

STATISTICAL CHANNEL KNOWLEDGE BASED TRANSMISSION STRATEGIES FOR ENERGY-CONSTRAINED AD-HOC WIRELESS RELAY NETWORKS

SABYASACHI GUPTA



BHARTI SCHOOL OF TELECOMMUNICATION
TECHNOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
OCTOBER 2016

STATISTICAL CHANNEL KNOWLEDGE BASED TRANSMISSION STRATEGIES FOR ENERGY-CONSTRAINED AD-HOC WIRELESS RELAY NETWORKS

by

SABYASACHI GUPTA

BHARTI SCHOOL OF TELECOMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY
AND MANAGEMENT

Submitted

in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
OCTOBER 2016

Certificate

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**Statistical channel knowledge based transmission strategies for energy-constrained ad-hoc wireless relay networks**” being submitted by **Mr. Sabyasachi Gupta** to the Bharti School of Telecommunication Technology and Management, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** is the record of bonafide research work carried out by him under my supervision. In my opinion, the thesis has reached the standards fulfilling the requirements of the regulations relating to the degree.

The results contained in this thesis have not been submitted either in part or in full to any other University or Institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

Dr. Ranjan Bose

Professor

Department of Electrical Engineering

and

Bharti School of Telecommunication

Technology & Management

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

Date:

Place: New Delhi

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude towards all the support without which this research would not have been possible. First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude towards my advisor Prof. Ranjan Bose for his guidance, encouragement, and contributions in the development of my research. I also thank him for providing me with the freedom and flexibility to develop my research work.

I am thankful to my student research committee members Dr. Swades De, Dr. Brejesh Lall, and Dr. Kolin Paul for many useful interactions and for their comments and suggestions on my work. I am grateful to all the professors at IIT Delhi for their support and valuable advice throughout my studies.

I would like to thank all my friends and members of the research scholar lab. I feel fortunate to have so many incredible friends around. Special thanks to my close friends: Abhishek Jindal, Prashanth Ravindran, Soumic Sarkar and Aniket Maitra for their support, friendship and advices.

Finally, and most importantly, my deepest gratitude goes to my parents for their unconditional love, care and support throughout my life. This thesis is dedicated to them.

Sabyasachi Gupta

Abstract

Reliable transmission of signal and energy efficiency are crucial design issues in wireless networks. With nodes helping each other to transmit message through multiple independent fading paths, user cooperation reduces the probability of erroneous message reception, improves reliability and reduces the transmit power consumption. The requirement to transmit the source messages from multiple independent channel may not be always be fulfilled. A conventional multihop transmission scheme is an effective method to transmit source messages to the destination when direct connection between source or relay nodes to the destination is not feasible or power efficient. Energy efficiency in multihop or cooperative networks can be improved by choosing an appropriate path to forward the source data at the network layer, as well as the transmit power allocation among the nodes at the physical layer. In this thesis, we investigate the statistical channel knowledge based energy efficient transmission schemes for multihop networks and cooperative networks with end-to-end quality of service (QoS) constraint. Particularly, we consider four different network setups: multihop networks with end-to-end error probability constraint, multihop networks with end-to-end outage probability constraint, source-relay pairing based cooperative networks with end-to-end error probability constraint and pairwise cooperative networks with end-to-end error probability constraint. We solve the joint route selection and power allocation problem for each of these network setups according to two network objectives: minimizing overall transmit power and maximizing lifetime of the networks.

For the multihop networks with end-to-end error probability constraint and outage probability constraint setups, we propose minimum total power (MTP) strategy which is optimal for minimizing overall transmit power consumption in the network. To max-

imize the lifetime for these network setups, we have developed two residual energy aware joint routing and power allocation strategies: path lifetime maximization (PLM) strategy and minimum weighted total power (MWTP) strategy. Distributed implementation for these strategies is also presented for each network setups. Simulation results demonstrate that the MWTP and PLM strategies achieve significant network lifetime improvement over MTP strategy. It has been shown that, at reasonably low route refresh interval, the MWTP strategy performs the best in terms of network lifetime while at very high route refresh interval, the PLM strategy is optimal for network lifetime maximization.

