, 2) its importance, 3) the technique you use, 4) stress the novelty of such technique / what you do. 5) comment on how your work / results can be reused / exploited to achieve further technical or practical goals.
- after this, you provide an itemized list to summarize the paper contributions: maximum six items, maximum four lines each.
- you finish up by reporting the paper structure, this

[†]Department of Information Engineering, University of Padova, email: {matteo.ciprian.8, tommy.azzino}@studenti.unipd.it

should be three to four lines. It is customary to do so, although I admit it may be of little use.

Lately, I tend to write introduction plus abstract within a single page. This forces me to focus on the important messages that I want to deliver about the paper, leaving out all the blah blah. **Remember:** 1) *less is more*, 2) writing a compact (*snappy*) piece of technical text is much more difficult than writing with no space constraints.

II. RELATED WORK

The goal of this section is to describe what has been done so far in *the* literature. You should focus on and briefly describe the work done in the best papers that you have read. For each you should comment on the paper's contribution, on the good and important findings of such paper and also, 1) on why these findings are not enough and 2) how these findings are improved upon / extended by the work that you do here. At the end of the section, you recap the main paper contributions (one or two, the most important ones) and how these extend / improve upon previous work. If possible, I would make this section no longer than one page, this leads to an overall *two pages* including abstract, introduction and related work. I believe this is a fair amount of space in most cases.

- **References:** please follow this *religiously*. It will help you a lot. Use *bibtex* as the tool to manage the bibliography. A bibtex example file, named `biblio.bib` is also provided with this package.
- When referring to **conference / workshop papers**, I recommend to always include the following information: 1) author names, 2) paper title, 3) conference / workshop name, 4) conference / workshop address, 5) month, 6) year. Examples of this are: [5] [6].
- When referring to **journal papers**, include the following information: 1) author names, 2) paper title, 3) full journal name, 4) volume, 5) number, 6) month, 7) pages, 8) year. Examples of this are: [7] [8] [9].
- For **books**, include the following information: 1) author names, 2) book title, 3) editor and edition, 4) year.

Note that some of the above fields may not be shown when you compile the Latex file, but this depends on the bibliography settings (dictated by the specific Latex style that you load at the beginning of the document). You may decide to include additional pieces of information in a given bibliographic entry, but please, be consistent across all the entries, i.e., use the same fields. Exceptions are in the (rare) cases where some of the fields do not exist (e.g., the paper *number* or the *pages*).

III. PROCESSING PIPELINE

I would start the technical description with a *high level* introduction of your processing pipeline. Here you do not have to necessarily go into the technical details of every processing block, this will be done later as the paper develops. What I would like to see here is a description of the general

approach, i.e., which processing blocks you used, how these were concatenated, etc. A diagram usually helps.

IV. SIGNALS AND FEATURES

Being a machine learning paper, I would put here a section describing the signals you have been working on. If possible, you should describe, in order, 1) the measurement setup, 2) how the signals were pre-processed (to remove noise, artifacts, fill gaps or represent them through a constant sampling rate, etc.). After this, you should describe how *feature vectors* were obtained from the pre-processed signals. If signals are *time series* this also implies stating the segmentation / windowing strategy that was adopted, to then describe how you obtained a feature vector for each time window. Also, if you also experiment with previous feature extraction approaches, you may want to list them as well, in addition to (and before) your own (possibly new) proposal.

V. LEARNING FRAMEWORK

Here you finally describe the learning strategy / algorithm that you conceived and used to solve the problem at stake. A good diagram to exemplify how learning is carried out is often very useful. In this section, you should describe the learning model, its parameters, any optimization over a given parameter set, etc. You can organize this section in sub-sections. You are free to choose the most appropriate structure.

VI. RESULTS

In this section, you should provide the numerical results. You are free to decide the structure of this section. As general rules of thumb, use plots to describe your results, showing, e.g., precision, recall and F-measure as a function of the system (learning) parameters. Present the material in a progressive and logical manner, starting with simple things and adding details and explaining more complex behaviors as you go. Also, do not try to explain / show multiple concepts at a time. Try to address one concept at a time, explain it properly, move to the next one.

The best results are obtained by generating the graphs in either encapsulated `postscript` (`eps`) or `pdf` formats. To plot your figures, use the `includegraphics` command.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This section should take max half a page.

In many papers, here you find a summary of what done. It is basically an abstract where instead of using the present tense you use the past participle, as you refer to something that you have already developed in the previous sections. While I did it myself in the past, I now find it rather useless.

What I would like to see here is: 1) a very short summary of what done, 2) some (possibly) intelligent observations on the relevance and *applicability* of your algorithms / findings, 3) what is still missing, and can be done in the future to extend your work. The idea is that this section should be *useful* and not just a repetition of the

abstract (just re-phrased and written using a different tense...).

Moreover: being a project report, I would also like to see a specific paragraph specifying: 1) what you have learned, and 2) any difficulties you may have encountered.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Rashidi and D. Cook, "The resident in the loop: Adapting the smart home to the user," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 949–959, 2009.
- [2] S. Patel, H. Park, P. Bonato, L. Chan, and M. Rodgers, "A review of wearable sensors and systems with application in rehabilitation," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 9, no. 21, 2012.
- [3] O. Lara and M. Labrador, "A survey on human activity recognition using wearable sensors," *IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1192–1209, 2013.
- [4] A. Avci, S. Bosch, M. Marin-Perianu, R. Marin-Perianu, and P. Havinga, "Activity Recognition Using Inertial Sensing for Healthcare, Wellbeing and Sports Applications: A Survey," in *23rd International Conference on Architecture of Computing Systems*, (Hannover, Germany), Feb. 2010.
- [5] M. Zargham, A. Ribeiro, A. Ozdaglar, and A. Jadbabaie, "Accelerated dual descent for network optimization," in *American Control Conference*, (San Francisco, CA, US), June 2011.
- [6] C. M. Sadler and M. Martonosi, "Data compression algorithms for energy-constrained devices in delay tolerant networks," in *ACM SenSys*, (Boulder, CO, US), Oct. 2006.
- [7] C. E. Shannon, "A mathematical theory of communication," *The Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 27, pp. 379–423, July 1948.
- [8] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, and B. P. J. Eckstein, "Distributed Optimization and Statistical Learning via the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers," *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 3, pp. 1–122, Jan. 2011.
- [9] D. Zordan, B. Martinez, I. Vilajosana, and M. Rossi, "On the Performance of Lossy Compression Schemes for Energy Constrained Sensor Networking," *ACM Transactions on Sensor Networks*, vol. 11, pp. 15:1–15:34, Aug. 2014.