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Abstract—Utilization of drones as aerial access points (AAPs) is a promising concept to enhance network coverage and area capacity promptly and on demand. The emerging millimeter-wave (mmWave) communication technology may in principle deliver higher data rates, thus making the use of AAPs more effective. By extending the conventional (planar) stochastic geometry considerations, we construct a novel three-dimensional model for drone-based mmWave communication that captures the high directionality of transmissions as well as the random heights of the communicating entities. Choosing signal-to-interference ratio (SIR) as our primary parameter of interest, we assess system performance with an emphasis on the impact of the ‘vertical’ dimension in aerial mmWave connectivity. We also demonstrate that accurate performance assessment is only possible with simplified models for certain ranges of input parameters.

I. INTRODUCTION

Drones have recently received much attention by demonstrating the potential to be deployed as dedicated aerial access points (AAPs) for cellular users [1] or as mobile relay stations. The utilization of drones as AAPs may provide (i) on-demand capacity boost, (ii) prompt coverage by offering service in the so-called “blind spots”, (iii) increased reliability and quality of service (QoS) by augmenting applications based on the use of licensed spectrum, and (iv) support for seamless session continuity as users move around [2], [3]. Provisional drone-based networks show a lot of promise to support future 5th generation (5G) services. Recently, both academia and industry studies have reported on the test trials of drone-assisted communication [4].

The use of drones as AAPs or relays brings novel unique challenges related to efficient spectrum management [5], [6]. Performance of drone-based communication from the perspective of service provisioning has been addressed already in the context of microwave 4th generation (4G) systems. The importance of accurate air-to-ground channel modeling was further stressed in [1]. In [7], the authors proposed a heuristic solution to enable drone-based AAPs and thus increase the spectral efficiency by 34% as well as the 5-percentile packet throughput by 50%. The effects of mobility, path loss, and elevation angle have additionally been taken into account. In [8], the authors elaborated a software-defined networking (SDN) solution for drone-based connectivity.

Several studies addressed the question of integrating AAPs as part of the future cellular networks. With extensive simulations, the authors of [9] studied the application of drones as intermediate aerial nodes between the macro and the small cell tiers in a heterogeneous network (HetNet). They revealed that the proposed concept allows to improve the spectral efficiency by 38% and reduce the delay by up to 37.5% as compared to the terrestrial network baseline without drones. The coverage probability of mobile AAPs with underlaid device-to-device (D2D) communication capability has been addressed in [10], where the authors emphasized the importance of drone mobility in serving randomly scattered users. The study in [11] considered the optimal positioning strategies for drones.

One of the challenges in the emerging 5G millimeter-wave (mmWave) communication is the blockage of the line-of-sight (LoS) signal path between a user terminal and the mmWave access point (AP) [12]. To alleviate it, the concept of multi-connectivity has recently been proposed by 3GPP [13]. The use of drones as mmWave AAPs may thus bring decisive benefits to the network operators as both air-to-ground and backhaul links remain mostly in LoS conditions [14]. Shifting the focus to mmWave frequencies requires an extension of the conventional models by including specific features of inherently three-dimensional nature, such as highly directional antenna radiation patterns in both horizontal and vertical planes as well as random heights of communicating entities [14]. As most of past studies have been performed by assuming omnidirectional antennas, and hence rely on planar stochastic geometry, the effects of the ‘vertical’ dimension in drone-based mmWave communication have been addressed only marginally.

Extending the methods of stochastic geometry to the third dimension, we construct a novel mmWave AAP communication model by explicitly taking into account the random heights of drones and user equipment (UE) as well as the highly directional nature of mmWave links. We derive expressions for both the mean interference and the signal-to-interference ratio (SIR). Having these metrics at our disposal, we carry out a comprehensive numerical analysis that reveals the crucial effects in the considered characteristic scenario.

