

Enhancing Quality of Experience in Telecommunication Networks: A Review of Frameworks and Machine Learning Algorithms

Parsa H. S. Panahi , Amir H. Jalilvand , Abolfazl Diyanat , *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—The Internet service provider industry is currently experiencing intense competition as companies strive to provide top-notch services to their customers. Providers are introducing cutting-edge technologies to enhance service quality, understanding that their survival depends on the level of service they offer. However, evaluating service quality is a complex task. A crucial aspect of this evaluation lies in understanding user experience, which significantly impacts the success and reputation of a service or product. Ensuring a seamless and positive user experience is essential for attracting and retaining customers. To date, much effort has been devoted to developing tools for measuring Quality of Experience (QoE), which incorporate both subjective and objective criteria. These tools, available in closed and open-source formats, are accessible to organizations and contribute to improving user experience quality. This review article delves into recent research and initiatives aimed at creating frameworks for assessing user QoE. It also explores the integration of machine learning algorithms to enhance these tools for future advancements. Additionally, the article examines current challenges and envisions future directions in the development of these measurement tools.

Index Terms—quality of experience, assessment frameworks, multimedia, next-generation networks, machine learning

WIRELESS networks serve diverse purposes in contemporary scenarios [1]. Among the myriad applications deployed on wireless networks, those prioritizing quality of service (QoS) are becoming increasingly prevalent. Examples of such applications include video streaming, VoIP service, real-time monitoring, and network control [2]. The distinctive feature of these applications lies in their specific communication requirements, which necessitate careful consideration. The QoS parameter encapsulates the comprehensive performance of a service. For instance, in a VoIP phone call, it becomes imperative to establish minimum requirements for the network facilitating the connection. Deviations from these minimums indicate inadequacies in the overall service performance from the operator's perspective. The minimum QoS requirements for a satisfactory phone call typically encompass the following criteria [3]:

- The jitter should be maintained at a level lower than 30 milliseconds.
- The packet loss should be kept below one percent.

As the expectations for quality vary among individuals, the reliance solely on QoS parameters have proven insufficient in recent years for ensuring overall customer satisfaction [4]. For instance, consider two users, (A and B). User (A), engaged in gaming services, demands zero tolerance for network delays, while the user (B), on the other hand, is more tolerant of slight delays. Despite encountering the same QoS, these two




Fig. 1. The QoE improvement system operates through a feedback loop mechanism. Users engage with servers to access services, resulting in specific experiences. These experiences, coupled with user-defined data, form the input for the AI system. The AI analyzes this data and generates predictions regarding future user experiences. These predictions are then utilized to optimize the server services offered creating a closed-loop system. This system ensures that user experiences continuously inform ongoing service improvements.

users derive different experiences. The assessment of quality of experience (QoE) has emerged as a burgeoning focus in both research and operational aspects within the telecommunications industry [5]. Given that QoE serves as a reflection of user satisfaction and the overall efficiency of the communication process, its precise calculation holds paramount importance [6]. In contrast to traditional network evaluation criteria such as data rate, the QoE criterion extends its scope to include subjective factors influencing users' perception of the service.

In addition, in commercial environments, QoE plays a vital role in maintaining collaboration and productivity [7]. Poor quality in communication networks can lead to misunderstandings, disruptions, and an overall reduction in efficiency. As organizations increasingly rely on telecommuting and virtual communication tools, focusing on QoE is becoming a strategic priority to ensure effective business productivity management [8]. Additionally, with the emergence of new technologies such as augmented reality (AR) and virtual reality (VR) in communications, we recognize the greater importance of QoE because these applications extensively use an immersive and pervasive user experience to achieve their desired impact [9]. It is expected that mobile network operators (MNOs) will need to keep up with the growing demand for QoE and maintain high QoE standards for various applications (*i.e.*, videos). This compels MNOs to strive for a thorough understanding of users' QoE to aid in network planning, provisioning, and traffic management [10].

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, extensive research has been conducted in the field of QoE, leading to the identification of two notable survey papers referenced in Ref. [11] and Ref. [12]. The survey paper

in [11] delves into QoE assessment methods in multimedia services. The authors comprehensively address QoE definitions, influencing factors, and subjective and objective methods. The paper also explores various QoE assessment models and methods, outlining specific characteristics of emerging technologies *e.g.*, AR, and video games. Additionally, it introduces influencing factors on QoE in these domains and examines machine learning (ML) models and algorithms for QoE prediction. The survey paper referenced in [12] explores the impact of the sixth generation of mobile networks (6G) on enhancing QoE for multimedia applications in mobile-health (m-Health). It investigates how 6G features, including configurable smart surfaces, terahertz communications, and ultra-reliable low-latency communications, contribute to QoE enhancement in multimedia applications for m-Health.

Despite the topics addressed in the mentioned survey papers, there has been comparatively less focus on available QoE measurement tools. The importance of QoE measurement tools encompassing both *closed-* and *open-source* alternatives is underscored by their pivotal role in assessing and improving user satisfaction within communication networks. As illustrated in Fig. 1, a comprehensive QoE improvement system, based on the objective method, designed to optimize services provided by servers incorporates the measurement tools (depicted as Users + Experiences in Fig. 1) and optimization tools (depicted as AI + Prediction in Fig. 1). In this system, users interact with servers to receive services, generating experiences. These experiences, along with additional user-defined data, serve as input for an artificial intelligence (AI) model. The AI model analyzes this data and generates predictions regarding future user experiences, which are subsequently utilized to optimize the servers' services. This establishes a closed-loop system wherein user experiences continually inform the improvement of services.

Open-source measurement tools, developed through community collaboration, offer transparency, flexibility, and customization options. In contrast, *closed-source* tools, typically developed by private companies, often provide comprehensive and user-friendly solutions with proprietary support. These tools may incorporate company-owned features, algorithms, and receive ongoing updates. Despite these differences, both *closed-* and *open-source* tools play a vital role in optimizing communication networks by identifying performance constraints, analyzing network behavior, and facilitating optimization. This review article scrutinizes the application, data collection method, and operational scope of the measurement tools, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each. Additionally, the paper explores the application of ML algorithms as a complement to these tools for future developments. Furthermore, the article addresses existing challenges in the QoE measurement field, encompassing data collection, generalizability, user device diversity, interpretability, benchmarking, and privacy considerations.

The subsequent sections of this paper are structured as follows. In § II, an overview of the main concepts in QoE metrics is provided, encompassing definitions, crucial factors, and a comparison with QoS. Moving on to § III, the focus shifts to QoE measurement tools and a model for calculating QoE. This section also delves into open-source and closed-source QoE measurement frameworks, along with their respective properties. The roles of AI algorithms as a complement to

TABLE I
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE MEANINGS

QoS	Quality of Service	QoE	Quality of Experience
VoIP	Voice over IP	AR	Augmented Reality
VR	Virtual Reality	MNO	Mobile Network Operator
LTE	Long Term Evolution	MOS	Mean Opinion Score
HTTP	Hypertext Transfer Protocol	IoT	Internet of Things
ITU	International Telecommunication Union	KPI	Key Performance Indicator
BS	Base Station	UE	User Equipment
CDN	Content Delivery Network		
MEC	Mobile Edge Computing	RAN	Radio Access Network
CFA	Critical Feature Analytics	ML	Machine Learning
SVR	Support Vector Regression	SVM	Support Vector Machine
DT	Decision Tree	RFR	Random Forest Regression
RNN	Recurrent Neural Network	LSTM	Long Short-Term Memory
CNN	Convolutional Neural Network	3D CNN	3D Convolutional Neural Network
DNN	Deep Neural Network	RBFN	Radial Basis Function Network
KNN	K-Nearest Neighbor	LR	Linear Regression
RR	Ridge Regression	GPR	Gaussian Process Regression
ANN	Artificial Neural Network	DL	Deep Learning
TCN	Temporal Convolutional Network	GAN	Generative Adversarial Network




Fig. 2. Four impact factors on user QoE with the corresponding examples [11].

the QoE improvement system feedback loop are explored in Tab. IV. Existing challenges and potential future developments are outlined in § V. Finally, conclusions are presented in § VI. Abbreviations used in this paper are described in Tab. I.

