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Introduction

- Efficient use of energy while providing an adequate level of connection to individual sessions is of paramount importance in multi-hop wireless networks.
- Nevertheless, the primary goal of a communication network is to deliver an acceptable level of communication network QoS guarantees.
QoS have different interpretations at different communication layers

- Physical layer:
  - bits error rate (BER)

- MAC layer:
  - minimum rate/maximum delay

- Network layer:
  - end-to-end provisioning of the guarantee QoS for each session

Minimum short-term rate requirements and maximum tolerable BERs of the session
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- Interaction among these layers
  (Physical layer, MAC layer, network layer)
- Physical layer
  - Transmit power, modulation level, coding rate, antenna beam coefficients.
  - Restraints both routing and MAC decisions by altering the directed topology graph, feasible transmission schedules, and payload transmission rates
- MAC layer
  - Responsible for scheduling the transmissions and allocating the wireless channels
  - As a result of transmission schedules, high packet delays and/or low bandwidth can occur, forcing the routing layer to change its route decision
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- Network layer
  - Select the wireless link that will eventually carry the data packets
  - Different routing decisions alter the performance of MAC layer
- Cross layer design.
Proposed algorithms

- Assumption
  - The routes are already given.
  - Point-to-point transmissions and no node is permitted to send multiple packets (for the same receiver or not) at the same time
Proposed algorithms

Transmission rate

\[ R(l) = \frac{b_{sym}^l \times R_c^l}{T_{sym}^l} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

- \( b_{sym}^l \) is the number of bits per symbol
- \( R_c^l \) is the coding rate
- \( T_{sym}^l \) is the symbol duration for the transmissions over \( l \)

\[ \gamma_i = \frac{b_{sym}^l \times R_c^l}{L \times T_{sym}^l} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

- \( \gamma_i \) is the constant payload rate for each slot on link \( l \)

\[ k_i^l = \begin{bmatrix} r_i \\ r_l \end{bmatrix} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

- \( r_i \) is the short-term requirement of each session \( i \)
- \( k_i^l \) is the actual number of times slots assigned to a directed link \( l \) of session \( i \)

Virtual Links
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\[ r_1 = 2 \text{ slots/frame} \]
\[ r_2 = 1 \text{ slot/frame} \]
\[ r_3 = 1 \text{ slot/frame} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\text{slot 1} & \text{slot 2} & \text{slot 3} & \text{slot 4} & \text{slot 5} \\
(1,5) & (4,3) & (4,6) & (1,5) & (4,6) \\
(2,4) & (5,7) & (5,7) & & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[ T_{\text{frame}} = 5 T_{\text{slot}} \]
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- BER

\[ SIRN \geq \frac{-\ln(5 \varepsilon)}{1.5} (M - 1) \]

\[ \frac{G_{T(l)R(l)}P_l}{\sum_{\substack{j \neq l \in C(n)} G_{T(j)R(l)}P_j + \sigma^2_{R(l)}}} \geq \gamma_i; \forall l \in C(n) \]

\[ P \geq GP + \beta \]

\( M \) is the modulation level
\( \varepsilon \) is a maximum acceptable BER
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Fig. 2. Block Diagram for Algorithm A.
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Fig. 3. Block Diagram for Algorithm B.
Simulation

Sample Topology with 41 Virtual Links
Simulation

Fig. 5. Ratio of jointly feasible scenarios for 7 sessions and minimum-hop routing.

Fig. 6. Total transmit power averaged over the jointly feasible scenarios for 7 sessions and minimum-hop routing.
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Fig. 7. Ratio of jointly feasible scenarios for 7 sessions and minimum routing.

Fig. 8. Total transmit power averaged over the jointly feasible scenarios for 7 sessions and minimum-power routing.
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Fig. 9. Ratio of jointly feasible scenarios for 15 sessions and minimum-hop routing.

Fig. 10. Total transmit power averaged over the jointly feasible scenarios for 15 sessions and minimum-hop routing.
Conclusion and future works

- A top-down design strategy such as first solving the feasibility problem, then minimizing the power consumption performs better in terms of the objective function.
- The water-filling argument outperforms the top-down design strategy in finding a feasible solution.
- Routing layer plays a dominant role in reducing power consumption, but it happens at the expense of QoS provisioning.
Conclusion and future works

- Try to find a distributed algorithm based on local information
- Try to design the really cross-layer mechanism that jointly performs routing, scheduling, and power control.
- Anycasting services
- Finding the performance limits of wireless multi-hop networks