The following are the main contributions of this work:

- developing a methodology that allows to capture the effects of random heights of communicating entities and the directionality of antennas in interference and SIR modeling across the mmWave AAP communication scenarios;
- confirming that simpler models, which neglect the aforementioned effects, do not provide accurate assessment of
SIR across the feasible range of system parameters;
- identifying the ranges of system parameters where simpler models provide sufficiently accurate approximations.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND ASSUMPTIONS

Our scenario of interest is displayed in Fig. 1. We concentrate on the downlink channel from the drone-based AAP to the UE on the ground. Assume that the locations of users are labeled as \( U_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots \), and modeled by a Poisson point process in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) with the intensity of \( \lambda \). The UEs are deployed at the height of \( H_R \) that is assumed to follow an exponential distribution with the parameter \( \mu_R \).

Each UE is associated with its corresponding serving AAP labeled as \( T_i \). Positions of the AAPs are distributed uniformly within the circle of radius \( R_T \) centered at the UE of interest. The altitude distribution of drones is exponential with the parameter \( \mu_R \). Without loss of generality, all AAPs are assumed to utilize the same frequency, thus effectively acting as interferers for the tagged UE. Among the AAP-UE pairs, we assume a cone antenna model, where the radiation pattern and the geometry of the model are illustrated. Assuming that all the radiation is now concentrated within the considered area, the antenna gain in question can be approximated by

\[
A = \frac{4\pi}{S_G} - \frac{2}{1 - \cos[\alpha/2]}, \tag{1}
\]

We introduce the coefficient \( A = P_T G_C \), where \( P_T \) is the transmit power, while the received power is \( P = P_T G_C r^{-\gamma} = A r^{-\gamma} \). The LoS path between the mmWave AAP and the UE in urban environments can be blocked by (i) large stationary objects, such as buildings, and (ii) smaller moving objects, such as humans. According to 3GPP [16], the probability of blockage by the former is referred to as the non-LoS state of the channel. Here, we consider an open-space scenario typical for drones, where there are no buildings; thus, we address only the LoS state of the channel. We also disregard blockage by humans, since the relatively high altitudes of drones as compared to e.g., stationary APs make this component negligible.

III. PROPOSED 3D MODELING APPROACH

We concentrate on evaluating the SIR that is expressed as

\[
S = \frac{P}{I} = \frac{A d_0^{-\gamma}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} I_i d_i^{-\gamma}} = \frac{d_0^{-\gamma}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} d_i^{-\gamma}}, \tag{2}
\]

where \( P \) is the received power, \( I \) is the aggregate interference power, \( N \) is a Poisson random variable (RV) with the mean of \( \lambda \pi R_T^2 \), \( d_0 \) is the \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) distance between the communicating entities, and \( d_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \), are the \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) distances corresponding to the interference paths to each interferer.

To obtain the mean SIR, we employ the Taylor series expansion of the SIR function, \( S = g(x, y) = P(x)/I(y) \). The second-order approximation is obtained by expanding \( g(x, y) \)
around \( \bar{\mu} = (E[P], E[I]) = (\mu_P, \mu_I) \) as

\[
E[g(\bar{\mu})] \approx g(\bar{\mu}) + g_{xx}'(\bar{\mu})\frac{\sigma_P^2}{2} + 2g_{xy}'(\bar{\mu})(\mu_P, \mu_I) + g_{yy}(\bar{\mu})\frac{\sigma_I^2}{2}, \tag{3}
\]

![Fig. 2. Illustration of antenna model and associated geometry.](image)

1At the moment of writing, there are no standardized air-to-ground propagation models for UAVs in mmWave bands. For this reason, we utilize the closest AP to UE propagation model by 3GPP.
where $K_{P,I}$ is the covariance between $P$ and $I$, while $\sigma_P^2$ and $\sigma_I^2$ are the variances of $P$ and $I$. Observing that $g'_{x,x}(x, y) = 0$, $g'_{x,y}(x, y) = -y^{-2}$, and $g''_{y,y}(x, y) = 2x/y^2$, we arrive at
\begin{equation}
E[P/I] \approx \mu_P/\mu_I - K_{P,I}/\mu_I^2 + \sigma_I^2 \mu_P/\mu_I^3. \quad (4)
\end{equation}