II. KEY CONCEPTS

A. Definition of QoE

At present, the satisfaction of users stands out as a paramount concern for both service and network providers. QoE is a subjective metric that incorporates human parameters and considers the user's perception, expectations, and experience along with application and network performance, providing a more comprehensive understanding of quality as experienced by end users [13]. Based on the ITU-T definition, QoE considers the user's subjective perception and expectations regarding specific services and may be defined as the "degree of delight or annoyance of a user with an application or service" [14]. Available methods for QoE assessment rely primarily on user surveys and scores which are highly dependent on subjective criteria and require considerable time and processing costs. Until now, considerable efforts and investments from industry study groups and universities have been directed towards delivering reliable services with personalized user experiences [15]. Factors associated with users, systems, services, applications, or contextual conditions that could impact QoE are termed influencing factors [14]. Broadly, these factors encompass elements such as the type and characteristics of the application or service, usage context,

meeting user expectations, user cultural background, socio-economic aspects, psychological state, and ultimately, the user's emotional state [16], [17].

B. Impact Factors in QoE

As shown in Fig. 2, the impact factors in QoE are summarized in the following four categories:

- **Human-related:** refers to any variable human characteristics such as motivation, attention level, emotional state, or any fixed attributes *e.g.*, age, gender, visual and hearing acuity. The population and socio-economic context, physical and mental structure, or the user's emotional state may also be described by human-related factors [15].
- **System-related:** refers to parameters that exist at the technical level. Characteristics such as delay, throughput, packet loss, encoding, storage, video buffering strategies, system hardware, rendering and reproduction, and media display are examples that relate to the transport network and the physical layer of a communication link [18].
- **Context-related:** context-related factors are user environmental factors such as location, transient information like mobility, social factors like the presence of other people, or the purpose of using the service, *e.g.* entertainment or educational reasons [19].
- **Content-related:** content-related factors consider the distinct characteristics of video streaming *e.g.* encoding rate, format, resolution, duration, video quality, and age, type, and popularity of the video [17].

C. Distinguishing QoS and QoE

In the context of obtaining service from cellular network infrastructure, as depicted in Fig. 3, distinctions between network quality, QoS, and QoE become apparent. This infrastructure comprises a core network (CN), a radio access network (RAN), and a device, referred to as user equipment (UE). When a user initiates video playback, network quality encompasses the Internet quality, CN, and RAN. Specifically, issues such as video stalling caused by encryption algorithm problems in the user's browser media player are not classified as network quality concerns. On the contrary, QoS encompasses matters related to the user's device, such as blurred video resulting from an incompatible video player.

QoE also considers user expectations. For example, if the video occasionally experiences quality drops but its playback continuity is fine, it may meet the user's expectations. This relates to the user's QoE and is not within the scope of network quality and QoS. As a result, QoE represents a complete end-to-end experience. To highlight the difference between the two QoE and QoS concepts, we need to consider the following:

- 1) We view QoE as end-to-end, signifying that its calculation initiates when a user sends the first request in the application to the server or acts to start up the system.
- 2) QoS solely focuses on the network and is calculated based on the delivery of packets from the server until they reach the client-side application; it does not take into account the user.
- 3) We may have various and numerous network issues (**bad** QoS), but the viewer watches the video smoothly and desirably (**good** QoE).

- 4) Our network may work flawlessly and perfectly (**good** QoS), but the viewer may not have a good experience watching the video (**bad** QoE).

III. QoE MEASUREMENT TOOLS

A. QoE Optimization platform

Gathering authentic user data to train AI models for precise QoE prediction is pivotal for optimizing network resources. However, this process is intricate. Hence, developing tools to automatically and precisely record user-perceived QoE parameters (such as video quality, stalls, etc.) is imperative in communication systems. Ensuring the reliability and accuracy of these tools is paramount, achieved through validation via user opinion comparisons and integration of results from different tools to gain a comprehensive understanding of user QoE, especially under complex and non-uniform network conditions.

- Ability to properly simulate user behavior when interacting with video services,
- Automatic recording of key parameters,
- Calculation of scores based on real values, *e.g.* mean opinion score (MOS),
- Ability to validate by comparing results with subjective data from real users.

In Fig. 4, subjective scenario is depicted for collecting and measuring service quality in video streaming media, following the ITU P.1203 standard. This scenario encompasses the following steps:

- 1) The Selenium WebDriver first opens the HTTP adaptive streaming (HAS) service website.
- 2) Following that, a specific video is searched,
- 3) The identified video is then selected,
- 4) The start button is located and clicked in this step,
- 5) If an advertisement is played, its skip button is activated in this step,
- 6) Part of the video, as defined in the startup file, is observed by the program at this stage,
- 7) After watching the designated segment of the video, the HAR file is extracted from the WebDriver via Selenium,
- 8) Within the HAR file, the .ts files are isolated (using regular expressions) and compiled into a list. Subsequently, these files are downloaded and stored in a designated folder, the service quality of each file is then calculated and transmitted one by one according to the ITU P1203 standard,
- 9) These scores are associated as labels with the video data and subsequently stored in a database.

The aim of this process is to acquire labeled data for training an ML model. Additionally, the program can be distributed and executed on user devices, facilitating the distributed training of the ML model. The precise assessment of QoE relies heavily on the accuracy and comprehensiveness of data collected from user experiences. The latest measurement tools and their attributes will be studied in the following subsections.

B. Closed-source platforms

Tab. II dives into the key features of closed-source QoE collection tools, exploring their practical applications, data collection methodologies, and unique functionalities. Ref. [21]




Fig. 3. Network quality, QoS, and QoE domain within a cellular network infrastructure.

TABLE II
CLOSED-SOURCE QoE MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORKS: APPLICATION, DATA COLLECTION METHODS, AND KEY FEATURES

Ref.	Year	Application	Data Collection Method	Features
[21]	2011	IPTV networks	Performing objective experiments using a network platform	Measuring the network parameters and their impact on QoE
[22]	2012	Optimizing mobile networks	Subjective tests on users, collecting network performance data through software agents	Ability to combine user QoE information and technical parameters, high model accuracy
[20]	2015	Optimizing QoE based traffic	Utilizing YoMoApp to simulate YouTube behavior	Passive measurement method used on the client side
[23]	2015	QoE of YouTube video service users in mobile networks	Using YoMoApp to measure QoE video variables in mobile networks and performing subjective tests	High tool accuracy in capturing user experience, applicability in QoE studies
[24]	2016	CFA algorithm based on video domain insights	Using real data collected from video users including user QoE measurements and session features	High prediction accuracy, scalability, leveraging fresh data
[25]	2017	Passive in-smartphone network traffic measurements	Using data collected from a field trial in operational cellular networks	Combining objective and subjective measurements for QoE evaluation
[26]	2019	A 5-step framework for measuring IoT service QoE	Conducting MOS survey of institutional IoT service users in Jakarta smart city using ACR-HR scale	Cohesive framework for measuring QoE in IoT services, using real data
[27]	2019	A framework for proactive management of LTE networks based on user QoE	Using LTE network performance data of a national operator at cell level over 5 weeks	Comprehensive framework for proactive network management
[28]	2023	Detecting quality issues in a video stream	Using Appium, Selenium and IR tools to control devices and detect displayed frames	Automation, applicability to various devices, visualization, high accuracy
[29]	2023	A solution to display video quality based on location, application, device, etc.	Using Sandvine's traffic analytics solution to measure video KPIs and QoE	Accurately measuring and classifying encoded videos and displaying comprehensive video quality
[30]	2023	Evaluating 5G service user QoE	Using a network lab to evaluate user QoE for mobile apps and services	High control and repeatability, flexibility for various apps and services




Fig. 4. Streamlining service quality assessment: Leveraging the ITU P.1203 standard for video streaming metrics analysis.




