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**Abstract**

Secret key extraction is a crucial issue in physical layer security and a less complex and, at the same time, a more robust scheme for the next generation of 5G and beyond. Unlike previous works on this topic, in which Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiplexing (OFDM) sub-channels were considered to be independent, the effect of correlation between sub-channels on the secret key rate is addressed in this paper. As an assumption, a realistic model for dependency among sub-channels is considered. Benchmarked by simulation, the result shows that the key exchange rate may decline by up to 72% due to the correlation of sub-channels. A new approach for efficient key extraction is used in this study. To do this, a Singular Value Decomposition based (SVD-based) pre-coding is utilized to alleviate the sub-channels correlation and the channel noise. The low computational complexity of our proposed approach makes it a promising candidate for developing secure and high-speed networks. Results obtained through simulation indicate that applying pre-coding on the measured correlated data resulted in a minimum gain of 9 dB. In addition, the result also depicts the advantage of SVD versus other pre-coding techniques, namely PCA, DCT, and WT.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Efficient secret key generation of physical layer and authentication schemes based on wireless channels are developing issues in physical layer security, especially in Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiplexing (OFDM)-based communication systems. Therefore, the channel parameter has received a lot of attention in literature as the fundamental part of key construction techniques [1-3].

Depending on the environmental conditions, the Key Generation Rate (KGR) is defined as a parameter that specifies the rate of secret key bits generated per second. Similarly, Key Disagreement Rate (KDR) is defined as the distinction rate of the key bits generated by Alice and Bob as the two ends of the communication link.

In recent studies, OFDM structures have been utilized for key generation with long sequences and increasing the rate of key generation by obtaining a key for each sub-channel in a coherence time. Since KGR and KDR oppose each other, a reasonable tradeoff should be set. This setting is configured between them by considering the demands of the system and the user interface. In literature, the key generation method is separated into four stages including the channel probing, quantization, information reconciliation and privacy amplification [4-6].

In the channel probing stage, the transmitter and the receiver use the static period of channel parameters in a coherence time interval. The extracted parameters from the channel are channel impulse response, channel frequency response, received signal strength, and channel phase.

In this stage, due to several reasons such as the channel noise, random displacements, multipath and scattering, the values measured by both ends of the communication link are not equal so some pre-processing should be done [7]. Unequal measurements of the
channel lead to disagreement among the keys, while a high KDR might lead to the deficiency of the key generation process [8, 9].

The quantization scheme is utilized to optimize the operation of randomness, KGR, and KDR by adjusting the level of quantization and the threshold limit [10, 11].

Another part of the information is also sent through public channels during the information reconciliation stage, which can be heard by Eve as a wire-tapper. This can potentially threaten the security of the key sequence. Privacy amplification is finally used for removing the revealed information from the agreed key sequence by legitimate users (Alice and Bob).

In the key generation, based on channel reciprocity, the secret key is made from one or more channel parameters such as channel phase, Received Signal Strength (RSS), and Channel State Information (CSI) [5, 12].

In the previous works on this topic, it is typically assumed that the sub-channels do not correlate for the sake of simplicity. In practice, there is a correlation between the sub-channels that suppress the assumption of randomness. Thus, determining the secret key rate by considering the correlation between sub-channels and maintaining the randomness as well as increasing the KGR is essential in physical layer security. However, in this paper, the correlation between the sub-channels and its effect on the secret key rate is studied.

There is no theoretical model for the mutual correlation between the measured values due to the lack of closed form for it. Thus, the correlation can be improved by interpolation or filter configuration, which is commonly done through different experiments [8, 13]. Due to the considerable impact of noise in a slow fading channel, a Low Pass Filter (LPF) is needed to eliminate the high-frequency components of the noise and to enhance the correlation [14].

In [9], efficient signal pre-coding is addressed and it is demonstrated that Principal Component Analysis (PCA)-based pre-coding achieves a higher KGR than Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT) and Wavelet Transform (WT). In other words, the channel correlation can be eliminated by a signal pre-processing procedure such as PCA [15], DCT [16, 17], and WT [18, 19].