The moments of interference can be obtained as in [18],
\begin{equation}
E[I^n] = \int_S E[I^n_1(r)] p_C(r) dS,
\end{equation}
where $dS = 2\pi r$ is the probability that there exists an interferer in the infinitesimal increment of the circumference, $p_C(r)$ is the probability that the transmit antenna at a drone acting as interferer and located at the planar distance of $x$ from the tagged UE is oriented such that the interference power reaches the tagged UE, named here directional exposure probability, and $E[I^n_1(r)]$ are the moments of interference from a single transmitter at the distance of $r$.

Note that our proposed methodology can be employed to obtain other metrics of interest, including the signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR), spectral efficiency, and Shannon capacity. The only modification needed is to expand the appropriate function into a Taylor series similarly to (3).

To obtain the mean SIR, the following is required: (i) mean received signal strength, (ii) first two conditional moments of interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR), spectral efficiency, and (iii) covariance between the received signal and interference. The propositions below establish these.

**Proposition 1 (Mean Received Power).** The moments of the received signal power are given by
\begin{equation}
E[P^n] = A^n 2^{\gamma} \gamma^n \left[ W(\mu_T,\mu_R) + W(\mu_R,\mu_T) \right] \times \\
\times \pi^2 \csc \left( \frac{\pi n}{2} \right) \sec \left( \frac{\pi n}{2} \right) R_T \Gamma \left( \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{n+1}{2} \right),
\end{equation}
where $W(x,y)$ is characterized as
\begin{equation}
W(x,y) = x^3 \left[ 2\sqrt{2} y^{n+1} R_T \Gamma \left( \frac{n+1}{2} \right) + R_T y \Gamma \left( \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \right] \\
\times \cos \left( \frac{\pi n}{2} \right) H_{x+1}^{n} - J_{n}^{R_T} \sin \left( \frac{\pi n}{2} \right) J_{n}^{R_T},
\end{equation}
where $\Gamma(z)$ is the Euler Gamma function, $J_n$ is the Bessel function of the first kind, and $H_n$ is the Struve function.

**Proof.** The power of the received signal can be expressed as
\begin{equation}
P = A \left( \sqrt{H_T - H_R} \right)^{\gamma},
\end{equation}
where $H_T$, $H_R$, and $r$ are the corresponding RVs. Since $H_T$ and $H_R$ follow the exponential distribution, the joint probability density function (pdf) of $[H_T - H_R]$ is
\begin{equation}
f_{H_T - H_R}(y) = \left( \frac{\mu}{\mu + \mu_T} \right) e^{-y/\mu_T} \mu_T, \quad y > 0. \quad (7)
\end{equation}

Based on [19], the moments $E[P^n(r)]$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, of the received signal power can be expressed as
\begin{equation}
E[P^n] = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty A^n \left( \frac{e^{-y/\mu} + e^{-y/\mu_T}}{\mu + \mu_T} \right) \mu_T R_T 2\pi dr dy.
\end{equation}
Evaluating the integrals in (8), we arrive at (9). □

**Corollary 1 (Conditional Moments of Interfering Signal from a Single AAP).** The conditional moments of interference are obtained by fixing the distance between the AAP and the UE on the ground as
\begin{equation}
E[I^n_1(r)] = \left[ \left( \frac{\mu_R + \mu_T}{\mu_R} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{n}{2} \right) \left[ W(\mu_T,\mu_R) + W(\mu_R,\mu_T) \right] \right] \\
\times 2^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} A^n \pi^\frac{n}{2} \mu_R \mu_T.
\end{equation}
where $1(x)$ is given by
\begin{equation}
1(x) = \left[ \left( \frac{x}{r} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{3}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{n}{2} \right) \right] \\
\times \left( 2J_{n}^{x} - J_{n}^{x} \csc \left( \frac{n\pi}{2} \right) \right).
\end{equation}