Fig. 5. MOS analysis conducted to assess stalls occurring in video playback under varying network conditions [20].

presents a framework, consisting of a video server, network simulator, and receiver. The impact of different network parameters on users' QoE in IPTV networks has been studied in this framework. An algorithm for network management based on user QoE has been proposed in this reference. Ref. [22] provides a tool for decision-making regarding optimizing mobile networks by combining user QoE information (collected through subjective experiments) and network technical parameters (collected by software agents). This tool enables accurate QoE prediction using the PSQA method and neural




Fig. 6. CFA algorithm results: Categorized by Content delivery networks (CDNs), edge nodes, and different cities [24].

network. The proposed model has very high accuracy in QoE classification. In Ref. [24], as shown in Fig. 5, the authors have plotted the MOS versus total stalls measured by YoMoApp, for each network condition. The authors have observed and analyzed the relationship between stalling and users' perceived quality. Thus, the performance accuracy of the YoMoApp tool is validated with human subjective evaluations. Ref. [23] used the YoMoApp tool to measure key performance indicators related to YouTube video users' QoE in mobile networks using HTTP adaptive encoding. This tool records important parameters (stalling and video quality) and has shown high accuracy in user experience capturing through subjective testing.

Accurate prediction of user QoE is crucial for significant service improvements, considering the complex and variable factors that influence it. Therefore, there is a recognized need for appropriate algorithms. Ref. [24] presents an algorithm leveraging insights from the video domain with high accuracy and scalability. This algorithm demonstrates significant improvements across key quality metrics, as illustrated in Fig. 6. In Ref. [25], ML-based QoE prediction models are introduced, utilizing data collected from a field trial in cellular networks. The data includes passive in-smartphone network traffic measurements and crowdsourced user QoE feedback. The best model presented in this paper achieves high accuracy (over 90%) in predicting user QoE by combining objective and subjective measurements. In Ref. [26], a five-stage framework is introduced for measuring and evaluating the QoE of IoT services. This framework involves defining services and QoE parameters, determining users, conducting mean opinion score surveys using the ACR-HR scale for quantitative results, and extracting strategic implications. The framework is evaluated using real data from an IoT services user survey in the smart city of Jakarta. The results presented in this reference indicate an improved user experience following IoT implementation in public services.

In Ref. [27], a framework for proactive management of LTE networks based on user QoE has been introduced, leveraging a large volume of real network performance data at the cell level of a national operator over five weeks. Various ML algorithms have been employed to predict QoE parameters, demonstrating high accuracy in predicting certain parameters, including user throughput and handover success rate. In Ref. [31], a QoE analysis system with the following features has been introduced:

- Examining influencing factors on QoE, including encoding profile, network, and device,
- Stating requirements for a QoE analysis tool,
- Presenting a framework design for video streaming QoE analysis




Fig. 7. QoE-DASH Architecture: From the UE Layer to the Cloud Server [36].

- Explaining the video recording and analysis method,

The results of this research can be summarized as follows:

- 1) Stalling and video quality are among the most important criteria affecting user QoE in YouTube video streaming,
- 2) The YoMoApp tool is capable of simulating YouTube behavior and accurately measuring QoE-related parameters,
- 3) The results of this tool are consistent with user subjective evaluations,
- 4) This tool can be utilized to evaluate mobile network performance and optimize QoE-based traffic.

Ref. [29] introduces a laboratory framework to measure and evaluate user QoE for various applications and services. This framework defines diverse network scenarios, simulates real-world conditions, measures relevant parameters, and calculates a QoE score for each test. Ref. [30] employed subjective tests using a testbed to assess the impact of network conditions on user QoE in mobile cloud gaming. The study in [30] identified significant gender differences in QoE and found a 200ms delay every 15 seconds to be optimal for the tested CS:GO game.

C. Open-source platforms

This section delves into open-source platforms designed for QoE measurement. Tab. III showcases various open-source tools that collect QoE data, providing valuable insights into their applications. Ref. [32] introduces an Android app that assesses YouTube user QoE. It measures network performance parameters and converts them into QoE scores to gauge user satisfaction. This platform validates existing theoretical models through a pilot study with feedback from 17 Android users, even proposing an alternative empirical model based on the data collected. Ref. [33] introduces VLQoE, a tool for evaluating video QoE on smartphones. VLQoE records various parameters simultaneously, including inter-frame delays and user reactions. It excels in predicting QoE by accurately modeling video stalls, making it valuable for QoE optimization studies. Another open-source framework is discussed in Ref. [34], reflecting end-user perception of mobile broadband services by simulating key quality indicators. This framework, utilizing real data from three mobile operators, assesses the impact of transport protocols on QoE. Its implementation through open-source tools ensures result reproducibility.

Addressing the significance of user QoE in IoT multimedia services, Ref. [35] suggests using the proposed pure boost score as a metric for QoE measurement. It introduces a model

TABLE III
OPEN-SOURCE QoE MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORKS: APPLICATION, DATA COLLECTION METHODS, AND KEY FEATURES

Ref.	Year	Application	Data Collection Method	Method Features (Programming Language)
[32]	2014	Presenting an Android app to evaluate YouTube user QoE	Pilot experiment with 17 users and collecting network performance and app data	Evaluating YouTube user QoE on Android devices Java and Kotlin
[33]	2015	A tool for evaluating video QoE on smartphones	Objective experiments on smartphones, developing and analyzing a software tool for evaluating video QoE	Simultaneously recording various QoE-related parameters, accurate modeling of video stalls
[34]	2015	A model for evaluating QoE in mobile broadband services	Data collected from three mobile operators. The framework simulates key quality indicators.	Real data and result re-productibility
[35]	2019	QoE in IoT multimedia services	Simulation using randomly generated data	a model for resource estimation based on QoE, easy implementation (Java)
[36]	2022	Introducing QoE-DASH as a tool for simulating DASH adaptive video streaming	Using the QoE-DASH simulation tool to evaluate different storage and recommender algorithms	Simulating diverse video streaming scenarios, supporting multiple QoE metrics (Python, JavaScript)
[37]	2023	Introducing the Daily Video mobile app for long-term QoE studies	Using a designed app called Daily Video to simulate real-world video consumption and collect daily subjective quality evaluations from users	Simulating actual usage of video services, ability to study user behavior and habits over time (Python, JavaScript, React Native)
[38]	2023	A tool for fast crowdsourcing QoE evaluation	Using a crowdsourcing framework and simulation based on real data	Reducing cost and measurement delays, reusability, (Python)
[39]	2023	A tool for evaluating containerized video quality	Conducting objective experiments using provided software on video samples	Applicability on different operating systems, using 14 video quality metrics (Python, Bash)
[40]	2024	A tool for extracting video and network parameters to estimate QoE using ML	Using Selenium and ITU P.1203 standard to calculate video MOS and implementation in simulated and real modes	Simulating diverse video streaming and network scenarios, ability to calculate real-time MOS (Python, Bash)

that calculates the QoE ratio, aiding in estimating required resources and optimal allocation. Ref. [36] introduces the QoE-DASH simulator tool, designed for evaluating caching and recommendation algorithms in multi-access edge computing networks. This open-source tool facilitates the simulation of diverse adaptive DASH video streaming scenarios and network conditions, supporting multiple QoE measurement metrics. The QoE-DASH architecture, depicted in Fig. 7, encompasses the following features:

- 1) **UE**: represents users in the network topology, simulated using the containerized version of goDASH. UEs are responsible for streaming requested videos based on user preferences.
- 2) **BS**: representing the RAN device in the topology. It is simulated using Open vSwitch and plays a crucial role in connecting UEs to the infrastructure.
- 3) **MEC Host**: a containerized HTTP server representing Cache in the topology. In comparison to the cloud, MEC Host operates faster but does not store all content and video representations.
- 4) **Cloud**: another containerized HTTP server that contains all contents and video representations. The Cloud serves as a place for data storage in the actual cloud infrastructure.

It is important to note that the connections between these components are established through web sockets. The UE initiates video requests to either the MEC Host or the Cloud. If the requested video is available on the MEC Host, the UE receives it more rapidly; otherwise, the video is retrieved from the Cloud with a slightly increased delay. In the study presented in Ref. [37], the daily video mobile app functions as a tool for conducting extensive QoE assessments in video services. By simulating real video consumption in daily life and collecting subjective evaluations on a daily basis, this tool enables the examination of user behavior over an extended period. The app's diverse capabilities, such as scheduling,




Fig. 8. The 3-layer architecture of Daily Video software consisting of a server, a client, and user layers.

customized questions, and immediate access to user feedback, enhance flexibility in experimental setups. As depicted in Fig. 8, the 3-layer architecture outlining the Daily Video app includes:

- **Server**: acts as a central point for information storage and exchange, accessible through web interface, REST API, and SSH interface. The server is designed using standard web app tools and architecture.
- **Client**: refers to researchers responsible for managing experiments, scheduling, and monitoring them using Python scripts.
- **Mobile App**: developed using the React Native framework and Expo support. This app incorporates key features, *e.g.*, interactive scheduling and video synchronization necessary for longitudinal studies.

The VidPlat tool, as described in Ref. [38], offers an innovative interface for conducting dynamic and effective QoE measurements. Its significance lies in addressing a limitation observed in traditional tools, where the determination of all samples (video samples or web pages with different qualities to be rated by users) and the required number per sample must occur before initiating a crowdsourcing task. VidPlat




Fig. 9. The QoE Measurement Framework described in [40] consists of User personal computers and Servers. In this framework, servers emulate various networks, each identified as a unique network profile within individual Docker containers.




Fig. 10. Comparison of researcher interfaces between previous QoE measurement tools and VidPlat [38]. Before the crowdsourcing task, previous tools required predefining all samples (N demos) and the number of ratings per sample (M times). VidPlat introduces a generator logic that dynamically determines the next sample for each user based on prior ratings, combining all necessary QoE measurements into a single integrated task without needing to prespecify the samples and rating counts.

introduces a noteworthy feature, allowing the definition of a generator logic or algorithm instead of specifying predetermined samples. This dynamic logic autonomously decides on the required next samples based on user ratings and feedback, as illustrated in Fig. 10. Furthermore, VidPlat determines the next sample for each evaluator, facilitating the combination of all necessary user QoE measurements into a single task. This innovative approach eliminates the need to predefine all samples and required ratings per sample.

In [39], a containerized tool for evaluating video quality is introduced that is capable of calculating 14 quality metrics from different categories. This tool supports various operating systems and offers both a graphical user interface and a command-line interface to collect data by conducting objective experiments on video samples. The experiment results demonstrated that the tool achieved real-time video quality evaluation with less than 5 milliseconds of computation time per metric on average. Compared to existing non-optimized video quality evaluation algorithms that can take over 100 milliseconds per metric, the containerized tool showed significant performance gains.

Additionally, [40] presents a comprehensive framework for




Fig. 11. Classification of AI algorithms utilized across different facets of QoE management.

measuring QoE in video streaming services. This framework automatically collects video data using Selenium and calculates an MOS based on the ITU P1203 standard. The framework employs simpler network parameters instead of more complex ones, and various ML models are successfully trained to predict MOS. As depicted in Fig. 9, the implementation involves two platforms. In the first platform, different internet service providers are used on the personal computers of eight individuals. In the second platform, servers are utilized with simulated network parameters (e.g, high delay or low bit-rate). These simulation profiles cover highly diverse conditions, totaling 42 different profiles.

IV. ML ALGORITHMS

In recent years, the growing popularity of ML algorithms among researchers and professionals in the telecommunications network industry has become apparent [49]. These algorithms contribute intelligence and automation capabilities to decision-making processes within communication networks. Integrating ML into QoE assessment frameworks is crucial in enhancing resource and network management. To explore this intersection of ML and QoE further, the following section reviews specific ML algorithms utilized in QoE management

TABLE IV
A SUMMARY OF KEY ML ALGORITHMS, THEIR CORE CONCEPTS, AND PREDICTIVE RESULTS IN QoE ASSESSMENT.

Ref.	Year	Algorithm	Key Idea	Results
[41]	2020	TCN	Uses TCN for continuous QoE prediction to overcome limitations of LSTM models	96.4% QoE prediction accuracy
[42]	2019	RNN + LSTM	Models complex temporal relationships for continuous QoE prediction	98.5% accuracy in predicting QoE scores
[43]	2019	3D CNN + LSTM	Captures non-linear temporal patterns for QoE prediction in adaptive bit-rate video streaming	High accuracy in predicting subjective QoE scores
[44]	2022	3D CNN + SVR	Models local spatiotemporal video features for stereoscopic video quality assessment	Achieves Pearson correlation of 0.9555 with human perception
[45]	2018	CNN	Learns video artifacts like blurriness and blockiness for gaming video quality assessment	Low complexity makes it suitable for real-time use
[46]	2013	RBFN	Models nonlinear relationships between features and QoE for H.264 video	High accuracy in predicting QoE scores
[47]	2020	GAN	Enhances visual quality of gaming images	Substantial improvement in perceived image quality
[48]	2012	K-Means Clustering	Customized clustering of stereoscopic video content	96.4% accuracy in predicting quality scores for clusters
[49]	2019	DNN	Models the relationship between network parameters and QoE scores in video streaming services	Achieves an accuracy of 97.8% in predicting subjective QoE scores
[50]	2020	RFR	Incorporates RFR into a QoE prediction model for video streaming services to achieve more accurate QoE score predictions	Demonstrates superior efficiency compared to a single DT
[51]	2018	SVR	Models the relationship between QoS parameters and QoE scores of streamed videos, and between gaming video quality parameters and VMAF scores	Achieves a high accuracy of 98.51% in predicting QoE scores
[52]	2019	DT	Leverages DT in building QoE prediction models for streaming video services and 360-degree VR videos	Confirms the high efficacy of DT-based models in accurately estimating QoE scores across various circumstances
[53]	2020	DT	Utilizes DT to estimate VR video QoE by predicting essential VR QoE influence elements including immersion, reality judgment, attention engagement, and acceptability	Relies on subjective assessments as well as objective transmission and video encoding parameters to make predictions

applications. Fig. 11 illustrates the categorization of AI algorithms used in various facets of QoE management. It's important to note that the algorithms employed are not limited to those presented in this paper. Tab. IV summarizes the key ML papers referenced in the articles, including the algorithms utilized, their key ideas, and the achieved results.

