# Probabilistic forwarding of coded packets on networks

#### Vinay Kumar B R, Navin Kashyap Indian Institute of Science

IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT) - 2019 11 Jul, 2019 Paris, France





Sensors in a field



Sensors in a field

Sensors in a field



Update sensing parameters among all nodes

#### Network of IoT nodes



Over-the-air programming of the nodes

Sensors in a field



Update sensing parameters among all nodes

#### Network of IoT nodes



Over-the-air programming of the nodes

#### Broadcast information with the following constraints

#### Nodes:

- Energy constrained
- Limited computational ability
- Limited knowledge of the network

## Algorithm:

- Completely distributed
- Run in finite time

## Abstraction

Broadcast over an ad-hoc network



A network of nodes  $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ . |V| = N. A source node *s* has *k* data packets to be broadcast to all the other nodes in an ad-hoc network.

## Flooding

- Each node forwards every received packet to all its one-hop neighbours.
- Subsequent receptions of the same packet are neglected.
- Total number of transmissions = kN.
- Wasteful <sup>1</sup>: nodes will receive same packet multiple times

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Y.-C. Tseng, S.-Y. Ni, Y.-S. Chen, and J.-P. Sheu, "The broadcast storm problem in a mobile ad hoc network," Wireless Networks, vol. 8, no. 2/3, pp. 153–167, 2002.

- Retransmission probability p.
- Source transmits all *k* packets to all its neighbors.
- ► Each node, upon receiving packet #j for the first time, forwards it to all its neighbours with probability p; does nothing with probability 1 - p.
- Subsequent receptions of the same packet are neglected.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Y. Sasson, D. Cavin, and A. Schiper, "Probabilistic broadcast for flooding in wireless mobile ad hoc networks," in Proc. IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conf. (WCNC) 2003, vol. 2, March 16–20, 2003, pp. 1124–1130.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Z. J. Haas, J. Y. Halpern, and L. Li, "Gossip-based ad hoc routing," IEEE/ACM Trans. Networking, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 479–491, 2006.





















Lesser number of transmissions (*kNp*) compared to flooding (*kN*).

BUT

Information lost even if a single packet out of the k packets is not received.

# Introducing Coded Packets

Coding:

- The source node encodes the k data packets into n coded packets using a Maximum Distance Separable (MDS) code.
- MDS code ensures that reception of any k of the n coded packets by any node, suffices to recover the original k data packets.

#### Probabilistic forwarding of coded packets:

- Source node transmits all n coded packets to its one-hop neighbours.
- Thereafter, the probabilistic forwarding protocol takes over.
   Each packet is forwarded independently of other packets and other nodes.
- Nodes which receive at least k out of n packets are termed successful receivers
- A near-broadcast is when the expected fraction of successful receivers is  $\geq 1 \delta$ .

## Illustration







Packet 1

Successful receivers

Packet 2

Packet 3



- o Received and transmitted the packet.
- • Received but did not transmit the packet.
- • Did not receive the packet.
- Successful receivers

# Formal Problem Statement

#### Given:

- a connected graph  $\mathcal{G}$  with N nodes
- number of data packets, k
- number of coded packets, n
- $\delta$  close to 0.
- retransmission probability p

## Define

•  $R_{k,n} = \#$  nodes that receive at least k out of n coded packets

## Want to find

- $p_{k,n,\delta}$  = minimum p such that  $\mathbb{E}_p[\frac{1}{N}R_{k,n}] \ge 1-\delta$
- $\tau_{k,n,\delta} = \mathbb{E}_{p_{k,n,\delta}}[\text{total } \# \text{ transmissions over all } N \text{ nodes of } \mathcal{G}]$

On what graphs is coding along with probabilistic forwarding beneficial?

