

Introduction to Ultra Reliable and Low Latency Communications in 5G

Hyoungju Ji^{†*}, Sunho Park[†], Jeongho Yeo^{*}, Younsun Kim^{*}, Juho Lee^{*}, and
Byonghyo Shim[†]

[†] Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Seoul National University, Korea

^{*} Seoul R&D Center, Samsung Electronics, Korea

Abstract

New wave of the technology revolution, often referred to as the fourth industrial revolution, is changing the way we live, work, and communicate with each other. These days, we are witnessing the emergence of unprecedented services and applications requiring lower latency, better reliability massive connection density, and improved energy efficiency. In accordance with this trend and change, international telecommunication union (ITU) defined three representative service categories, viz., enhanced mobile broadband (eMBB), massive machine-type communication (mMTC), and ultra-reliable and low latency communication (uRLLC). Among three service categories, physical-layer design of the uRLLC service is arguably the most challenging and problematic. This is mainly because uRLLC should satisfy two conflicting requirements: low latency and ultra-high reliability. In this article, we provide the state-of-the-art overview of uRLLC communications with an emphasis on technical challenges and solutions. We highlight key requirements of uRLLC service and then discuss the physical-layer issues and enabling technologies including packet and frame structure, multiplexing schemes, and reliability improvement techniques.

I. INTRODUCTION

New wave of the technology revolution, often referred to as the fourth industrial revolution, is changing the way we live, work, and communicate with each other. These days, we are witnessing the emergence of unprecedented services and applications such as autonomous vehicle and drone-based delivery, smart home and factory, remote surgery, and artificial intelligence (AI) based personal assistant (see Fig. 1a). Communication mechanisms associated with these

This work was sponsored by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korean government(MSIP) (2016R1A2B3015576)


services are quite distinct from traditional human-centric communications in the perspective of latency, throughput, scalability, reliability, and energy-efficiency. Therefore, co-existence of human-centric and machine-type services and also hybrid of these two will make future wireless environments more diverse and complicated. In accordance with this trend and change, international telecommunication union (ITU) defined three representative service categories, viz., enhanced mobile broadband (eMBB), massive machine-type communication (mMTC), and ultra-reliable and low latency communication (uRLLC) [1]. In order to guarantee the quality of service for these service categories, various performance requirements other than higher data throughput have been introduced. These include lower latency, better reliability, massive connection density, and improved energy efficiency. Since it is not possible to satisfy these relentless changes with a small modification of current radio access technology, 3rd generation partnership project (3GPP) has defined new air interface called as *New Radio* (NR) access technology. Underlying principle of the NR access technology is to give up the backward compatibility and add entirely new features and technologies to provide a customized connection to any device from sensor to vehicle and smartphone. It is expected that early features in NR will be standardized by 2018 and a complete set of NR will be finalized by 2020 to keep pace with the global standard (IMT-2020).

Among three service categories, physical-layer design of the uRLLC service is arguably the most challenging and problematic (see Fig. 1b). This is because uRLLC should satisfy two conflicting requirements: *low latency* and *ultra-high reliability*. When we try to minimize the latency, we need to use a short packet, which will cause a severe degradation in channel coding gain. On the other hand, when we try to enhance reliability, we need to use more resources (e.g., parity, redundancy, and re-transmission), which will simply increase the latency.


Our intent in this article is to give a state-of-the-art overview of uRLLC communications with an emphasis on technical challenges and solutions. We highlight key requirements of uRLLC service and then discuss the physical-layer issues and enabling technologies including packet and frame structure, multiplexing schemes, and reliability improvement techniques.

II. 5G SERVICE CATEGORIES: EMBB, MMTC, AND URLLC


Before we get into the details, we briefly discuss three service categories of 5G systems (see Fig. 1c). First, eMBB pertains to the services having high requirements for bandwidth, such as virtual reality (VR), augment reality (AR), and high-resolution video streaming. In the 4G



(a) Overall 5G systems with key use cases



(b) Tradeoff between throughput, reliability, and latency [2]



