

Bandwidth Exchange as an Incentive for Relaying

Dan Zhang, Omer Ileri, Narayan Mandayam



Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

www.winlab.rutgers.edu

{bacholic, narayan}@winlab.rutgers.edu

omer.ileri@radio.kth.se

An Overview of Relay Cooperation

- ❑ Enhance potential connectivity and throughput
- ❑ Essential to ad hoc networks
- ❑ Incurs costs of power, delay, ...
- ❑ Not guaranteed without sufficient incentive

Existing Incentive Mechanisms

- Reputation-based mechanism
- Credit-based mechanism
- Network-assisted pricing

Some difficulties of these approaches:

- Stable currency
- Central system of credit
- Shared understanding of worth
- A good deal of record keeping

Bandwidth Exchange

- Delegate bandwidth for cooperation
- Simple bartering of basic wireless resource
- Avoid unwarranted complexity
- Different implementations
 - Delegate time slots
 - Use spreading codes of different length
 - Use different maximum backoff window
- We study exchanging orthogonal frequency bands


System Model

- N nodes communicating to AP under Rayleigh fading:

$$p(\rho_{ij}) = \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}_{ij}} \exp\left(-\frac{\rho_{ij}}{\bar{\rho}_{ij}}\right)$$

- Each node has its exclusive bandwidth W_i and minimum required rate R_i^{\min}
- Instantaneous rate on link ij is modeled as


$$R_{ij} = W_i \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{\rho_{ij} P_i^T}{W_i} \right) \text{ (bits/second)}$$



Bandwidth Exchange for Two nodes

- When $R_{10} < R_1^{min}$ and $R_{12} \geq R_1^{min}$ node 1 requests relay from node 2
- Delegating part of its bandwidth ΔW_1 to node 2 such that

$$R_1^{min} = (W_1 - \Delta W_1) \log \left(1 + \frac{\rho_{12} P_1^T}{W_1 - \Delta W_1} \right)$$



Bandwidth Exchange for Two nodes


- If node 2 cooperates, it allocates R_1^{min} from the total capacity

$$(W_2 + \Delta W_1) \log \left(1 + \frac{\rho_{20} P_2^T}{W_2 + \Delta W_1} \right)$$

for node 1

- Node 2 will not grant cooperation if the total capacity is less than

$$R_1^{min} + R_2^{min}$$



Two Node Relay Game

Given a snapshot of the channel

- Reserved rate U_i^{NC} : rate achieved without cooperation
- Actual rate U_i : rate achieved with or without cooperation
- Define payoff ("gain"): $u_i = U_i - U_i^{NC}$
 - Reflects the effect of cooperation on rates
 - Without cooperation payoff is zero
 - With cooperation, payoff for source i is R_i^{min}

Static Channel

- ❑ Node 1 and node 2 take a constant strategy
- ❑ With BE potential relay cooperates if payoff is positive, does not cooperate if negative
- ❑ Without BE there is no cooperation since relay always incurs loss of rate
 - Payoff is negative
 - Loss = min required source rate





Illustration of Static Channels with BE

□ Node 2 at $(-100\text{m}, 0)$

AP at origin

$$P_1^T = P_2^T = 100\text{mW}$$

$$W_1 = W_2 = 20\text{MHz}$$


$$R_1^{\min} = R_2^{\min} = 30\text{Mbps}$$

□ cooperation region:
locations (x_1, y_1) of node
1 such that

$$R_{10} < R_1^{\min}$$


$$R_{12} \geq R_1^{\min}$$

$$U_2^C \geq U_2^{NC}$$



Two Node Relay Game in a Fading Channel

- Link gains change from one snapshot to another
- Consider a snapshot with a relay request generated
- WLOG assume $R_1^{min} = R_2^{min} = u_t$
- Request from node 2 to node 1 with probability P
from node 1 to node 2 with probability $1 - P$



Conditional Request Probability

- P is the conditional probability of node 2 sending a relay request to node 1 given there is a request generated in the snapshot

$$P = P_2 / (P_1 + P_2)$$

Unconditional probability that node 1 sends node 2 a request

$$P_1 = \iiint_{\substack{R_{10} < R_1^{min} \\ R_{12} \geq R_1^{min} \\ U_2^C \geq R_2^{min}}} p(\rho_{10}, \rho_{20}, \rho_{12}) d\rho_{10} d\rho_{20} d\rho_{12}$$