The singular value decomposition (SVD) is a factorization of a real or complex matrix by which the original matrix is expressed by/forms three matrix, namely USV*. One of the most widely used functions of SVD is noise elimination and reduction of measured correlations.

In this paper, inspired by [9], an SVD-based channel decorrelation is proposed which is more accurate than the PCA-based method, with a significant superiority from the computational complexity point of view. The main contributions that distinguish our work from others in literature are as follows:

- In previous works, authors did not consider the correlation among sub-channels, for the sake of simplicity. However, in our study, the effect of correlation among sub-channels is evaluated by applying a new realistic model.
- An optimal SVD-based pre-coding scheme is presented which has lower computational complexity than other works. Moreover, the Mutual Information (MI) calculation and KGR improvement are provided.
- Our proposed SVD-based method is numerically compared with some other approaches, especially with the PCA-based method as an appropriate benchmark to determine the method which is better for key extraction; to the best of our knowledge, the numerical aspect has not been yet considered in any previous literature. As a result of SVD-based pre-coding, one will be able to obtain an optimal key generation.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, the communication and adversary models are presented. The correlation of the sub-channels and its effect on the secret key rate is also derived in this section. In Section 3, our proposed SVD-based pre-coding is addressed. The comparison among SVD and other approaches are also done, and advantages of the proposed approach are further investigated. In Section 4, simulation results are expressed. Finally, Section 5 deals with conclusions.

2. OFDM SYSTEM MODEL WITH CORRELATED SUB-CHANNEL

Figure 1 shows an OFDM-based system model including three nodes in which Alice and Bob are known as legitimate users and Eve is known as the adversary or the interceptor [20]. In this model, the adversary can only initiate a passive attack. In other words, Eve can tap into the connection between legitimate users and search for the secret key based on her deductions. Therefore, she cannot affect the information between Alice and Bob [21, 22]. Alice and Bob use a half-duplex communication system. Thus, they cannot simultaneously send and receive a signal. Mathematically, Alice and Bob attempt to estimate the channel by sending signals according to the following formulas:

\[ h_A = h_{BA} + z_A, \quad h_B = h_{AB} + z_B \]  

in which \( z_A \) and \( z_B \) refer to the channel noises at the locations of Alice and Bob respectively, \( h_{BA} \) and \( h_{AB} \) are the legitimate channel vectors in frequency domain.

The measured values of the channel such as CSI, RSS, and channel phase are collected by Alice and Bob. They probe the channel by sending successive time signals in each period. Due to channel reciprocity in coherence time, a high correlation exists between the measured values of Alice and Bob, and these measured
values of the channel will change into a vector of bits after quantization. However, the quantized values of the channel slightly differ from each other due to the existence of noise. Because of the channel reciprocity between $h_{BA}$ and $h_{AB}$ which are the channel vectors between Alice and Bob in the frequency domain, they can be written as:

$$h_{BA} = h_{AB} = h = [h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_N],$$

$$z_A = [z_{A1}, z_{A2}, \ldots, z_{AN}], \quad z_B = [z_{B1}, z_{B2}, \ldots, z_{BN}].$$

In Figure 1, the terms $h_{AE}$ and $h_{BE}$ show information about Eve from the channel and it is assumed that Eve is positioned at a distance greater than one half-wavelength from Alice and Bob. Therefore, $h_E$ has no correlation with $h_A$ and $h_B$. Here, it is assumed that the sub-channels $h_i$, $i = 1,2,3, \ldots, N$ have $CN(0, \sigma^2_{h_i})$ distribution and also $z_{B1}$ and $z_{A1}$ are independent noises with distributions $z_{A1} \sim CN(0, \sigma^2_{z_{A1}})$, and $z_{B1} \sim CN(0, \sigma^2_{z_{B1}})$ which are also independent of $h$. Therefore, the estimated values of $h_A$ and $h_B$, and their distributions can be readily written as:

$$h_A = h_{BA} + z_A,$$

$$h_B = h_{AB} + z_B.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

$$h_{A} \sim CN(0, R_{A}), \quad h_{B} \sim CN(0, R_{B}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

$$(h_A, h_B) \sim CN(0, R_{AB}), \quad R_{AB} = \begin{bmatrix} R_A & R_C \\ R_D & R_B \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where the covariance matrices $R_A$ and $R_B$ are both diagonal. In literature, for the sake of simplicity, it is assumed that the sub-channels have no correlation and the secret key rate in OFDM systems based on the sub-channel state information is calculated and analyzed. To increase the key generation rate, the corresponding keys $k_i$ are generated for each independent sub-channel $h_i$ from $N$ sub-channels, and the long key sequence $K$ is then generated as:

$$K = k_1k_2k_3 \ldots k_N.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

It should be noted that there is a correlation between the sub-channels which leads to the lower randomness in the practical scenarios. Thus, calculating the secret key rate by considering the amount of correlation among sub-channels and maintaining randomness as well as increasing the KGR would be crucial. The relation of the secret key rate for $h_A$ and $h_B$ is given as [14]:

$$I_m = I(h_A, h_B | h_{AB}) = I(h_A, h_B | h_{AB}) = I(h_A, h_B) = H(h_A) + H(h_B) - H(h_A, h_B)$$

in which $H(.)$ refers to entropy function. Therefore, by considering the correlation among sub-channels in the OFDM system, the relation for the covariance between the two sub-channels $h_{IA}$ and $h_{IA}$ can be written as:

$$COV(h_{IA}; h_{JA}) = COV\left[(h_i + n_{IA}), (h_j + n_{IA})\right] = E[h_i n_{IA}]$$

$$= E[h_i n_{IA}] + E[n_{IA}]^2$$

(7)

where the covariance matrices $R_A$ and $R_B$ are diagonal matrices defined by:

$$R_A = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^2_{h_1} + \sigma^2_{n_{IA}} & E(h_1 n_{IA}) & \cdots & E(h_1 n_N) \\ E(h_1 n_{IA}) & \sigma^2_{h_2} + \sigma^2_{n_{IA}} & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ E(h_1 n_{IA}) & \vdots & \cdots & \sigma^2_{h_N} + \sigma^2_{n_{IA}} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$R_B = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^2_{h_1} + \sigma^2_{n_{IA}} & E(h_1 h_2) & \cdots & E(h_1 n_N) \\ E(h_1 h_2) & \sigma^2_{h_2} & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ E(h_1 h_2) & \vdots & \cdots & \sigma^2_{h_N} \end{bmatrix}$$

(9)

(10)

Also $R_C$ and $R_D$ are defined by:

$$R_C = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^2_{n_{IA}} & E(h_1 h_2) & \cdots & E(h_1 n_N) \\ E(h_1 h_2) & \sigma^2_{h_2} & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ E(h_1 h_2) & \vdots & \cdots & \sigma^2_{h_N} \end{bmatrix}$$

(11)

Therefore, the formula for the secret key rate can be derived as follows:

$$I(h_A; h_B) = log_2(\pi e R_A) + log_2(\pi e R_B) - log_2(|R_{IA}| R_{IB}|R_{IA} - R_{IA} R_{IB}^{-1} R_{IC}|).$$

(12)

**3. THE PROPOSED SVD-BASED PRE-CODING METHOD**

In this section, our proposed SVD-based pre-coding method is presented. According to Equation (12), to achieve a more efficient secret key and preventing the similarity of key sequences, the correlation between sub-channels should be considered. Using Equation (12) in
which the frequency correlation of the sub-channels is considered, a more accurate model for the KGR can be presented. It is worthwhile to point out that the correlation between the measured sub-channel coefficients of data can be eliminated by a signal preprocessing procedure such as the PCA [15], DCT [16, 17] and WT [18, 19]. In [9], a new pre-coding method is addressed and it is also demonstrated that PCA-based pre-coding achieves a higher KGR than both the DCT and the WT. In this paper, the SVD is applied on the covariance matrix of the channel $h_A$. The correlation matrix is defined as:

$$R_A = E\{h_A h_A^H\} = U_A(A_A + \sigma_A^2 I_N)U_A^H$$

where $U_A = [u_A^{(1)}, u_A^{(2)}, \ldots, u_A^{(N)}]$ is the transform matrix and $A_A$ is a diagonal matrix with sorted eigenvalues ($\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_N \geq 0$). Our main goal is to obtain the optimal unitary matrix $V^*$ through maximizing the MI which can be obtained using:

$$V^* = Arg \max_I \sum_N v_{i}^* v_{i}$$

Ultimately, $V_A^*, R_A, \tilde{R}_A, \tilde{R}_C$, and $\tilde{R}_D$ are written as:

$$V_A^* = [v_{A1}^*, v_{A2}^*, \ldots, v_{An}^*].$$

$$\tilde{R}_A = V_A^* (A_A + \sigma_A^2 I_N) V_A^{H*},$$

$$\tilde{R}_B = V_B^* (A_B + \sigma_B^2 I_N) V_B^{H*},$$

$$\tilde{R}_C = V_C^* (A_C + \sigma_C^2 I_N) V_C^{H*},$$

$$\tilde{R}_D = V_D^* (A_D + \sigma_D^2 I_N) V_D^{H*}.$$ (19)

The optimal transform matrix $V_A^*$ is provided by the eigenvectors of the channel covariance matrix corresponding to the $M$ maximum eigenvalues; the proof can be found in [9].

As explained above, it is demonstrated that the optimal $V_A^*$ consists of the maximum $M$ eigenvectors of the covariance matrix. This means that the proposed method mathematically obtains the optimal solution from the secret key rate aspect. Bob’s pre-coding vector can be obtained similarly. In addition, it can be concluded from Equation (12) that:

$$I(h_A; h_B) = \log_2 \left( \frac{|R_A||R_B|}{|R_A - R_B||R_A + R_B|} \right).$$ (20)

The block diagram for the proposed system is shown in Figure 2.

**3.1 Comparison between SVD and PCA**

In this subsection, a comparison between SVD and PCA is presented. The SVD decomposes a diagonalizable matrix into special matrices that are straightforward to handle and to analyze; however, the PCA method maps some data linearly into different properties that are not correlated with each other. Meanwhile, PCA can use various algorithms to implement the principal component analysis such as Eigenvalue Decomposition of the covariance matrix. It is faster than SVD, but less accurate. Another algorithm is Alternating Least Squares (ALS) algorithm, which uses an iterative method with a random seed. It is designed to handle missing values [23].

The PCA-based approach is used to break down $R_A$ into $U_A A_A V_A^{H*}$, only if $R_A$ is a square matrix. Hereby, one result can be expanded for all matrices using SVD, which indicates the numerical advantages of this approach. The matrices $R_A R_A^*$ and $R_A^* R_A$ are symmetric, square, positive semi-definite with positive eigenvalues, and both have the same rank. Since they are symmetric, it is inferred that their eigenvectors must be orthonormal. This is an essential property for symmetric matrices [24]. Therefore, using SVD, $R_A$ does not require to be square. The eigenvectors for $R_A R_A^*$ are shown as $u_i$ and $R_A^* R_A$ shown as $v_i$ and these sets of eigenvectors are called $U_A$ and $V_A$ singular vectors of $R_A$. The square roots of these eigenvalues are called singular values.

Comparing to Eigen-decomposition, SVD works on non-square matrices. $U_A$ and $V_A$ are invertible for any matrix in SVD and they are orthonormal. Besides, singular values are numerically more stable than eigenvalues [25]. Although the PCA-based method mathematically has an optimal performance for using in channel decorrelation and key extraction systems, the numerical aspect has not been considered yet in similar research efforts.