(c) Service categories and key requirements for uRLLC

Fig. 1. Service categories (eMBB, mMTC, and uRLLC) in 5G

long-term evolution (LTE) and LTE-Advanced systems, major emphasis has been placed on the improvement of system throughput (e.g., peak, average, cell-edge, area, and perceived throughput). Physical-layer techniques to improve the throughput include multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO)-based spatial multiplexing and diversity, high order modulation (HOM) transmission,

network densification using heterogeneous cells, and carrier aggregation of the licensed and unlicensed spectrum. eMBB is in line with this direction since the primary purpose of eMBB is to provide better data rate to the end user. In order to achieve hundred to a thousand-fold increase in capacity over the 4G systems, more aggressive techniques exploiting unexplored spectrum or improving spectral efficiency have been proposed. Notable approaches include massive MIMO (a.k.a full-dimension MIMO [3]), millimeter-wave (mmWave) technology [4], and new waveform using filtered orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM) [5].

mMTC is a service category to support a massive number of machine-type devices. mMTC-based services, such as logging, metering, monitoring, and measuring, should support high connection density and ultra energy efficiency. There have been some trials, both licensed and unlicensed band sides, to support machine-type communications (e.g., NB-IoT in the licensed band, SigFox and LoRA in unlicensed band [6]). While these technologies provide some improvement over the LTE standard, such as a reduction of the power consumption and improved coverage, they do not really touch the massive connectivity issue. In order to support a huge number of devices with limited resources, aggressive technologies breaking the barrier of interference-free orthogonal transmission need to be investigated. The key idea behind this approach, called non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) technology, is to use non-orthogonal sequences to support users with limited resources. Since the number of users is not strictly limited by the number of resources, NOMA can support far more users than the conventional approach using orthogonal sequences [7]. uRLLC is a service category designed to meet delay-sensitivity services such as the tactile internet, vehicular-to-vehicular communication, autonomous driving and remote control. Since the human reaction time is in the order of a millisecond (e.g., around 1 msec for the hand touch and 10 msec for the visual reaction), packets for the mission-critical applications should be delivered in the order of a microsecond. When compared to 3G network, a time-to-transmit latency of 4G network has been reduced dramatically from 10 msec to 1 msec. However, since the latency associated with the control signaling (e.g., scheduling information, pilot signal) occupies significant portion of latency (around 0.3 ~ 0.4 msec per data transmission), it is not desirable to design a packet whose time-to-transmit latency is smaller than 1 msec. For example, if we try to reduce the time-to-transmit latency of a packet to 0.5 msec, then almost 60% of resources would be used for the control overhead. Furthermore, since it takes around 8 msec per re-transmission and yet it is very difficult to remove the re-transmission mechanism in 4G systems, there should be fundamental changes in the packet/frame structure and transmission strategy.

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF THREE SERVICE CATEGORIES OF 5G SYSTEMS

Category	eMBB	mMTC	uRLLC
Main motivations	Increase spectral efficiency and increase peak throughput	Increase the number of support devices and support low-cost devices	Reduce end-to-end latency and increase robustness of data transmission
Key requirements	20x peak throughput 100x area throughput 5x spectral efficiency	10^6 devices/ km^2 100x energy efficiency	10 msec end-to-end latency (e.g., 0.5 msec physical-layer latency) BLER $<10^{-5}$ within 1 msec
Packet size	$\gg 100$ bytes	Hundreds of bytes	Tens to hundreds of bytes
Physical-layer solutions	Massive antennas, mmWave band-aggregation, and new waveforms	Non-orthogonal multiple access, overloaded data transmission, and active-user detection	Instant access, errorless data transmission
Applications	Virtual reality, real-time security, 3-dimensional image, and 4K-resolution video streaming	Logging, metering, lodging, tagging, and measuring	Tactile internet, remote control, self-car driving, argument reality, and industrial automation

From the physical-layer point of view, there are three main issues to be addressed to achieve this goal. First, system overhead should be minimized. For example, procedures for channel training, user scheduling, and resource allocation should be removed or combined. Second, packet error probability of the first transmission should be reduced dramatically since the latency requirement would not be satisfied by the packet re-transmission mechanism. Third, when the uRLLC packet is generated, this packet should be transmitted immediately without delay. Thus, frame structure and corresponding multiplexing scheme to support the prompt transmission yet guarantees the reliability of uRLLC packets are required. In Table I, we summarize key features of three service categories discussed in the 5G systems.