Next, we investigate the relay assignment and power allocation problems for source-relay pairing based cooperative networks. The MTP policy aims at minimizing overall power in the network. To maximize network lifetime, we propose group lifetime maximization (GLM) and MWTP policies. We solve the power allocation solution optimally for each policy. Then, we solve the the optimal relay assignment for MTP and MWTP policies using minimum weighted bipartite matching (MWBM) algorithm and optimal relay assignment for GLM policy using bottleneck bipartite matching (BBM) algorithm. We propose a novel minimum bottleneck bipartite matching (MBBM) algorithm to solve the relay assignment problem optimally for GLM policy which is more power efficient compared to the relay assignment with BBM algorithm. We further propose suboptimal relay selection (SRS) algorithm with lower time complexity compared to the optimal relay selection schemes. Simulation results demonstrate that with derived power allocation solution, relay assignment with SRS algorithm has performance very close to optimal relay assignment with bipartite graph matching strategy in terms of power minimization and lifetime maximization. The proposed relay selection and power allocation strategies based on GLM policy have better network lifetime performance over the strategies based on MWTP policy and achieve significant lifetime improvement over strategies based on MTP policy. We show that relay assignment based on MBBM algorithm achieves maximum network lifetime performance.

With the aim of lifetime maximization in pairwise cooperative wireless networks, we investigate the partner selection and power allocation problem for two different network power management policies: GLM and MWTP. With optimal power allocation solution derived according to each policy, we show that the optimal partner selection can be

obtained using the bottleneck matching (BM) algorithm and the maximum weighted matching (MWM) algorithm for GLM and MWTP policies, respectively. Since partner selection with BM algorithm is not power efficient, we propose a novel minimum bottleneck matching (MBM) algorithm to solve the optimal partner selection problem for GLM policy. We further propose a suboptimal partner selection (SPS) algorithm for these policies with lower time complexity compared to the optimal partner selection schemes. Simulation results demonstrate that the proposed partner selection and power allocation strategies based on GLM policy have better network lifetime performance over the strategies based on MWTP policy and achieve significant network lifetime improvement over conventional strategies of minimizing the total power per transmission with and without equal power constraint. We show that partner selection based on MBM algorithm achieves the maximum network lifetime performance and partner selection with SPS algorithm has performance very close to it.

Table of Contents

Certificate	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	v
List of Figures	xv
List of Algorithms	xix
List of Abbreviations	xxi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation and Problem Description	1
1.2 Thesis Contributions	5
1.3 Thesis Outline	8
2 Literature Review	9

2.1	Multihop Networks	9
2.2	Cooperative Networks	11
3	Energy-Efficient Joint Routing and Power Allocation Optimization in BER-Constrained Multihop Wireless Networks	15
3.1	Introduction	15
3.2	System Model and Problem Formulation	16
3.2.1	Network Model	16
3.2.2	Channel Model	17
3.2.3	End-to-end BER	17
3.2.4	Problem Formulation	18
3.3	Optimal Power Allocation for a Fixed Path	21
3.3.1	MTP Strategy	21
3.3.2	PLM Strategy	22
3.3.3	MWTP Strategy	24
3.4	Distributed Routing and Power Allocation Implementation	25
3.4.1	Routing Problem	25
3.4.2	Routing Implementation	26
3.4.3	Distributed Power Allocation	27
3.5	Performance Evaluation	28

3.5.1	Results for Transmit Power Minimization	29
3.5.2	Results for Lifetime Maximization	31
3.6	Summary	35
4	Energy-Efficient Joint Routing and Power Allocation Optimization in Outage-Constrained Multihop Wireless Networks	37
4.1	Introduction	37
4.2	System Model and Problem Formulation	38
4.2.1	Network Model	38
4.2.2	Channel Model	39
4.2.3	End-to-end Outage Probability	39
4.2.4	Problem Formulation	40
4.3	Optimal Power Allocation for a Fixed Path	42
4.3.1	MTP Strategy	42
4.3.2	PLM Strategy	43
4.3.3	MWTP Strategy	45
4.4	Distributed Routing and Power Allocation	46
4.4.1	Routing Problem	46
4.4.2	Routing and Power Allocation Implementation	47
4.5	Performance Evaluation	52