Unconditional probability that node 2 sends node 1 a request

$$P_2 = \iiint_{\substack{R_{20} < R_2^{min} \\ R_{21} \geq R_2^{min} \\ U_1^C \geq R_1^{min}}} p(\rho_{10}, \rho_{20}, \rho_{12}) d\rho_{10} d\rho_{20} d\rho_{12}$$

Two Node Relay Game in a Fading Channel

- Normal form with average payoffs

1 \ 2	Cooperation (C)	Noncooperation (N)
C	$(-Pu_1 + (1-P)u_t, Pu_t - (1-P)u_2)$	$(-Pu_1, Pu_t)$
N	$((1-P)u_t, -(1-P)u_2)$	$(0, 0)$

- Proposition:* Without BE (payoff for cooperation is $-u_t$) nodes do not cooperate

1 \ 2	Cooperation (C)	Noncooperation (N)
C	$((1-2P)u_t, -(1-2P)u_t)$	$(-Pu_t, Pu_t)$
N	$((1-P)u_t, -(1-P)u_t)$	$(0, 0)$

efficient NE

How Bandwidth Exchange Helps?

- With bandwidth exchange, the payoff loss is compensated to a certain extent
 - Payoff loss is less than u_t

- In spite of the loss there can still be sufficient incentive for cooperation
 - $\langle C, C \rangle$, $\langle N, C \rangle$, $\langle C, N \rangle$ can Pareto dominate $\langle N, N \rangle$

		2	
		Cooperation (C)	Noncooperation (N)
1	C	$(-Pu_1 + (1-P)u_t, Pu_t - (1-P)u_2)$	$(-Pu_1, Pu_t)$
	N	$((1-P)u_t, -(1-P)u_2)$	$(0, 0)$

Over-Compensation

- *Proposition:* If $u_1 < 0$ (node 1 benefits from the extra bandwidth received) node 1 always cooperates

	2		
1 \		Cooperation (C)	Noncooperation (N)
C		$(-Pu_1 + (1-P)u_t, Pu_t - (1-P)u_2)$	$(-Pu_1, Pu_t)$
N		$((1-P)u_t, -(1-P)u_2)$	$(0, 0)$

The table includes green checkmarks in the (C,C) and (C,N) cells, and red X marks in the (N,C) and (N,N) cells.

- Similarly, if $u_2 < 0$ node 2 always cooperates

Under-Compensation

- What if $0 \leq u_1, u_2 \leq u_t$?
- NE of the stage game is $\langle N, N \rangle$
- Can be quite inefficient

1 \ 2	Cooperation (C)	Noncooperation (N)
C	$(-Pu_1 + (1-P)u_t, Pu_t - (1-P)u_2)$	$(-Pu_1, Pu_t)$
N	$((1-P)u_t, -(1-P)u_2)$	$(0, 0)$

NE

- $\langle C, C \rangle$ can dominate $\langle N, N \rangle$
 - But not a NE, thus unattainable

Repeated Game and Nash Bargaining

- Repeated game in every snapshot
 - Inefficient NE can be avoided
 - Many subgame perfect equilibria (Folk Theorem)

- Need a criterion to settle down to the “best” subgame perfect equilibrium
 - Implemented by a Nash Bargaining Solution with mixed strategies

Nash Bargaining Solution (NBS)

- Exists and unique
- Pareto optimal
- Proportional fair
- With v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n being the correlated payoff profile, it boils down to solving

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{maximize} & \prod_{i=1}^N v_i \\ v_i, i=1,2,\dots,N & \\ \text{subject to} & (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N) \text{ feasible} \end{array}$$

NBS for the Two Node Relay Game

Strategy	Payoff
$\langle N, N \rangle$	$(\tilde{v}_1^1, \tilde{v}_2^1) = (0, 0)$
$\langle N, C \rangle$	$(\tilde{v}_1^2, \tilde{v}_2^2) = ((1 - P)u_t, -(1 - P)u_2)$
$\langle C, C \rangle$	$(\tilde{v}_1^3, \tilde{v}_2^3) = (-Pu_1 + (1 - P)u_t, Pu_t - (1 - P)u_2)$
$\langle C, N \rangle$	$(\tilde{v}_1^4, \tilde{v}_2^4) = (-Pu_1, Pu_t)$

NBS: a set of mixing probs $\lambda_i \geq 0, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, solving


$$\underset{\lambda_i, i=1,2,3,4}{\text{maximize}} \quad v_1 v_2$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad v_1 = \lambda_1 \tilde{v}_1^1 + \lambda_2 \tilde{v}_1^2 + \lambda_3 \tilde{v}_1^3 + \lambda_4 \tilde{v}_1^4$$

$$v_2 = \lambda_1 \tilde{v}_2^1 + \lambda_2 \tilde{v}_2^2 + \lambda_3 \tilde{v}_2^3 + \lambda_4 \tilde{v}_2^4$$