![Figure 1. The block diagram for the proposed system](image-url)
Using SVD has some numerical advantages over the PCA. A suitable approach for calculating PCA on a computer is needed to directly implement the eigenvalue decomposition of \( \mathbf{R}_A \).

It results in some computational complexity that could be decreased by adopting SVD. Let \( \tilde{\sigma}_i \) be the output of an algorithm calculating singular values for \( \mathbf{R}_A \), and \( \sigma_i \) be the appropriate singular value, it can be shown that:

\[
|\tilde{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| = O(\epsilon \|\mathbf{R}_a\|).
\]

where \( \|\mathbf{R}_a\| \) is a measure of the size of \( \mathbf{R}_a \). On the other hand, for an algorithm that calculates the eigenvalues \( \lambda_i \) of \( \mathbf{R}_A \mathbf{R}_a^T \), it can be shown as:

\[
|\tilde{\lambda}_i - \lambda_i| = O(\epsilon \|\mathbf{R}_a\|^2) = O(\epsilon\|\mathbf{R}_a\|^2).
\]

which in terms of the singular values of \( \mathbf{R}_A \), it can be written as:

\[
|\tilde{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| = O\left(\epsilon \frac{\|\mathbf{R}_a\|^2}{\sigma_i}\right).
\]

Ultimately, when small singular values, e.g. \( \sigma_i \ll \|\mathbf{R}_a\| \) are needed, using \( \mathbf{R}_A \) will result in more accurate output than using \( \mathbf{R}_A \mathbf{R}_a^T \).

4. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we simulate some examples to evaluate the performance of our proposed method. The Monte Carlo simulation is adopted using MATLAB to model both the SVD and PCA algorithms. In all simulation examples, we assume that the OFDM symbols undergo Rayleigh fading. Moreover, channel realizations are based on statistical distributions presented in [20]. In our simulation studies, some curves are presented for both dependent and independent of frequency domains to assess the effect of the SVD. Some verifications are further done to demonstrate the optimality of the proposed SVD-based pre-coding. Meanwhile, our proposed method is compared with a PCA-based pre-coding method in both the MI and computational complexity aspects. As a case study, we focus on the de-correlation algorithms for channel measurement with frequency correlation in the OFDM model. Channel measurements are generated by the channel responses of all the sub-channels of an OFDM symbol.

4.1. Example 1: Considering Correlated Sub-Channels in OFDM Model

In this simulation example, we evaluate the secret key rate for both uncorrelated and correlated sub-channels. We assume that the variance of each sub-channel is random and normalized. The variance of sub-channels utilized in this example is listed in Table 1 for sub-channels.

Figure 3 shows the MI in terms of the SNR in outdoor conditions for constant \( T_n \) and independent sub-channels. As seen, the secret key rate is increased as the SNR becomes greater. Also, the secret key rate increases as the number of sub-channels increases. For \( N=8, 16, 32 \), the secret key rate is increased to 16.19, 27.42, 55.3 bits, respectively, where the target SNR is considered to be 8 dB. This increment in the secret key rate is due to the increase in the number of random sources as the greater number of sub-channels is utilized.

Figure 4 depicts the secret key rate for an OFDM-based system with correlated sub-channels with the above assumptions. As obviously observed, the rate in the dependent scenario is less than the independent scenario because of the correlation between sub-channels. As a result, where the target SNR is 8 dB, the secret key rate is obtained as Independent = 5.139, 8.814, 10.97, 15.17 bits, which are less than the values illustrated in Figure 3 for independent scenarios, for the same number of sub-channels.

Figure 5 illustrates the comparison of the secret key rate for both dependent and independent scenarios for an OFDM symbol including 32 sub-channels. As a result, the values of secret key rate where the target SNR is considered to be 8 dB are obtained as 15.17, 55.3 bits for correlated and independent sub-channels, respectively.