III. KEY REQUIREMENTS OF URLLC

In this section, we describe key requirements (low latency, ultra-high reliability, and co-existence) for the success of uRLLC service.




Fig. 2. uRLLC transmission: illustration of five latency components (upper), transmission of three service categories in subframe-level (center), and overlay of uRLLC into eMBB transmission in symbol-level (bottom).

A. Low Latency

Physical-layer latency T_L is expressed as a sum of the four distinct latency components (see Fig. 2)¹:

$$T_L = T_{ttt} + T_{prop} + T_{proc} + T_{reTx},$$

- T_{ttt} , called time-to-transmit latency, is the time required to transmit a packet
- T_{prop} , called propagation latency, is the time for a signal to travel from the sender to the receiver
- T_{proc} is the processing time for the channel estimation, encoding and decoding for the first transmission
- T_{reTx} is the time for the re-transmission

In compliance with the ITU requirement, 3GPP decided that the physical-layer latency T_L of uRLLC should not exceed 0.5ms. To ensure this, T_{ttt} should be designed in the order of hundreds of microsecond. Since T_{ttt} of 4G networks is fixed to 1 msec and cannot satisfy the physical-layer latency constraint, new frame structure supporting the uRLLC as well as eMBB and mMTC should be introduced. In fact, one of the most important goals of 5G systems is to support various packet length (from one to 10 megabyte) and different symbol numerology (e.g., symbol duration, sampling rate, subcarrier spacing) to adapt to diverse service requirements and deployment scenarios. It is also important to come up with a low-latency transmission protocol to reduce the latency caused by the control signaling. Recently, various protocols, such as one-shot, grant-free, and feedback-less protocols, have been suggested to this end.

B. Ultra-High Reliability

Typical block error rate (BLER) of the 4G systems is 10^{-2} . This performance level can be achieved by the channel coding (e.g., Turbo code) and re-transmission mechanism (e.g., hybrid automatic repeat request (H-ARQ)). The performance level of the uRLLC service should be much better than this, and in fact, target BLER within 1 msec period is at least 10^{-5} . In some services requiring near real-time response such as remote surgery or autonomous driving, target BLER can be as low as 10^{-7} . In order to achieve this, channel estimation performance should be improved first. In fact, when the gain obtained from the channel coding is marginal, which is true

¹End-to-end latency is the sum of physical-layer and network-layer latencies. In this article, we consider the physical-layer latency exclusivity.

for short packet transmission regime, the loss, if any, caused by the channel estimation should be minimized. Since a number of pilot signals in 4G systems are not sufficient for this purpose, more resources in frequency, antenna, and spatial domain should be used for the pilot purpose. Note, however, that the time-domain resources are not desirable since those will increase the latency. In addition to this, a reliability of the control and data part should be improved. In the case of control part, a new strategy that does not rely on the channel decoding and cyclic redundancy check (CRC) would be desired. In the case of the data part, advanced channel coding scheme working for the short-packet regime can be employed (e.g., polar code).

C. Co-existence with Other Services

When the uRLLC service request is generated, the basestation should promptly access to the wireless medium for the immediate transmission of the uRLLC packets. This event can happen not only in the scheduling period but also in the middle of data transmission period. In other word, resources being reserved for the eMBB and mMTC services need to be used for the uRLLC service (see Fig. 2). In fact, when the uRLLC packet is generated, the basestation should stop sending the eMBB and mMTC packets without notice to transmit the uRLLC packets. Since devices in use do not aware of this interrupt, the packet error rate of the eMBB and mMTC devices will increase sharply. This problem, referred to as co-existence problem, is inevitable and thus a proper mechanism to mitigate the performance degradation of existing services is needed. Overall, strategies to deal with this co-existence problem fall into two categories: *reactive* and *proactive* strategies. Basically, reactive strategy is based on the new re-transmission mechanism (e.g., partial re-transmission) and proactive strategy relies on the preprocessing (e.g., robust coding or MIMO precoding).

IV. PHYSICAL LAYER SOLUTIONS FOR URLLC SERVICE

In order to satisfy the uRLLC requirements discussed in the previous section, the physical-layer should be re-ordered as a whole. In this section, we go over the physical-layer solutions including packet and frame structure to reduce the latency, multiplexing options to overlay the uRLLC packet into existing service, and techniques to guarantee the quality of existing service.