## On well-connected graphs



 $31\,\times\,31$  grid

- 1.  $p_{k,n,\delta}$  decreases (to 0) as n increases; for fixed k and  $\delta$ .
- 2.  $\tau_{k,n,\delta} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i$ , where  $T_i$  is the expected number of transmissions of packet *i*.
  - Each term *T<sub>i</sub>* decreases as *n* increases since *p<sub>k,n,δ</sub>* decreases.
  - The number of terms in the above equation increases with *n*.

k = 100 packets and  $\delta = 0.1$ 



Minimum forwarding probability



Expected total number of transmissions

Why  $p_{k,n,\delta} \searrow 0$ ?

 $\begin{array}{l} R_{k,n} = \# \text{ nodes that receive at least } k \text{ out of } n \text{ coded packets.} \\ p_{k,n,\delta} = \inf\{p \mid \mathbb{E}_p[\frac{1}{N} R_{k,n}] \geq 1 - \delta\} \end{array}$ 

- For  $j = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor$ , let  $A_j$  be the event that the *j*th set of *k* coded packets is received by at least  $1 \delta/2$  fraction of the nodes.
- The events A<sub>j</sub> are mutually independent and have the same probability of occurrence.
- For any p > 0, we have  $P(A_j)$  being small but strictly positive.
- Hence,  $P(\text{at least one } A_j \text{ occurs}) \ge 1 \delta/2$  for all sufficiently large *n*, so that  $\frac{1}{N}R_{k,n} \ge 1 \delta/2$  with probability at least  $1 \delta/2$ .
- ▶ Thus, for any p > 0, we have  $p_{k,n,\delta} \le p$  for sufficiently large n.

## On trees

Rooted binary tree of height H = 10 with k = 100 and  $\delta = 0.1$ 



Expected total number of transmissions

- Large fraction of nodes on the leaves
- Unique path from the source to any node on the tree
- It can be shown that

 $p_{k,n,\delta} \approx c \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{H-1}}$ 

for some constant c dependent on H and  $\delta$ .

This gives

$$\tau_{k,n,\delta} \approx n \frac{(2c)^{H} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\frac{H}{H-1}} - 1}{2c \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{H-1}} - 1}$$

which is increasing in n.

# On the grid



Site percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  - Definitions

- Associate each vertex (site) u of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with a Bernoulli(p) random variable  $X_u$ . The vertex is open if  $X_u = 1$ ; else closed.
- ► Two open sites u and v are said to be connected by an open path (u↔v), if there is a path of open sites from u to v.



# Site percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ - Transmitters

- Associate each vertex (site) u of Z<sup>2</sup> with a Bernoulli(p) random variable X<sub>u</sub>. The vertex is open if X<sub>u</sub> = 1; else closed.
- ► Two open sites u and v are said to be connected by an open path (u↔v), if there is a path of open sites from u to v.



- Probabilistic forwarding of a single packet over Z<sup>2</sup> is modelled by site percolation on Z<sup>2</sup> conditioned on the origin **0** being open.
- Nodes transmitting the *j*th packet (for fixed *j* ∈ [*n*]) may be viewed as open sites of a site percolation process which are connected to the origin by an open path. Call this cluster of nodes as C<sup>o</sup><sub>j</sub>.
- The total number of transmissions is simply  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |C_i^o|$ .

## Site percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ – *Receivers*

- ► The boundary, ∂C<sup>o</sup><sub>j</sub>, is the set of all closed sites which are adjacent to a site in C<sup>o</sup><sub>i</sub>.
- The set C<sup>o+</sup><sub>j</sub> := C<sup>o</sup><sub>j</sub> ∪ ∂C<sup>o</sup><sub>j</sub> is called the extended cluster of the origin.



For site percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , there exists  $p_c \in (0,1)$  s.t. for  $p > p_c$ ,

- There exists a unique infinite open cluster (IOC), *C*, almost surely.  $p_c \approx 0.59$  for site percolation.
- Hence, there also exists a unique infinite extended cluster (IEC),  $C^+ = C \cup \partial C$ , a.s..
- $\theta(p) :=$  percolation probability, i.e.,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{0} \in C)$  $\theta^+(p) := \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{0} \in C^+)$

**Lemma:**  $\theta^+(p) = \frac{\theta(p)}{p}$ . Proof:  $\{\mathbf{0} \in C\} = \{\mathbf{0} \in C^+ \text{ and } \mathbf{0} \text{ is open}\}$ 

## Ergodic theorems

For  $p > p_c$ , if C is the unique IOC and  $C^+$  is the unique IEC, then,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\frac{|C\cap\Gamma_m|}{m^2}=\theta(p)\qquad a.s.$$

Similarly,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\frac{|C^+\cap\Gamma_m|}{m^2}=\theta^+(p)\qquad a.s.$$

Using DCT, expected values also converge.