4.2. Example 2: Evaluation of the Performance of Proposed SVD-Based Pre-coding

In this sub-section, an OFDM model including 32 sub-carriers is utilized to do the simulations. Figure 6 shows the covariance matrix of \( \mathbf{h}_A \), \( \mathbf{h}_A \). Each element in this pattern indicates the amount of correlation between the two sub-channels. As an up-down sorting, a significant correlation is illustrated in brown, red and yellow colors, respectively. The first \( M \)

| Number of sub-channels | Variance |
|------------------------|----------|
| \( N = 4 \)           | \( \delta^2 = [1.1819 \quad 1.0935 \quad 0.3597 \quad 0.820] \) |
| \( N = 8 \)           | \( \delta^2 = [1.1194 \quad 0.6190 \quad 0.3706 \quad 0.7079 \quad 1.0966 \quad 0.9597 \quad 1.0638 \quad 0.2884] \) |
| \( N = 16 \)          | \( \delta^2 = [1.1977 \quad 0.9788 \quad 0.9442 \quad 0.7271 \quad 1.5351 \quad 2.0229 \quad 1.3886 \quad 1.4335] \) |
| \( N = 32 \)          | \( \delta^2 = [1.1822 \quad 0.9545 \quad 0.4923 \quad 0.9560 \quad 2.5430 \quad 0.5759 \quad 0.9384 \quad 0.3889] \) |

| Number of sub-channels | Variance |
|------------------------|----------|
| \( N = 4 \)           | \( \delta^2 = [1.1819 \quad 1.0935 \quad 0.3597 \quad 0.820] \) |
| \( N = 8 \)           | \( \delta^2 = [1.1194 \quad 0.6190 \quad 0.3706 \quad 0.7079 \quad 1.0966 \quad 0.9597 \quad 1.0638 \quad 0.2884] \) |
| \( N = 16 \)          | \( \delta^2 = [1.1977 \quad 0.9788 \quad 0.9442 \quad 0.7271 \quad 1.5351 \quad 2.0229 \quad 1.3886 \quad 1.4335] \) |
| \( N = 32 \)          | \( \delta^2 = [1.1822 \quad 0.9545 \quad 0.4923 \quad 0.9560 \quad 2.5430 \quad 0.5759 \quad 0.9384 \quad 0.3889] \) |
rows of $V$ represent the signal subspace and the other rows describe the noise subspace which may be separated. The most important feature of the SVD is that the matrix $U$, which transforms the matrix of correlated sub-channels into a matrix of uncorrelated coefficients is unitary.

Figure 7 illustrates a 3D-view of the covariance matrix values. It should be noted that in our proposed approach, we try to select the elements of the matrix that are effective in the key generation process by discarding the destructive elements.

According to the PCA approach, the covariance matrix of the ideal channel $\mathbf{h}_A$ can be decomposed as $\mathbf{R}_A = \mathbf{U}_A \mathbf{\Lambda}_A \mathbf{U}_A^H$, where $\mathbf{U}_A = [\mathbf{u}_A^{(1)}, \mathbf{u}_A^{(2)}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_A^{(N)}]$ is the transform matrix and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_A$ is a diagonal matrix with some sorted eigenvalues.

After transformation, matrix $\mathbf{H}_u$ is transformed into $\mathbf{Y}_u = [\mathbf{y}_u^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}_u^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_u^{(K-1)}]$ by expanding the CSI estimates with their projections on $\mathbf{Y}_u = \mathbf{U}_u^H \mathbf{H}_u$. Because only a part of $\mathbf{U}$ is used for key generation, column vectors can be re-ordered and a part be chosen as a $M \times K$ matrix $\mathbf{Y}_u$ as $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{V}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{(M)}]$. This is an $N \times K$ matrix and satisfies $\mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{I}_M$, $M \leq N$. The output $M \times K$ matrix $\mathbf{\tilde{Y}}_u$ is obtained by $\mathbf{\tilde{Y}}_u = \mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{H}_u$, where $\mathbf{\tilde{Y}}_u$ is the result of the pre-coding procedure. Figure 7 shows the values of the new covariance matrix as long as we consider the equivalent channel. Figures 8 and 9 show the values of the covariance matrix of $\mathbf{R}_B$ after applying SVD and PCA pre-coding. As seen, the proposed algorithm will eliminate the peaks of the covariance matrix in Figure 9 and the smoother values are well selected.
Figure 8. The covariance matrix of $\mathbf{R}_B$ (Bob) after SVD