The directional exposure probability $p_C(r)$ can be approximated by $p_C(r) = p_V(r) p_H(r)$, where $p_H(r)$ is the probability that the interferer exposes the tagged UE in two dimensions, $p_V(r)$ is the probability that this also occurs in the third (vertical) dimension. The two-dimensional exposure probability, $p_H$, is $p_H(r) = \alpha r/2\pi r = \alpha/2\pi$.

**Proposition 2 (‘Vertical’ Exposure Probability).** The ‘vertical’ exposure probability, $p_V(r)$, is established by integrating the jpdf of angles $\beta$ and $\theta$ over $|\beta - \theta| < \alpha/2$ (see Fig. 3), that is,
\begin{equation}
p_V(r) = \int_{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \int_{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} W_{\beta,\theta}(y_1,y_4) dy_1 dy_4,
\end{equation}
where $W_{\beta,\theta}(y_1,y_4)$ is the jpdf of $\beta$ and $\theta$ in the form of (11).

**Proof.** Let $\xi^n = \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_4\} = \{H_R, H_T, d_T, H_I\}$. Observe that the jpdf of these RVs has a multiplicative form due to their independence, which yields
\begin{equation}
H_4 = \mu R e^{-\mu R x_1} e^{-\mu R x_2} x_3 e^{-\mu R x_2}/H_T^2. \quad (13)
\end{equation}
Relabeling the target RVs as $\eta^n = \{\eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots, \eta_4\} = \{\beta, H_T, d_T, \theta\}$, we note that $m < n$. Complementing the set of target RVs as $\eta^m = \{\eta_1^m, \eta_2^m, \ldots, \eta_4^m\} = \{\beta, H_T, d_T, \theta\}$, we define the transformation as
\begin{align*}
y_1 &= \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{x_1 - x_2}{x_3} \right) = \beta, \\
y_2 &= x_2, \\
y_3 &= x_3, \\
y_4 &= \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{x_4 - x_2}{x_3} \right) = \theta.
\end{align*}

Fig. 3. An illustration of interference in three dimensions.
The inverse transform is a one-to-one mapping in the domains of $\beta$ and $\theta = (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ (bijection). Therefore,

$$\begin{align*}
&\begin{cases}
x_1 = \varphi_1 (y_1^0) = y_2 + y_3 \tan y_1, \\
x_2 = \varphi_2 (y_1^0) = y_2, \\
x_3 = \varphi_3 (y_1^0) = y_3, \\
x_4 = \varphi_4 (y_1^0) = y_2 + r \tan y_4.
\end{cases}
\end{align*}$$

(16)

The sought pdf is then given by

$$W_{\eta_1}(y_1^0) = \omega_{\eta_1}^\ast [\varphi_1 (y_1^0), \ldots, \varphi_n (y_1^0)] | J |,$n\]

(17)

where the Jacobian is computed as $J = y^{3r} \sec^2 y_1 \sec^2 y_4$, while $\omega_{\eta_1}^\ast [\varphi_1 (y_1^0), \ldots, \varphi_n (y_1^0)]$ can be produced as

$$2e^{-2y_2 \mu_T - \mu_R(y_2 + y_3 \tan y_1) - \mu_R(y_2 + r \tan y_4)} y_3 \mu_T^3.$$  

(18)