A. DNN and CNN

Deep neural networks (DNNs) represent a class of NNs characterized by multiple hidden layers. These networks can establish a mapping from input to output, effectively modeling highly intricate patterns by amalgamating simple functions in each layer. The modeling capacity of DNNs increases with greater depth. In the context of [49], the DNN algorithm is employed to model the relationship between network parameters and QoE scores in video streaming services. In Ref. [49], a DNN-based model is employed to estimate the QoE in mobile video streaming services. The model achieves an accuracy of 97.8% in predicting the subjective QoE scores, as shown in Fig. 12. This high accuracy demonstrates DNN's capability in effectively learning the complex correlations between network characteristics and user perception of video quality represented by MOS. Additionally, DNNs have been utilized for predicting QoE, AR images, and stereoscopic videos. On the other hand, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) constitute a class of DNNs that are well-suited for processing various forms of data, such as images, videos, and audio. These networks incorporate convolutional and pooling layers that excel at extracting spatial and temporal features from the data. CNNs demonstrate proficiency in recognizing complex patterns and finding applications in tasks like classification and regression.

Notably, CNNs have been leveraged in Ref. [43]–[45] for QoE modeling and prediction for the following purposes:

- Predicting QoE of streamed videos like YouTube as in [43], where a QoE prediction model utilizes CNN and LSTM to capture the correlation between input features vector and MOS values,
- Predicting QoE of AR images and stereoscopic videos as in [44], where a stereoscopic video quality assessment model employs 3D CNN architecture to collect local spatiotemporal information automatically.
- Predicting quality of gaming videos as in [45], where a CNN-based quality metric is proposed to evaluate gaming video quality, and a new temporal pooling method based on frame-level predictions is introduced.

A QoE prediction model is presented in Ref. [43] for adaptive video streaming services with DASH standard. The model utilizes a combination of 3D CNN and LSTM to dynamically characterize the correlation between input feature vectors containing QoS metrics and subjective MOS-measured QoE scores. The CNN-LSTM architecture effectively captures the nonlinear temporal patterns induced by adaptive bitrate adjustment. Ref. [44] proposes a stereoscopic video quality assessment model based on 3D CNN and SVR techniques. The model leverages 3D CNN to automatically extract local spatiotemporal video features and integrates them with global temporal clues across frames using SVR. In Ref. [45], a gaming video quality prediction model is introduced, which employs a CNN trained with both objective video multimethod assessment fusion (VMAF) quality metric and subjective quality scores. The CNN-based architecture effectively learns the artifacts present in gaming visual content. Additionally, the model incorporates a temporal pooling scheme on top of




Fig. 12. The proposed approach involves a framework wherein data collection is facilitated through the interfaces of our developed APP. The dataset size is $N \times 93$. For data analysis, 16 key network parameters are initially selected, resulting in a dataset size of $N \times 16$. Subsequently, outliers are removed, reducing the dataset size to $N' \times 16$. In model learning, network structures and a loss function are designed to train the QoE model [49].

frame-level quality predictions by the CNN model. The low complexity of the model makes it suitable for real-time use cases.

B. RFR, SVR, and DT

Random forest regression (RFR) is a supervised ML algorithm designed for performing regression tasks and predicting continuous values. It operates based on numerous decision trees (DT), each constructed using a subset of the training data and employing a distinct set of features—the final prediction results from averaging the outputs of all the trees. In Ref. [50], RFR is incorporated into a proposed QoE prediction model for video streaming services. The goal is to achieve more accurate QoE score predictions by combining results from the ensemble of DTs. RFR demonstrates superior efficiency compared to a single DT and has proven to predict QoE scores with high accuracy.

Support vector regression (SVR), another supervised ML algorithm for regression tasks, excels in modeling nonlinear relationships between variables. Unlike linear regression, SVR is valuable for addressing problems with complex and nonlinear input-output relationships. In Ref. [51], SVR serves two purposes:

- modeling the relationship between QoS parameters and QoE scores of streamed videos,
- modeling the relationship between gaming video quality parameters and Video multi-method assessment fusion scores.

SVR's capability to handle complex nonlinear relationships makes it a suitable choice in both cases, achieving high accuracy in predicting QoE scores.

In Ref. [51], an SVR algorithm is employed to model the relationship between gaming video quality parameters and VMAF scores. SVR achieves a high accuracy of 98.51% in predicting QoE scores. This demonstrates SVR's proficiency in modeling the complex nonlinear correlations between input features like frame rate and output variables such as VMAF. DT stands as one of the most popular supervised ML algorithms for classification and regression. It forms a tree-shaped model where each node represents a test or question on one of the input variables. Based on the answer given at each node, one of the output branches is selected, and the algorithm progresses to the next node. At the leaves of this tree, the class corresponding to the input pattern or the value of the target variable is predicted. DT is known for its simplicity, fast execution, and interoperability. In the

studies referenced by [50], [52], [53], DT is utilized in two QoE prediction models for video streaming services and two QoE prediction models for 360-degree videos. The primary objective is to achieve precise predictions of QoE scores, considering various parameters such as network features and video features. The models based on DTs showcase a notable ability to predict QoE values with high accuracy across diverse scenarios, resulting in satisfactory overall outcomes.

In Ref. [50] and [52], a DT algorithm is utilized in constructing QoE prediction models for streaming video services. Specifically, in [50], DT Regression is employed to predict the QoE scores for DASH video streaming by considering critical network factors. Moreover, Ref. [52] introduces an enhanced neural network architecture composed of multiple steps that utilizes DTs to predict the QoE of 360-degree VR videos. These predictions depend on both network-related and visual content characteristics. Furthermore, DTs are employed in proposals [53] to estimate VR video QoE. This study develops a QoE prediction technique based on DTs aiming to predict essential VR QoE influence elements, including immersion, reality judgment, attention engagement, and acceptability. These predictions are derived relying on subjective assessments as well as objective transmission and video encoding parameters. Overall, the studies confirm the high efficacy of DT-based models in accurately estimating QoE scores across a variety of circumstances.

C. RNN and LSTM

Recurrent neural networks (RNNs) represent a class of NNs well-suited for processing time series data and recognizing time-dependent patterns. Distinguished from regular NNs, RNNs incorporate feedback loops, allowing the output of the previous step to serve as input for the subsequent step. This unique feature enables RNNs to comprehend more intricate temporal patterns. In the context of [43], the RNN algorithm collaborates with long short-term memory (LSTM) to predict QoE in video streaming services. The objective is to model complex temporal relationships and time-dependency inherent in predicting QoE scores. RNNs are combined with LSTM networks to effectively capture the intricate temporal patterns associated with adaptive bit-rate streaming settings. The hybrid RNN-LSTM model demonstrates the highest accuracy in predicting QoE scores.