A. Packet Structure

The primary goal in the design of a uRLLC packet is to minimize the processing latency T_{proc} . The processing latency includes time for receiving data symbols, acquiring channel information,

extracting control (scheduling) information, decoding data packet, and checking the existence of error. In the 4G systems, a rectangular-shaped packet structure is employed to make an efficient use of the spectrum under time-frequency fading channel. In the uRLLC systems, on the other hand, a non-rectangular packet (stretched in the frequency axis) is preferred since using this structure will save time to receive the packet data. In order to further reduce the latency, three components of a packet, viz., pilot, control, and data part are grouped together and then transmitted sequentially. In doing so, pipelined processing of the channel estimation, control channel decoding, and data detection becomes possible (see Fig. 3a).

In the control part, a simple and fast decoding scheme is desired rather than relying on the time-consuming process consisting of the channel decoding, blind searching, and CRC test. One promising way under consideration is the control channel sparse encoding (CCSE) [9] which is designed to deliver the control information using non-orthogonal spreading sequences. When the number of non-orthogonal sequences is N , then by choosing K sequences among them, the basestation can encode $\binom{N}{K}$ distinct control information. For example, when $N = 96$ and $K = 2$, $\lfloor \log_2 \binom{N}{K} \rfloor = 12$ bits of control information can be encoded. In the basestation, control information is mapped to the low density binary sequence with sparsity K (e.g., $\mathbf{u} = [0\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 0\ \dots\ 0\ 0\ 0]^T$). By multiplying the codebook matrix \mathbf{C} whose column is the spreading sequence \mathbf{c}_i with this binary vector \mathbf{u} , we obtain the transmit vector $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{u}$. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times 1}$ be the received vector in the frequency domain, then \mathbf{y} is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n} \\ &= \mathbf{H}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{n} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & & h_m & & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} | & & | \\ \mathbf{c}_1 & \dots & \mathbf{c}_N \\ | & & | \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_N \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} n_1 \\ \vdots \\ n_m \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ is the diagonal matrix whose diagonal element is the channel component for each resource, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times N}$ is the codebook matrix, and \mathbf{n} is the additive white Gaussian noise. Since \mathbf{u} is a sparse vector and further K is known to the receiver, input sequence \mathbf{u} containing control information can be recovered via the compressed sensing (CS) technique [8]. One advantage of the CS technique is that the receiver can decode the control information using a small number of measurements (resources). Simulation results demonstrate that CCSE technique




Fig. 3. Key solutions for uRLLC service: (a) packet structure, (b) frame structure, (b) multiplexing schemes, and (c) co-existence with other services.

outperforms the control channel decoding mechanism in 4G systems by a large margin (see Fig. 4a).

B. Latency-sensitive Frame and Multiplexing Schemes

1) *Frame structure for uRLLC*: To achieve a reduction in the time-to-transmit latency T_{tt} , symbol period and/or the number of symbols in a packet need to be reduced (see Fig. 3b). In many indoor scenarios, and also when a high-frequency band (millimeter wave) is used, cell radius would be small, and so will be the channel delay spread. In this case, we can reduce the symbol period by controlling the subcarrier spacing (e.g., 15, 30, and 60kHz) without affecting the system performance. For example, when we double the subcarrier spacing from 15kHz to 30kHz, symbol length is reduced from 72 μ sec to 36 μ sec, that is, 28 OFDM symbols can be sent during 1 msec period. If we transmit a packet consisting of 14 OFDM symbols as in the 4G systems, T_{tt} can be reduced to 0.5 msec. Also, by reducing the number of symbols in a packet, one can further control T_{tt} . In fact, by using slot level (7 symbols) or mini-slot level (2 or 3 symbols) transmission, T_{tt} can be reduced to 142, 241, and 500 μ sec. Combining two approaches together, one can design a frame with T_{tt} of 30 μ sec to 1 msec.

2) *Multiplexing Schemes*: One important issue in the transmission of uRLLC packet is how to multiplex uRLLC and other services. Notable options under consideration are as follows.