Evaluating the subject integrals leads to

$$W_{\eta_1, \eta_4}(y_1, y_4) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega_{\eta_1}^\ast [\varphi_1 (y_1^0), \ldots, \varphi_n (y_1^0)] |J|^{-1} dy_2 dy_3 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{m(y_1, y_4)} \frac{2y_2 \mu_T \mu_R^2 y_3 \sec^2 (y_1) \sec^2 (y_4) dy_2 dy_3}{R_T e^{2y_2 \mu_T + \mu_R(y_2 + y_3 \tan y_1) + \mu_R(y_2 + r \tan y_4)}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{m(y_1, y_4)} \frac{2y_2 \mu_T \mu_R^2 y_3 \sec^2 (y_1) \sec^2 (y_4) (2 \mu_R + r) dy_2 dy_3}{e^{2y_2 \mu_T + \mu_R(y_2 + y_3 \tan y_1) + \mu_R(y_2 + r \tan y_4)}} =$$

(19)

where $m(y_1, y_4) = \max \{0, -y_3 \tan y_1, -x \tan y_4\}$.

Considering the last integral, we obtain the pdf $W_{\eta_1, \eta_4}(y_1, y_4)$ in its closed form (11).

Proposition 3 (Covariance $K_{P,I}$). The covariance between the interference and the received signal may be determined as

$$K_{P,I} = A^2 \lambda \pi R_T^2 R_P E[(X_0, X_I)^{-\gamma}] - \mu_P \mu_I,$n\]

(20)

where $E[(X_0, X_I)^{-\gamma}]$ is obtained by numerical integration,

$$\int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} [x_1 - x_2]^2 + x_5^4]^{-\gamma} f(x_1, \ldots, x_5) dx_1 \ldots dx_5,$n\]

(21)

with the associated pdf provided in the following form

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_5) = \frac{\mu T e^{-\mu T x_1 - \mu R(x_2 + x_3)} x_4 x_5}{(R_T R_T)^2}.$$  

(22)

Proof. Rewrite $K_{P,I}$ as $K_{P,I} = E[PI] - \mu_P \mu_I$, where $\mu_P$ and $\mu_I$ have been established previously. Next, the Wald's identity [19] is applied to $E[PI]$ as

$$K_{P,I} = E[PI] - \mu_P \mu_I = E[A X_0^{-\gamma} \sum_{i=1}^{N} A X_i^{-\gamma}] - \mu_P \mu_I = A^2 \lambda \pi R_T^2 R_P E[(X_0, X_I)^{-\gamma}] - \mu_P \mu_I,$n\]

(23)

where $X_0$ is the distance between the AAP and the UE of interest, $X_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, are the distances between the interferers and the said UE, and $N$ is the number of interferers; $E[N] = \lambda \pi R_T^2 R_P$ and $E[(X_0, X_I)^{-\gamma}]$ are the only unknowns. Note that here we apply the Wald's identity [19] and thus can rewrite $E[(X_0, X_I)^{-\gamma}]$ by using the random heights as

$$E\left[\left((H_R - H_T)^2 - r_0\right)^{-\gamma}\right],$$  

(24)

where $r_0$ is a constant; we thus arrive at (20).
Our developed 3D model is rather complex as it involves numerical integration of (11) according to (12) and in (21). Assuming fixed heights of both the AAPs and the UEs, the solution becomes much simpler since the joint distribution of $\beta$ and $\theta$ depends only on one RV. Further, disregarding the heights of AAPs and UEs leads to a two-dimensional formulation, where the expressions for the moments of SIR are available in the closed form [15]. A natural research question is then “can we still apply simpler (e.g., 2D) models to accurately represent SNR?”

Below, we first assess the accuracy of our proposed model and then conduct a numerical study on the discrepancy that arises as a result of replacing the true 3D model with its simplifications. We concentrate on the carrier frequency of $28$ GHz. The propagation coefficients $C$ and $\gamma$ that correspond to this frequency are computed to be $28935037$ and $2.1$, respectively. The maximum association distance of $R_T$ is $15$ m, while the interference radius is calculated dynamically, since it is affected by the antenna directivity angle $\alpha$.