4.5.1	Results for Transmit Power Minimization	52
4.5.2	Results for Lifetime Maximization	54
4.6	Summary	59
5	Relay Selection and Power Allocation Optimization for Multiple-User Source-Relay Pairing Based Cooperative Networks	61
5.1	Introduction	61
5.2	System Model and Problem Formulation	62
5.2.1	System Model	62
5.2.2	Problem Formulation	63
5.3	Power Allocation for a Fixed Pair	66
5.3.1	MTP Policy	66
5.3.2	GLM Policy	67
5.3.3	MWTP Policy	68
5.4	Relay Selection Schemes	69
5.4.1	Optimal Relay Selection with Bipartite Matching Approach . .	70
5.4.2	Suboptimal Relay Selection	74
5.5	Performance Evaluation	77
5.5.1	Results for Transmit Power Minimization	77
5.5.2	Results for Lifetime Maximization	79

5.6	Summary	83
6	Partner Selection Based on Optimal Power Allocation for Lifetime Maximization in Cooperative Networks	85
6.1	Introduction	85
6.2	System Model and Problem Formulation	86
6.2.1	System Model	86
6.2.2	Problem Formulation	88
6.3	Residual Energy Aware Power Allocation for a Fixed Group	90
6.3.1	MWTP Policy	90
6.3.2	GLM Policy	92
6.4	Partner Selection Schemes	96
6.4.1	Optimal Partner Selection with Graph Theoretic Matching Techniques	97
6.4.2	Suboptimal Partner Selection	103
6.5	Performance Evaluation	105
6.6	Summary	111
7	Conclusions and Future Work	113
7.1	Contributions of this Research	113
7.2	Future Research Directions	115

Bibliography	117
A Background	125
A.1 Convex Optimization	125
A.1.1 Duality	126
A.2 Shortest Path Algorithms	128
A.3 Graph Matching Techniques	129
B Proof of Convexity	133
C Proof of Proposition 6.1	135
D Proof of Proposition 6.2	137
E Proof of Proposition 6.3	139

List of Figures

1.1	An example of source-relay pairing based cooperation scenario.	2
1.2	An example of pairwise cooperation scenario.	2
1.3	An example of a multihop network.	3
3.1	Route transmit power for different number of nodes in 50m×50m network with BER constraint 10^{-4}	30
3.2	Route transmit power versus BER constraint in 50m×50m network with 10 nodes.	30
3.3	Network lifetime for different number of nodes in 50m×50m network with BER constraint 10^{-4}	32
3.4	Network lifetime versus BER constraint in 50m×50m network with 10 nodes.	32
3.5	Network lifetime versus route refresh interval in 50m×50m network with BER constraint 10^{-4} and 10 nodes.	33
3.6	Average transmit energy per packet transmission versus route refresh interval in 50m×50m network with BER constraint 10^{-4} and 10 nodes.	34
3.7	Average wasted energy versus route refresh interval in 50m×50m network with BER constraint 10^{-4} and 10 nodes.	35

4.1	Route transmit power for different number of nodes and spectral efficiency in $50m \times 50m$ network with outage probability constraint 10^{-3} . .	53
4.2	Route transmit power versus outage probability constraint in $50m \times 50m$ network with 20 nodes and $r = 0.5$ bps/Hz.	54
4.3	Network lifetime for different number of nodes and spectral efficiency in $50m \times 50m$ network with outage probability constraint 10^{-3}	55
4.4	Network lifetime versus outage probability constraint in $50m \times 50m$ network with 20 nodes and $r = 0.5$ bps/Hz.	56
4.5	Network lifetime versus route refresh interval in $50m \times 50m$ network with outage probability constraint 10^{-3} , $r = 0.5$ bps/Hz and 20 nodes. . . .	57
4.6	Average transmit energy per packet transmission versus route refresh interval in $50m \times 50m$ network with outage probability constraint 10^{-3} , $r = 0.5$ bps/Hz and 20 nodes.	58
4.7	Average wasted energy versus route refresh interval in $50m \times 50m$ network with outage probability constraint 10^{-3} , $r = 0.5$ bps/Hz and 20 nodes. .	58
5.1	An example of weighted bipartite graph with unique bottleneck edge. .	71
5.2	An example of graph updation with iterations of MBBM algorithm. . .	74
5.3	Transmit power versus relay node number in $100m \times 100m$ network with SER constraint 10^{-4} and six source nodes.	78
5.4	Transmit power versus SER constraint in $100m \times 100m$ network with six source nodes and twenty relay nodes.	78
5.5	Network lifetime versus relay node number in $100m \times 100m$ network with SER constraint 10^{-4} and six source nodes.	79