- Instant access (without reservation): on-going data transmission is stopped to initiate the uRLLC data transmission (see Fig. 4c). This protocol is superior in terms of the latency but causes a throughput loss due to the abrupt increase in the packet error rate (PER) of the stopped services. Apparently, special treatment to mitigate the performance degradation of the stopped services is crucial for the success of this approach (see Section IV. C).
- Semi-static reservation: in essence, this approach reserves the uRLLC resources in prior of data scheduling. This reservation is semi-static in the sense that basestation broadcasts configuration of frame structure infrequently. Broadcast information includes frequency numerology, service time, and service period. Due to the reservation of resources, abrupt performance loss of the on-going data transmission can be avoided.
- Dynamic reservation: this approach is similar to but distinct from the semi-static reservation in the sense that reservation information is updated frequently. Basestation transmits information on the uRLLC resources using the control channel of scheduled user. For example, when a packet for the eMBB service is composed of 14 symbols, only ten symbols are used for the original purpose and the rest are reserved for the uRLLC transmission. Therefore, if there is no uRLLC data to be sent in the scheduled period, reserved resources would be

simply wasted.


In Fig. 4b and 4c, we plot the throughput-latency results of uRLLC and eMBB transmission, respectively. In our simulations, we set the target BLER of uRLLC data and eMBB data to 10^{-5} and 10^{-2} , respectively. We observe from Fig. 4b that the instant access scheme outperforms dynamic and semi-static reservation schemes both in throughput and latency. However, as shown in Fig. 4c, the instant access scheme will induce a latency increase and throughput loss of the eMBB service. Thus, in the latency perspective, reservation strategy is superior to the instant access scheme. Since each strategy has pros and cons and there is no absolute winner in terms of the latency and throughput, more research to come up with a better solution is needed.

C. Solutions to Co-existence Problem


So far we have discussed transmission strategy to minimize the latency of uRLLC service. We now present two approaches (reactive and proactive strategies) to mitigate the performance loss of existing services caused by the uRLLC transmission.

1) *Reactive strategy*: The key to the success of the reactive strategy is to give a high priority to the uRLLC transmission and at the same time ensure the reliability of the other channel interrupted by the uRLLC data transmission. Here we provide a summary of three representative reactive options (see Fig. 3d).


- Re-transmission of transport block: when the on-going service is stopped by the uRLLC transmission, basestation re-transmits whole transport block. This simple strategy is in essence similar to the H-ARQ scheme in 4G systems. Since the re-transmission latency T_{ReTx} is significant, this scheme is generally not very attractive.
- Re-transmission of selected symbols: instead of re-transmitting whole transport block, data symbols interrupted by uRLLC transmission are selectively re-transmitted. In order to minimize the service delay of the stopped service, these symbols are transmitted right after the initial transmission. This strategy has an advantage of using only a few resources for the re-transmission. However, when the number of re-transmitted symbols is very small (smaller than the number of resource grid), unused resource will be wasted.
- Re-transmission of selected codeblocks: in this strategy, only corrupted codeblocks are re-transmitted. Using the re-transmitted codeblock, receiver performs the soft symbol combining such as log-likelihood ratio (LLR) combining. For this reason, this scheme achieves




(a) Performance of uRLLC control channel



(b) Performance of multiplexing schemes (uRLLC)



(c) Performance of multiplexing schemes (eMBB)



(d) Performance of co-existence options (eMBB)

Fig. 4. Performance of enabling solutions for uRLLC service. For comparison of control channel, 12 bits control information is encoded and repeated 8 times for both physical downlink control channel (PDCCH) and CCSE. 1 transmit antenna and 1 receive antenna is used under additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel.

better coding gain when compared to the selected symbol re-transmission strategy. One can further adjust the code rate of re-transmitted codeblock for achieving higher coding gain.

2) *Proactive strategy*: When the uRLLC data transmission occurs frequently, efficiency of reactive approaches drops sharply due to the increased number of re-transmission. In this case, proactive strategy can be an appealing option. Key idea of this approach is to secure the reliability of data channel even in the presence of uRLLC transmission by using additional resources such as parity bits and spatial resources. Two representative options are as follows:

- **Robust channel coding**: to prevent the packet error caused by the uRLLC transmission,

robust channel coding can be applied to non-uRLLC data transmission. For example, basestation can increase the number of parity bits or use additional error correction code (e.g., outer codes). Moreover, one can lower the modulation order or code rate to improve the reliability of eMBB data channel. Clearly, this strategy will lower the re-transmission rate but at the expense of throughput loss.