### A. Accuracy of models

We first assess the accuracy of our developed 3D model and its simplified formulation by comparing the corresponding results with simulations. Fig. 5 illustrates the mean SIR as a function of antenna directivity $\alpha$ for the intensity of AAP arrival process $\lambda = 0.5$, where $RH$ and $FH$ represent the random and fixed heights of AAPs and UEs, respectively, $PV$ is the ‘vertical’ exposure probability, while sign ‘+’ implies that $p_V$ is taken into account. The mean heights of the AAPs and the UEs are set to $E[H_T] = 40$ m and $E[H_R] = 1.7$ m. Our simulation results are displayed by using ticks of the same color. Both the proposed 3D model as well as its simplified version agree well with the simulations. Similar observations can be made for different intensities $\lambda$ and various mean heights $E[H_T]$ and $E[H_R]$.

### B. Comparison of models

The mean SIR as a function of the antenna directivity angle $\alpha$ and the intensity of AAP arrivals $\lambda$ is illustrated in Fig. 4 for $E[H_T] = 40$ m and $E[H_R] = 1.7$ m. First, we note that for the considered models the mean SIR decreases as $\alpha$ grows, thus implying that they correctly capture the qualitative system behavior. However, the quantitative difference between these results is due to the ‘vertical’ exposure probability $p_V$; it increases as $\alpha$ becomes smaller. Particularly, the model with fixed heights and without considering the ‘vertical’ exposure probability for $\lambda = 0.5$ underestimates the mean SIR by approximately $7$ dB for $\alpha = 60^\circ$ and by $27$ dB for $\alpha = 2^\circ$. Similar figures are observed for $\lambda = 2$. The model with random heights that does not take into account the ‘vertical’ exposure probability converges to the formulation with the ‘vertical’ exposure probability accounted for as $\alpha$ grows.

The closest approximation with regards to our developed model is given by the approach that takes $p_V$ into account and has fixed heights of AAPs and UEs. However, this
approximation depends on the antenna directivity angle. For smaller values of $\alpha$, the model with fixed heights overestimates the actual mean SIR. After increasing $\alpha > 80^\circ$, the model begins to underestimate the mean SIR, and the gap may reach several decibels for $\alpha > 80^\circ$. In this regime, the use of the model with random heights that disregards the ‘vertical’ exposure probability is more appropriate. The results presented in Fig. 4(c) indicate that the value of $\lambda$ does not affect the discrepancy between the models drastically, since the distance between the curves is preserved across the entire range of the considered intensities.

The effect of the mean height of the AAPs on the average SIR for $\alpha = 2^\circ$, $\lambda = 0.5$, and $E[H_R] = 1.7$ m is displayed in Fig. 6. The model that neglects the ‘vertical’ exposure probability drastically underestimates the mean SIR for all the considered values of $E[H_T]$. Furthermore, significant underestimation is observed for the model with fixed heights and ‘vertical’ exposure probability at $E[H_T] > 20$.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we developed a 3D model for drone-based mmWave communication that explicitly takes into account the random heights of drone-transceivers, or AAPs, and the UEs as well as the ‘vertical’ exposure probability. Our simulations confirmed the accuracy of the proposed model. The subsequent numerical analysis demonstrated that capturing the ‘vertical’ exposure probability as well as the random heights of AAPs and UEs to assess the aggregate interference is of crucial importance. The simplier models are not capable of providing accurate approximations of the mean SIR across the entire feasible range of input parameters.

For the specific ranges of antenna directivity values $\alpha$, one can however resort to such simpler formulations. Particularly, when $\alpha > 60^\circ$ the model without the ‘vertical’ exposure probability delivers an adequate approximation for the considered AAP arrival intensities. When $\alpha < 10^\circ$, the model with the ‘vertical’ exposure probability as well as the fixed heights of AAPs and UEs that are equal to their mean values becomes sufficiently accurate.
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