5.6	Network Lifetime versus SER constraint in $100m \times 100m$ network with six source nodes and twenty relay nodes.	80
5.7	Network lifetime versus update interval in $100m \times 100m$ network with SER constraint 10^{-4} , six source nodes and twenty relay nodes.	81
5.8	Average transmit energy per packet for different update interval in $100m \times 100m$ network with SER constraint 10^{-4} , six source nodes and twenty relay nodes.	82
5.9	Total wasted energy for different update interval in $100m \times 100m$ network with SER constraint 10^{-4} , six source nodes and twenty relay nodes. . .	82
6.1	An example of weighted graph with unique bottleneck edge.	98
6.2	An example of graph update with iterations of MBM algorithm.	101
6.3	Network lifetime versus network size in $100m \times 100m$ network with SER constraint 10^{-4}	106
6.4	Network Lifetime versus SER constraint in $100m \times 100m$ network with 20 nodes.	107
6.5	Network lifetime versus update interval in $100m \times 100m$ network with SER constraint 10^{-4} and 20 users.	108
6.6	Average transmit energy consumption per packet for different update interval in $100m \times 100m$ network with SER constraint 10^{-4} and 20 users. 109	
6.7	Average wasted energy for different update interval in $100m \times 100m$ network with SER constraint 10^{-4} and 20 users.	109
6.8	Network lifetime versus E_{ratio} in $100m \times 100m$ network with SER constraint 10^{-4} , 20 users and total energy 200J.	110

A.1	An example of strict isotonicity.	129
A.2	An example of weighted graph.	131
A.3	An example of weighted bipartite graph.	132

List of Algorithms

5.1	Minimum bottleneck bipartite matching (MBBM) algorithm	73
5.2	Suboptimal relay selection (SRS) algorithm	75
6.1	Minimum bottleneck matching (MBM) algorithm	101
6.2	Suboptimal partner selection (SPS) algorithm	104

List of Abbreviations

ACSI	Average channel state information
AF	Amplify-and-forward
AODV	Ad hoc on-demand distance vector
AWGN	Additive white Gaussian noise
BBM	Bottleneck bipartite matching
BER	Bit Error Rate
BM	Bottleneck matching
BPSK	Binary phase-shift keying
BS	Base station
CDF	Cumulative distribution function
DF	Decode-and-forward
DSDV	Destination-sequenced distance vector
EGC	Equal gain combining
FA	Flow augmentation
FDD	Frequency-division duplex
GLM	Group lifetime maximization
ICSI	Instantaneous channel state information
KKT	Karush-Kuhn-Tucker
MAC	Medium access control
MBBM	Minimum bottleneck bipartite matching
MBM	Minimum bottleneck matching
MIMO	Multiple-input multiple-output
MRC	Maximal ratio combining
MTP	Minimum total power
MWBM	Minimum weighted bipartite matching

MWM	Maximum weighted matching
MWTP	Minimum weighted total power
PLM	Path lifetime maximization
QoS	Quality of service
SC	Selection combining
SER	Symbol error rate
SNR	Signal-to-noise ratio
SPS	Suboptimal partner selection
SRS	Suboptimal relay selection
TDD	Time-division-duplex
TDMA	Time division multiple access
UWB	Ultra-wideband
WLF	Worst link first