- Sharing: this strategy combines on-going data channel with uRLLC data channel. Multiple antenna or beam-domain techniques can be used to support two data channels simultaneously. For example, if the spatial layer (rank) of the channel is n , then $n - 1$ layers are used for eMBB transmission and the rest are used for uRLLC transmission. This strategy is effective when $n \geq 2$. If the rank is one, power-domain NOMA might be used instead.

In Fig. 4d, we plot the latency-throughput results of various co-existence strategies. We observe that the performance loss caused by the instant access (red circle in Fig. 4c) is mitigated by using reactive and proactive strategies. We also observe from Fig. 4d that the re-transmission of selected symbols and codeblocks outperform transport block re-transmission scheme by a large margin, achieving more than 30% latency reduction. Since a large number of parity bits is used, the robust channel coding suffers considerable throughput loss (40% of loss over the reactive strategy). Since these early stage results are not conclusive and there is still a lot of room for improvement, further study is needed to find out the right solution to the co-existence problem.

V. CONCLUSION

uRLLC is one of the key services in 5G communications and had various applications such as intelligent transportation systems, factory automation, remote control, and tactile internet. Despite its importance, the physical-layer solutions to support uRLLC service is in its infancy. In this article, we have identified the key requirements for uRLLC and discussed enabling techniques. In order to satisfy stringent latency and reliability requirements, re-design of the entire physical-layer is indispensable, and the techniques presented in this paper can be a good starting point. Our work focused primarily on uRLLC transmission from a basestation to a receiver, there are still many issues for reverse direction including active (blind) user identification, contention-based access, and grant-less access.

REFERENCES

- [1] Rec. ITU-R M.2083-0, "IMT Vision - Framework and overall objectives of the future development of IMT for 2020 and beyond", Sep, 2015.

- [2] B. Soret, P. Mogensen, K. I. Pedersen, and M. C. Aguayo-Torres, "Fundamental tradeoffs among reliability, latency and throughput in cellular networks", *IEEE GC Wkshps*, pp. 1391-1396, Dec. 2014.
- [3] H. Ji, Y. Kim, J. Lee, O. Eko, Y. Nam, Z. Zhang, B. Lee, and B. Shim, "Overview of Full-Dimension MIMO in LTE-Advanced Pro," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol.55, no. 2, pp. 176-184, 2017.
- [4] S. Han, C. I. Z. Xu, and C. Rowell, "Large-scale antenna systems with hybrid analog and digital beamforming for millimeter wave 5G," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol.53, no.1, pp. 186-193, 2015.
- [5] T. Wild, S. Frank, and C. Yejian, "5G air interface design based on universal filtered (UF-) OFDM," *IEEE 19th Int. Conf. on DSP*, 2014.
- [6] P. Schulz, M. Matthé, H. Klessig, M. Simsek, G. Fettweis, J. Ansari, S. A. Ashraf, B. Almeroth, J. Voigt, I. Riedel, A. Puschmann, A. Mitschele-Thiel, M. Müller, T. Elste, and M. Windisch, "Latency Critical IoT Applications in 5G: Perspective on the Design of Radio Interface and Network Architecture", *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol.55, no. 2, pp. 70-78, 2017.
- [7] C. Bockelmann, N. Pratas, H. Nikopour, K. Au, T. Svensson, C. Stefanovic, and A. Dekorsy, A, "Massive Machine-type Communications in 5G: Physical and MAC-layer solutions," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol.54, no. 9, pp. 59-65, 2016.
- [8] J. W. Choi, B. Shim, Y. Ding, B. Rao, and D. I. Kim, "Compressed Sensing for Wireless Communications: Useful Tips and Tricks.," *to appear in IEEE Commun. Survey and Tutorials*,, 2017.
- [9] H. Ji, S. Park, and B. Shim, "Sparse coding for reliable control channel transmission," *to appear in IEEE Commun. Letter*, 2017.