## Site percolation and probabilistic forwarding

- Prob. forwarding of a single packet over  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is modelled by site percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  conditioned on the origin **0** being open.
- *n* pkts  $\leftrightarrow$  *n* independent site percolations with **0** open in all.
- $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m) :=$  {sites in  $\Gamma_m$  that receive at least k out of n pkts}
- We are interested in finding

$$p_{k,n,\delta} = \min\left\{ p \mid \mathbb{E}_p\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left| \mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m) \right| \right] \ge 1 - \delta \right\}$$

## Site percolation and probabilistic forwarding

- Prob. forwarding of a single packet over  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is modelled by site percolation on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  conditioned on the origin **0** being open.
- *n* pkts  $\leftrightarrow$  *n* independent site percolations with **0** open in all.
- $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m) :=$  {sites in  $\Gamma_m$  that receive at least k out of n pkts}
- We are interested in finding

$$p_{k,n,\delta} = \min\left\{ p \mid \mathbb{E}_p\left[ \frac{1}{m^2} \left| \mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m) \right| \right] \ge 1 - \delta \right\}$$

#### Theorem

For  $p > p_c$ , we have

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left| \mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m) \right| \right] = \sum_{t=k}^n \sum_{j=k}^t \binom{n}{t} \binom{t}{j} (\theta^+(p))^{t+j} (1-\theta^+(p))^{n-j}$$

## Total transmissions

Consider the transmissions of a single packet on  $\ensuremath{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ 

- C<sup>o</sup> := open cluster containing 0 (set of transmitters)
- The expected number of transmissions on a large grid,  $\Gamma_m$ , is given by  $\mathbb{E}[|C^{\circ} \cap \Gamma_m| \mid \mathbf{0} \text{ is open}].$

Proposition  
For 
$$p > p_c$$
, we have  

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{1}{m^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ |C^o \cap \Gamma_m| \mid \mathbf{0} \text{ is open} \right] = \frac{\theta(p)^2}{p}.$$

• Hence, for *n* coded packets, with each packet being transmitted with probability  $p_{k,n,\delta} > p_c$ , we obtain

$$\tau_{k,n,\delta} \approx nm^2 \frac{\theta^2(p_{k,n,\delta})}{p_{k,n,\delta}}$$

## Comparison with simulation results



We want to show,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m)\right|\right] = \sum_{t=k}^n \sum_{j=k}^t \binom{n}{t} \binom{t}{j} (\theta^+(p))^{t+j} (1-\theta^+(p))^{n-j}.$$

Step 1:  $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \coloneqq \{ \text{sites that receive at least } k \text{ out of } n \text{ pkts on } \mathbb{Z}^2 \}$ 

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m)\right|\right] = \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \cap \Gamma_m\right|\right]$$



Probabilistic forwarding on the  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  lattice



We want to show,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m)\right|\right] = \sum_{t=k}^n \sum_{j=k}^t \binom{n}{t} \binom{t}{j} (\theta^+(p))^{t+j} (1-\theta^+(p))^{n-j}.$$

Step 1:  $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \coloneqq \{ \text{sites that receive at least } k \text{ out of } n \text{ pkts on } \mathbb{Z}^2 \}$ 

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m)\right|\right] = \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \cap \Gamma_m\right|\right]$$





#### Probabilistic forwarding on the

We want to show,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m)\right|\right] = \sum_{t=k}^n \sum_{j=k}^t \binom{n}{t} \binom{t}{j} (\theta^+(p))^{t+j} (1-\theta^+(p))^{n-j}.$$