Figure 9. The covariance matrix of $\mathbf{R}_B$ (Bob) after PCA

Figure 10 shows a comparison among the effect of the SVD, PCA, SVD and Wavelet matrix transforms on the MI. As expected, the proposed SVD-based method performs better than the other conventional methods from the MI aspect. In our simulations, the conventional OFDM-based key generation rate is first numerically plotted by substituting the covariance matrix $\mathbf{R}_A$ in Equation (13). Then, the transformed channel $\mathbf{R}_A$ is applied to Equation (12). As seen, where an OFDM symbol is utilized including 32 correlated sub-channels, 16 bits are obtained in terms of the key generation rate at a target SNR of 8 dB. It can be observed that using each of the above mentioned transform matrices will lead to improvements in terms of MI.

4. 3. Example 3: On the Optimality of the SVD-Based Pre-coding In this simulation, we aim to obtain a contact zone between the SVD and PCA methods. As a result of SVD based pre-coding, we can achieve this optimal zone in which the performance of both methods are equal and complex. Ultimately, the proposed SVD-based pre-coding has a promising computational complexity. The comparison of MI performance is further performed in Figures 11 and 12 according to the variable $M$ defined in Equation (14), for SNR=20 dB and SNR=10 dB respectively according to the results obtained from 32 correlated sub-channels, the SVD-based method outperforms the PCA-based method for both of the two scenarios.

Figures 12 and 13 show that the proposed SVD-based scheme has a promising superiority in terms of computational complexity due to adopting decomposition property of the SVD and eliminating of the non-related sub-routines of the PCA procedure. Assessment of the results for a case study including 32 correlated sub-channels verifies that the SVD based method achieves the optimal performance while consuming less processing time which is a crucial parameter for high-speed applications in 5G communications and other low-delay demanded secure applications.

Figure 11. A comparison between the MI performance of the SVD and PCA methods for SNR=20db

Figure 12. A comparison between the MI performance of the SVD and PCA methods for SNR=10db
5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, an SVD-based method was addressed for key extraction in OFDM-based communication systems. It was demonstrated that applying our proposed method has considerable advantages over the PCA, WT and DCT-based methods. Having considered a practical assumption, we investigated the effect of correlation among sub-channels on the secret key rate. Moreover, it was numerically shown that if we deal with temporal correlation alongside frequency correlation, KGR decreases and a more accurate value for secret key rate is obtained. Simulation results demonstrated that the computational complexity of our proposed SVD-based pre-coding has promising superiorities as a better MI is obtained.
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Persian Abstract
چکیده
در امنیت مبتنی بر لایه فیزیکی، استخراج کلید امن مسئله‌ای مهم است که در نسل‌های مخابراتی 5G و نسل‌های مخابراتی آتی، روشی با پیچیدگی کم و در عین حال مقاوم می‌باشد. برخلاف تحقیقات گذشته که زیرکانال‌ها در سیستم‌های OFDM مستقل فرض می‌گردیدند، در این مقاله به تأثیر همبستگی زیرکانال‌ها در شبیه‌سازی پرداخته شده است و یک مدل واقعی برای همبستگی زیرکانال‌ها استفاده شده است. نتایج شبیه‌سازی نشان می‌دهد که همبستگی زیرکانال‌ها باعث کاهش اطلاعات متقابل می‌شود. نتایج شبیه‌سازی نشان می‌دهد که اعمال پیش‌پردازش بر روی مقادیر اندازه‌گیری وابسته، منجر به بهره حداقلی 9 دسیbel شده است. همچنین برتری عملکرد SVD نسبت به روش‌های دیگر نظریه این سوال می‌باشد.