In Ref. [42], to continuously predict QoE in HTTP adaptive video streaming, a combination of RNN and LSTM algorithms is employed. The model achieves an accuracy of 98.5% in estimating QoE scores based on perceptual visual




Fig. 13. Bidirectional LSTM networks for QoE prediction [42].

quality metrics and re-buffering events. This high accuracy underscores the competence of RNN and LSTM in capturing intricate temporal relationships in a video stream, as depicted in Fig. 13. LSTM is a subtype of RNNs designed to learn long-term patterns in time series data. LSTMs incorporate memory cells capable of retaining information for extended periods, facilitating the learning of longer-term dependencies. The LSTM algorithm, collaborating with RNN for predicting QoE in video streaming services, is introduced in Ref. [43]. The purpose of incorporating LSTMs is to model complex and long-term temporal relationships in the prediction of QoE scores. By combining LSTMs with RNNs, the model adeptly captures the temporal complexity arising from adaptive bit-rate settings in videos. The resultant hybrid RNN-LSTM model achieves the highest accuracy in predicting QoE.

D. TCN

A temporal convolutional network (TCN) is a CNN architecture tailored for processing time series data. By incorporating Dilated Convolutional layers, TCN can adeptly capture longer-term temporal patterns. Additionally, TCN exhibits lower computational complexity compared to RNNs. In the study presented in Ref. [41], as depicted in Fig. 14, the proposed CNN-QoE model for continuously predicting QoE in streaming services leverages TCN. The primary objective is to address the computational limitations associated with LSTM-based models and enhance the accuracy of QoE predictions. The model achieves an accuracy of 96.4%, demonstrating TCN's capability to capture temporal dynamics while overcoming computational constraints associated with recurrent networks.

E. RBFN

Radial basis function networks (RBFNs) are an ANN model utilizing radial basis functions (RBF) in the hidden layer. The network is structured into three layers: input, hidden, and output. Within the hidden layer, numerous nodes incorporate RBF, with the output from the hidden layer serving as input for the output layer. RBFNs excel at modeling nonlinear relationships. In Ref. [46], the RBFN algorithm, recognized as an advanced neural network with strong modeling capabilities, is employed for predicting H.264 video QoE. The objective in utilizing RBFN lies in its high capacity to model intricate nonlinear relationships, enabling accurate predictions of QoE scores. RBFN has demonstrated notable success in predicting QoE scores with high accuracy, as illustrated in Fig. 15.




Fig. 14. The residual block in TCN architecture in [41].




Fig. 15. RBFN-based QoE estimation model for video streaming [46].

F. GAN and SRGAN

Generative adversarial networks (GANs), constitute an ML framework composed of two competitive NNs: a generator network and a discriminator network. These networks are trained in opposition, allowing the generator to produce novel yet realistic synthetic patterns indistinguishable from the original data by the discriminator. In [47], this algorithm is employed to enhance the image quality of compressed gaming content. The objective is to improve the visual quality of gaming videos by generating more realistic and higher-resolution versions. The GANs' application has led to a substantial enhancement in perceived image quality. SRGAN, a specialized GAN model for increasing image resolution, follows a similar structure, comprising a generator for higher-resolution images and a discriminator for distinguishing real from artificial images. Possessing the ability to generate more realistic images with finer details, SRGAN is utilized in [47] to enhance the image quality of gaming content, particularly in cloud gaming services. The implementation of SRGAN has resulted in a significant improvement in perceived image quality.

G. k-Means Clustering

k-Means is an unsupervised and non-hierarchical clustering algorithm in ML. This algorithm clusters data based on similarities present in their features. Initially, k cluster




Fig. 16. Challenges in the design and development of QoE assessment frameworks.

centers are assumed and then data is clustered based on the distance from these centers. In the context of [48], k-Means is employed for customized clustering of video content, focusing on spatio-temporal activities across different depth layers. The objective is to cluster stereoscopic videos based on common features and subsequently predict quality scores for each cluster. The proposed k-means-based algorithm has demonstrated exceptional success in predicting quality scores with an accuracy exceeding 90%. In reference [48], a k-means clustering technique is employed for customized clustering of stereoscopic videos using spatio-temporal features. The algorithm successfully predicts quality scores for different clusters with an accuracy exceeding 96.4%, validating its efficacy in modeling domain-specific patterns.

V. CHALLENGES AND FUTURE HORIZONS

The concept of QoE has garnered significant research interest in recent years and is acknowledged as a pivotal factor in evaluating network operational efficiency. Consequently, QoE measurement and modeling have become increasingly crucial for various multimedia services. Operators have dedicated considerable efforts to providing satisfactory services to their users, prioritizing the end-user experience. However, several key challenges are associated with the development of QoE measurement and prediction frameworks, as depicted in Fig. 16. We will elaborate on these challenges in the following subsections.

A. Data Collection

Collecting user QoE data on a large scale from real sources under various conditions poses a fundamental challenge for both open-source and closed-source tools. As outlined in references [37]–[40], limitations such as restricted user access, unwillingness to share data/feedback, and the high cost of extensive data gathering exist. These limitations act as significant barriers in this domain, particularly for open-source tools relying on voluntary participation. Ensuring the quality and accuracy of collected data is crucial, as highlighted in [28] and [29]. The presence of noise, outlier data, and measurement errors can undermine the accuracy of QoE prediction models. A key challenge, as raised in [30], is training artificial intelligence models using data collected from specific locations such as subways, trains, or crowded stadiums. This is due to the highly non-stationary and variable traffic and network conditions in these places, adding complexity to the model training process. Additionally, different tools exhibit varying capabilities in terms of generalizability to new applications and services, as discussed in [32]–[35].

B. Generalizability Constraints and Standard Dynamics

Most user QoE data collection methods proposed in references [32]–[35] are designed and implemented for a limited

number of applications such as YouTube, posing challenges for open-source and closed-source tools. For instance, these methods may lack the capability to generalize to other applications and multimedia services, as highlighted in [34]. Additionally, adapting these methods to cater to the needs and requirements of new applications is limited, as discussed in [33]. Meanwhile, integrating these different methods to consider multiple applications is a difficult and complex task, according to the analysis in [35].

Currently, there are no specific requirements or standards for selecting metrics, methods, and tools to measure user QoE in open-source and closed-source frameworks. Most researchers and organizations act based on their own conditions and objectives, leading to differences in definitions, metrics, and methods, confusing interpreting and comparing results, as explained in [37]. Developing comprehensive frameworks and standards for QoE measurement to establish a common language and enable comparison of study results is highly important, as emphasized by [38] and [39].

C. User Device Diversity

Today, users access multimedia services using a wide variety of devices, leading to increased complexity in understanding and modeling influencing QoE factors for both open-source and closed-source tools [36], [37]. The diverse hardware and software of these devices contribute to this complexity. Furthermore, the different capabilities of these devices cause users to experience varying quality levels, making their prediction and comparison more challenging [38].

Open-source tools relying on voluntary participation encounter greater challenges in collecting data covering diverse devices compared to closed-source solutions with dedicated data gathering infrastructure [32], [39]. However, closed-source tools also face limitations in terms of flexibility to handle new and evolving devices [33], [40]. Both open-source and closed-source communities still require significant research to identify quality issues stemming from device heterogeneity and to model their impact on user-perceived quality of experience.