Step 1:  $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \coloneqq \{ \text{sites that receive at least } k \text{ out of } n \text{ pkts on } \mathbb{Z}^2 \}$ 

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m)\right|\right] = \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \cap \Gamma_m\right|\right]$$

Step 2: Let  $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{perc}(\mathbb{Z}^2) := \{ \text{sites that are in at least } k \text{ out of } n \ C^+s \}$ Using ergodicity, we show that for  $p > p_c$ ,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{perc}(\mathbb{Z}^2)\cap\Gamma_m|}{m^2}\right] = \underbrace{\sum_{j=k}^n \binom{n}{j} (\theta^+(p))^j (1-\theta^+(p))^{n-j}}_{\equiv \theta^+_{k,n}(p).}$$

We want to show,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m)\right|\right] = \sum_{t=k}^n \sum_{j=k}^t \binom{n}{t} \binom{t}{j} (\theta^+(p))^{t+j} (1-\theta^+(p))^{n-j}.$$

Step 1:  $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \coloneqq \{ \text{sites that receive at least } k \text{ out of } n \text{ pkts on } \mathbb{Z}^2 \}$ 

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m)\right|\right] = \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \cap \Gamma_m\right|\right]$$

Step 2: Let  $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{perc}(\mathbb{Z}^2) := \{ \text{sites that are in at least } k \text{ out of } n \ C^+s \}$ Using ergodicity, we show that for  $p > p_c$ ,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{perc}(\mathbb{Z}^2)\cap\Gamma_m|}{m^2}\right] = \underbrace{\sum_{j=k}^n \binom{n}{j} (\theta^+(p))^j (1-\theta^+(p))^{n-j}}_{\equiv \theta^+_{k,n}(p).}$$

Recall:

$$\theta^+(p) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{0} \in C^+)$$

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{|C^+ \cap \Gamma_m|}{m^2} = \theta^+(p)$$
 a.s.

We want to show,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m)\right|\right] = \sum_{t=k}^n \sum_{j=k}^t \binom{n}{t} \binom{t}{j} (\theta^+(p))^{t+j} (1-\theta^+(p))^{n-j}.$$

Step 1:  $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \coloneqq \{ \text{sites that receive at least } k \text{ out of } n \text{ pkts on } \mathbb{Z}^2 \}$ 

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\Gamma_m)\right|\right] = \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \cap \Gamma_m\right|\right]$$

Step 2: Let  $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{perc}(\mathbb{Z}^2) := \{ \text{sites that are in at least } k \text{ out of } n \ C^+s \}$ Using ergodicity, we show that for  $p > p_c$ ,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{perc}(\mathbb{Z}^2)\cap\Gamma_m|}{m^2}\right] = \underbrace{\sum_{j=k}^n \binom{n}{j} (\theta^+(p))^j (1-\theta^+(p))^{n-j}}_{\equiv \theta^+_{k,n}(p).}$$

Step 3: Carefully relate  $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{perc}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  to obtain,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{m^2} |\mathcal{R}_{k,n}^{pr.fwd}(\mathbb{Z}^2) \cap \Gamma_m|\right] = \sum_{t=k}^n \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq [n]:\\|T|=t}} \theta_{k,t}^+(p) (\theta^+(p))^t (1-\theta^+(p))^{n-t}.$$

## Some bounds

It can be shown that

 $\sum_{t=k}^{n} \sum_{j=k}^{t} {n \choose t} {t \choose j} (\theta^{+}(p))^{t+j} (1-\theta^{+}(p))^{n-j} = Pr(Y \ge k)$ 

where  $Y \sim Bin(n, (\theta^+(p))^2)$ . So, for large grids, we have

 $p_{k,n,\delta} = \inf\{p: Pr(Y \ge k) \ge 1 - \delta\} \text{ and } \tau_{k,n,\delta} \approx nm^2 \frac{\theta^2(p_{k,n,\delta})}{p_{k,n,\delta}}.$ 



## Other graphs

Lattices- triangular, hexagonal.



Random geometric graphs





#### Random regular graphs



#### Thank you ©