Two Node Nash Bargaining

- A simple geometric interpretation exists
- Feasible set \mathcal{C} for the two node relay game is a parallelogram
- NBS S lies on Pareto boundary
 - Negative gradient of OS is a subgradient of the boundary at S



Possible Locations of NBS


- *Proposition:* if $u_1, u_2 > 0$ NBS can be determined by checking gradients



$$1. \tan B < -\frac{u_t}{u_1} \text{ or } \tan B > \frac{u_t}{u_1}$$
$$\iff S \text{ on } AB$$

Node 2 always cooperates, node 1 cooperates with a probability


Possible Locations of NBS



$$2. \quad -\frac{u_2}{u_t} < \tan B < \frac{u_2}{u_t}$$
$$\iff S \text{ on } BC$$

Node 1 always cooperates,
node 2 cooperates with a
probability

Possible Locations of NBS



$$3. \frac{u_2}{u_t} \leq \tan B \leq \frac{u_t}{u_1}$$

$\iff S$ at B

Both node 1 and node 2 always cooperate

Special Case I – Complete Symmetry

- Identical bargaining power – equal outage probabilities and rate loss
- Typical in an ad hoc network with
 - homogeneous nodes
 - i.i.d. channels
- *Proposition:* if $P = 0.5, u_t \geq u_1 = u_2 \geq 0$ the best strategy for each node is to always cooperate

Special Case II – Symmetric Outage

- Different bargaining power due to different rate loss; but identical outage probabilities
- *Proposition:* If $P = 0.5$, $u_t \geq u_1 > u_2 \geq 0$ node 2 always cooperates; node 1 cooperates with probability

$$P_C = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{u_t}{u_1} + \frac{u_2}{u_t} \right), & u_1 \geq \frac{u_t^2}{2u_t - u_2} \\ 1, & u_1 < \frac{u_t^2}{2u_t - u_2} \end{cases}$$

- Node suffering less rate loss always cooperates
- Other node starts to mix in noncooperation when loss becomes too high

Special Case III – Symmetric Rate Loss

- Different bargaining power due to different outage probabilities; but identical rate loss
- *Proposition:* If $P > 0.5, u_t \geq u_1 = u_2 \geq 0$ node 2 cooperates; node 1 cooperates with probability

$$P_C = \begin{cases} \frac{1-P}{2P} \left(\frac{u_t}{u} + \frac{u}{u_t} \right), & P \geq \frac{u^2 + u_t^2}{(u + u_t)^2} \\ 1, & P < \frac{u^2 + u_t^2}{(u + u_t)^2} \end{cases}$$

- Node sending more requests always cooperates
- The other node starts to mix in noncooperation when the incoming requests becomes too fast


Numerical Results

- Node 2 fixed at $(-100\text{m}, 0)$
- AP fixed at origin
- Node 1 in a $400 \times 600\text{m}^2$ rectangular area

$$P_1^T = P_2^T = 100\text{mW}$$


$$W_1 = W_2 = 20\text{MHz}$$

$$R_1^{\text{min}} = R_2^{\text{min}} = 30\text{Mbps}$$




Request and Cooperation Probabilities

probability node 1 requests
relay cooperation from node 2




probability node 2 grants a
relay request from node 1




Without Bandwidth Exchange...

probability node 1 requests
relay cooperation from node 2




probability node 2 grants a
relay request from node 1




Coverage Area - Outage Prob < 0.1

without BE




with BE




Coverage Area - Outage Prob < 0.01


without BE



with BE



How Much is Average Delegated Bandwidth?



- Node 1 delegates bandwidth for node 2 to cooperate
- Bandwidth measured in MHz
- The closer to node 2, the more bandwidth delegated

N -Node Relay Game with BE

- Under flow splitting and multi-hop, BE can still be defined
 - Exponentially increasing relay configurations
 - Requires simplification and heuristic algorithms
- NBS requires convex optimization tools
 - Geometric approach no longer feasible
- Only flows of few hops are of practical interest, restricting the number of relays

Conclusion

Bandwidth Exchange

- Simple resource-bartering incentive mechanism
- Triggers extensive cooperation
 - greatly enhances connectivity
 - also enhances rates
- Motivates the need to explore other resource exchange mechanisms