D. Lack of Interpretability

Modern ML models, particularly complex neural networks, are often referred to as “black boxes” because they do not offer explanations for their internal logic or the rationale behind specific predictions [11], [12]. However, understanding why a model makes certain QoE assessments could provide valuable insights into significant influencing factors. Interpretable ML models could greatly benefit the analysis and enhancement of communication networks and services to improve user experience. Nevertheless, developing accurate and interpretable QoE models remains a challenging research area due to the intricate dependencies involved [12]. The survey conducted in [11] underscores that while DNN models achieve high accuracy in QoE prediction, they lack interpretability regarding their decision-making process. The authors stress the importance of developing interpretable models to gain insights into key QoE influencing factors. Similarly, [12] discusses the trade-off between model complexity and interpretability in QoE prediction for multimedia applications. The paper notes that although complex models like CNNs and LSTM networks

exhibit strong performance, their black-box nature impedes understanding of the learned relationships.

E. Lack of Comparative Benchmarking

The current research landscape concerning data-driven, ML-based QoE prediction is characterized by numerous isolated contributions, each extensively evaluated on custom datasets. However, to assess progress towards achieving human-level video quality modeling, there is a need for comparative benchmarking using standard evaluation protocols and publicly available datasets. Establishing standardized test conditions by releasing expert-labeled video streaming sessions captured across diverse contexts would facilitate the quantitative assessment of advancements in machine intelligence for QoE modeling. Additionally, implementing comparative leaderboards to track the prediction accuracy of submitted solutions on fixed benchmarks would offer incentives and clarity regarding the state-of-the-art. Therefore, the development of common evaluation platforms for fair and transparent comparisons remains an open challenge.

F. Privacy

Given the critical importance and sensitivity of personally collected user data related to QoE, ensuring the privacy and security of this data has emerged as a significant challenge. Stringent laws and regulations are in place concerning the protection of personal user data. However, compliance with these legal requirements can impose restrictions on researchers regarding data collection, storage, and usage. Therefore, finding a balanced solution to maintain user privacy while retaining access to high-quality data is imperative.

Moreover, with the increasing emphasis on service security and encryption, current models for real-time video quality assessment encounter obstacles. Enhanced encryption measures hinder current video quality assessment models from inspecting and analyzing network packets effectively. Additionally, existing video quality assessment algorithms, which rely on packet inspection, become less efficient in the presence of encryption. Consequently, there is a pressing need to explore alternative solutions to enhance the functionality of current real-time video quality assessment models and address this challenge.

VI. CONCLUSION

The domain of QoE measurement has emerged as a central focus of both research and operational efforts within the telecommunications sector. Understanding and predicting end-user QoE is crucial for optimizing the delivery of multimedia services, shedding light on how network technical aspects impact service quality. Quality assessment encompasses subjective evaluation, relying on human evaluators, and objective techniques, which assess perceived quality using objective metrics. QoE measurement tools, ranging from open-source to closed-source solutions, are instrumental in evaluating and improving user satisfaction across communication networks. The choice between open-source and closed-source tools offers flexibility, considering factors such as cost, performance, and specific user or organizational requirements. This balanced approach contributes to ongoing enhancements in communication experiences. This survey paper highlights the key features

of the latest QoE measurement tools in both closed- and open-source domains. Furthermore, the integration of AI algorithms as a complementary element within QoE optimization frameworks is investigated. The paper addresses challenges associated with tool development, including data collection, generalizability, user device diversity, interpretability, benchmarking, and privacy considerations.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Jayaraman, B. Manickam, S. Annamalai, M. Kumar, A. Mishra, and R. Shrestha, "Effective resource allocation technique to improve qos in 5g wireless network," *Electronics*, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 451, 2023.
- [2] A. A. Jaish and B. K. Al-Shammari, "Quality of experience for voice over internet protocol (voip)," *Wasit Journal of Engineering Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 96–105, 2023.
- [3] B. Adhilaksono and B. Setiawan, "A study of voice-over-internet protocol quality metrics," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 197, pp. 377–384, 2022, sixth Information Systems International Conference (ISICO 2021). [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877050921023772>
- [4] H. J. Kim, D. H. Lee, J. M. Lee, K. H. Lee, W. Lyu, and S. G. Choi, "The qoe evaluation method through the qos-qoe correlation model," in *2008 Fourth International Conference on Networked Computing and Advanced Information Management*, vol. 2, 2008, pp. 719–725.
- [5] H. H. Omar, P. K. Justin, and O. S. D. Tapsoba, "Machine learning based quality of experience (qoe) prediction approach in enterprise multimedia," *JRI 2022: Proceedings of the 5th edition of the Computer Science Research Days, JRI 2022, 24-26 November 2022, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso*, p. 79, 2023.
- [6] C. Hewage and E. Ekmekcioglu, "Multimedia quality of experience (qoe): current status and future direction," *Future Internet*, vol. 12, no. 7, p. 121, 2020.
- [7] V. Menkovski, G. Exarchakos, A. Liotta, and A. C. Sánchez, "Measuring quality of experience on a commercial mobile tv platform," in *2010 Second International Conferences on Advances in Multimedia*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 33–38.
- [8] P. Casas, M. Seufert, S. Egger, and R. Schatz, "Quality of experience in remote virtual desktop services," in *2013 IFIP/IEEE International Symposium on Integrated Network Management (IM 2013)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1352–1357.
- [9] J. Ruan and D. Xie, "A survey on qoe-oriented vr video streaming: Some research issues and challenges," *Electronics*, vol. 10, no. 17, p. 2155, 2021.
- [10] N. Barman and M. G. Martini, "Qoe modeling for http adaptive video streaming—a survey and open challenges," *Ieee Access*, vol. 7, pp. 30 831–30 859, 2019.
- [11] G. Kougiumtzidis, V. Poulkov, Z. D. Zaharis, and P. I. Lazaridis, "A survey on multimedia services qoe assessment and machine learning-based prediction," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 19 507–19 538, 2022.
- [12] M. M. Nasralla, S. B. A. Khattak, I. Ur Rehman, and M. Iqbal, "Exploring the role of 6g technology in enhancing quality of experience for m-health multimedia applications: A comprehensive survey," *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 13, p. 5882, 2023.
- [13] M. Alreshoodi and J. Woods, "Survey on qoe\qos correlation models for multimedia services," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.0221*, 2013.
- [14] K. Brunnström, S. A. Beker, K. De Moor, A. Doms, S. Egger, M.-N. Garcia, T. Hossfeld, S. Jumisko-Pyykkö, C. Keimel, M.-C. Larabi *et al.*, "Qualinet white paper on definitions of quality of experience," 2013.
- [15] K. Bouraqia, E. Sabir, M. Sadik, and L. Ladid, "Quality of experience for streaming services: measurements, challenges and insights," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 13 341–13 361, 2020.
- [16] I. Recommendation, "10/g. 100—vocabulary for performance, quality of service and quality of experience," Technical Report, Tech. Rep., 2016.
- [17] P. Juluri, V. Tamarapalli, and D. Medhi, "Measurement of quality of experience of video-on-demand services: A survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 401–418, 2015.
- [18] I. Sousa, M. P. Queluz, and A. Rodrigues, "A survey on qoe-oriented wireless resources scheduling," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 158, p. 102594, 2020.
- [19] Y. Wang, P. Li, L. Jiao, Z. Su, N. Cheng, X. S. Shen, and P. Zhang, "A data-driven architecture for personalized qoe management in 5g wireless networks," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 102–110, 2016.
- [20] F. Wamser, M. Seufert, P. Casas, R. Irmer, P. Tran-Gia, and R. Schatz, "Yomoapp: A tool for analyzing qoe of youtube http adaptive streaming in mobile networks," in *2015 European Conference on Networks and Communications (EuCNC)*, 2015, pp. 239–243.

- [21] J. Lloret, M. Garcia, M. Atenas, and A. Canovas, "A qoe management system to improve the iptv network," *International Journal of Communication Systems*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 118–138, 2011.
- [22] C. Lozano-Garzon, C. Ariza-Porras, H. Riveros-Ardila, Y. Donoso *et al.*, "Mobile network qoe-qos decision making tool for performance optimization in critical web service," *International Journal of Computers Communications & Control*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 892–899, 2012.
- [23] F. Wamser, M. Seufert, P. Casas, R. Irmer, P. Tran-Gia, and R. Schatz, "Poster: Understanding youtube qoe in cellular networks with yomoapp: A qoe monitoring tool for youtube mobile," in *Proceedings of the 21st Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*, 2015, pp. 263–265.
- [24] J. Jiang, V. Sekar, H. Milner, D. Shepherd, I. Stoica, and H. Zhang, "CFA: A practical prediction system for Video QoE optimization," in *13th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 16)*. Santa Clara, CA: USENIX Association, 2016.
- [25] P. Casas, A. D'Alconzo, F. Wamser, M. Seufert, B. Gardlo, A. Schwind, P. Tran-Gia, and R. Schatz, "Predicting qoe in cellular networks using machine learning and in-smartphone measurements," in *2017 Ninth International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [26] M. Suryanegara, D. A. Prasetyo, F. Andriyanto, and N. Hayati, "A 5-step framework for measuring the quality of experience (qoe) of internet of things (iot) services," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 175 779–175 792, 2019.
- [27] U. S. Hashmi, A. Rudrapatna, Z. Zhao, M. Rozwadowski, J. Kang, R. Wuppalapati, and A. Imran, "Towards real-time user qoe assessment via machine learning on lte network data," in *2019 IEEE 90th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2019-Fall)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [28] Sandvine Corporation, "Video QoE analysis," Sandvine Corporation, Plano, TX, USA, Use case brief, 2023.
- [29] H. Wang, A. P. Aguilar, A. D. Zayas, G. C. Madueño, C. Zhang, N. Hao, and X. Yu, "A general qoe assessment framework for applications and services," *Computer Networks*, vol. 225, p. 109641, 2023.
- [30] M. Blomqvist, "Investigating users' quality of experience in mobile cloud games," 2023.
- [31] E. D. Testing, "Designing the ideal video streaming QoE analysis tool," Eurofins Digital Testing, White paper, 2023.
- [32] G. Gómez, L. Hortigüela, Q. Pérez, J. Lorca, R. García, and M. C. Aguayo-Torres, "Youtube qoe evaluation tool for android wireless terminals," *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, vol. 2014, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2014.
- [33] S. Ickin, M. Fiedler, K. Wac, P. Arlos, C. Temiz, and K. Mkocha, "Vlqoe: Video qoe instrumentation on the smartphone," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 74, pp. 381–411, 2015.
- [34] J. Sandoval, A. Ehijo, A. Casals, and C. Estevez, "New model and open tools for real testing of qoe in mobile broadband services and the transport protocol impact: The operator's approach," *IEEE Latin America Transactions*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 546–551, 2015.
- [35] M. Aazam and K. A. Harras, "Mapping qoe with resource estimation in iot," in *2019 IEEE 5th World Forum on Internet of Things (WF-IoT)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 464–467.
- [36] J. P. Esper, A. C. B. L. Monção, K. B. C. Rodrigues, C. B. Both, S. L. Corrêa, and K. V. Cardoso, "Qoe-dash: Dash qoe performance evaluation tool for edge-cache and recommendation," in *ICC 2022-IEEE International Conference on Communications*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 757–762.
- [37] J. Bulat, L. Janowski, N. Cieplińska, and R. Figlus, "Daily video: A tool for quality of experience (qoe) in long-term context research," *Available at SSRN 4639904*, 2023.
- [38] X. Zhang, H. Li, P. Schmitt, M. Chetty, N. Feamster, and J. Jiang, "Vidplat: A tool for fast crowdsourcing of quality-of-experience measurements," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06698*, 2023.
- [39] W. Moína-Rivera, J. Gutiérrez-Aguado, and M. Garcia-Pineda, "Video quality metrics toolkit: An open source software to assess video quality," *SoftwareX*, vol. 23, p. 101427, 2023.
- [40] P. Hassani Shariat Panahi, "Qoe selenium," <https://github.com/F4RAN/qoe-selenium>, 2024, [Online; accessed 03-January-2024].
- [41] T. N. Duc, C. T. Minh, T. P. Xuan, and E. Kamioka, "Convolutional neural networks for continuous qoe prediction in video streaming services," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 116 268–116 278, 2020.
- [42] T. N. Duc, C. M. Tran, P. X. Tan, and E. Kamioka, "Bidirectional lstm for continuously predicting qoe in http adaptive streaming," in *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Information Science and Systems*, 2019, pp. 156–160.
- [43] N. Eswara, S. Ashique, A. Panchbhavi, S. Chakraborty, H. P. Sethuram, K. Kuchi, A. Kumar, and S. S. Channappayya, "Streaming video qoe modeling and prediction: A long short-term memory approach," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 661–673, 2019.
- [44] M. Utke, S. Zadtootaghaj, S. Schmidt, S. Bosse, and S. Möller, "Ndnnetgaming-development of a no-reference deep cnn for gaming video quality prediction," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, pp. 1–23, 2022.
- [45] J. Yang, Y. Zhu, C. Ma, W. Lu, and Q. Meng, "Stereoscopic video quality assessment based on 3d convolutional neural networks," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 309, pp. 83–93, 2018.
- [46] Y. Kang, H. Chen, and L. Xie, "An artificial-neural-network-based qoe estimation model for video streaming over wireless networks," in *2013 IEEE/CIC International Conference on Communications in China (ICCC)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 264–269.
- [47] N. J. Avanaki, S. Zadtootaghaj, N. Barman, S. Schmidt, M. G. Martini, and S. Möller, "Quality enhancement of gaming content using generative adversarial networks," in *2020 Twelfth International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [48] H. Malekmohamadi, W. Fernando, and A. M. Kondoz, "Automatic qoe prediction in stereoscopic videos," in *2012 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo Workshops*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 581–586.
- [49] X. Tao, Y. Duan, M. Xu, Z. Meng, and J. Lu, "Learning qoe of mobile video transmission with deep neural network: A data-driven approach," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 1337–1348, 2019.
- [50] R. Ul Mustafa, S. Ferlin, C. Esteve Rothenberg, D. Raca, and J. J. Quinlan, "A supervised machine learning approach for dash video qoe prediction in 5g networks," in *Proceedings of the 16th ACM symposium on QoS and security for wireless and mobile networks*, 2020, pp. 57–64.
- [51] S. Zadtootaghaj, N. Barman, S. Schmidt, M. G. Martini, and S. Möller, "Nr-gvqm: A no reference gaming video quality metric," in *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Multimedia (ISM)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 131–134.
- [52] Z. Fei, F. Wang, J. Wang, and X. Xie, "Qoe evaluation methods for 360-degree vr video transmission," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 78–88, 2019.
- [53] M. S. Anwar, J. Wang, S. Ahmad, W. Khan, A. Ullah, M. Shah, and Z. Fei, "Impact of the impairment in 360-degree videos on users vr involvement and machine learning-based qoe predictions," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 204 585–204 596, 2020.