

Fast Transmission in Ad Hoc Networks

Paul Balister¹

Dept. of Mathematics
Univ. of Memphis
Memphis, TN 38152

balistep@msci.memphis.edu

Béla Bollobás²

Dept. of Mathematics
Univ. of Memphis
Memphis, TN 38152

bollobas@msci.memphis.edu

Martin Haenggi³

Dept. of Electr. Eng.
Univ. of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556

mhaenggi@nd.edu

Mark Walters⁴

Dept. of Mathematics
Univ. of Memphis
Memphis, TN 38152

walters@renyi.hu

I. INTRODUCTION

We are interested in various transmission strategies for sending information from a *source* s over a large distance to a *target* t in ad hoc wireless networks where the nodes are distributed as a Poisson process of intensity 1. We wish to transmit reliably (s and t lie in the same component with probability $1-\epsilon$), quickly (through few hops), and economically (using little power).

In Gilbert's disk model [4] for omni-directional transmission, for each point x of the Poisson process, we take a disk D_x of area a centred at x , and postulate that two points x and y of the process can communicate if $y \in D_x$ or, equivalently, $x \in D_y$. Joining two points by an edge if they can communicate, we obtain an infinite geometric random graph G_a . Note that the area a is exactly the expected degree of a vertex.

Gilbert proved that there exists a critical area a_c such that if $a > a_c$ then G_a almost surely has an infinite component, and if $a < a_c$ then G_a almost surely has only finite components.

The existence of an infinite component, i.e., *percolation*, is not sufficient for our problem since the proportion of vertices in the infinite component may be very low. To achieve *connectivity* the power must increase with the number of vertices, since there is some positive chance that a vertex is isolated. Independently, Penrose [6,7], and Xue and Kumar [5] proved that the threshold on the degree is $\log n$ where n is the number of vertices in the region. So to guarantee that s and t are connected we need enormous power, and we do not know anything about transmission speed⁵.

II. DIRECTIONAL TRANSMITTERS

It has been shown that percolation can occur if a vertex can, on average, broadcast to $1+o(1)$ neighbors if we have transmitters that transmit (1) to a randomly oriented sector of angle δ and radius r or (2) to an annulus of inner and outer radii 1 and $1+\delta$. These results⁶ show that as soon as the average degree exceeds *one*, there is an infinite component.

Result (1) shows that with directional transmissions, even with very low power there exist points at arbitrarily large distance that can communicate. It does not give us any bound on how many hops this will take or how likely this transmission is. Indeed if the power is such that we expect only $1+\eta$ neighbours then there is a significant probability ($e^{-(1+\eta)}$)

that s has no neighbours at all, and hence definitely can not talk to t . Hence even to hope for reliable transmission with reliability $1-\epsilon$ the vertex s must expect $\log(1/\epsilon)$ neighbours, and similarly for t . Rather than pushing the power this high, we make s and t better nodes than the rest. With a more powerful transmitter s and a more sensitive receiver t there is a high chance of s and t communicating even with all the rest of the nodes being low power:

Theorem 1 *Fix an angle ϕ (small but not tiny, i.e., not tending to zero). Suppose that all the transmitters nearer s than t broadcast directionally into a sector of radius r and angle δ oriented randomly inside the sector of angle ϕ pointed in the st direction, and that all the transmitters nearer t than s receive directionally, again with radius r and angle δ this time randomly oriented in a sector of angle ϕ pointed in the ts direction. Finally suppose that s can transmit to any point within distance R and that t can receive from any point within distance R . Then, provided that R is large enough independently of the distance from s to t and that the area of a sector, $\delta r^2/2$, is greater than 1, node s can communicate with the node t with probability arbitrarily close to one. Moreover the number of hops is at most $(1+o(1))\left(\frac{3\phi}{4r \sin(\phi/2)}\right)d(s,t)$.*

This is the main result of this paper. Since the expected distance of a neighbour of a vertex is $4r \sin(\phi/2)/3\phi$, this is the best that we could hope for.

Note that the transmitters and receivers are directed randomly: they do *not* need to know the locations of their nearby neighbours. Indeed, if they all point directly towards t we need a higher density of transmitters; i.e., the critical area is bounded away from one.

We conjecture that Theorem 1 holds using only directional transmitters (i.e., all receivers are omni-directional).

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Balister, B. Bollobás, M. Walters. *Continuum percolation with steps in an annulus*. To appear in Annals of Applied Probability.
- [2] P. Balister, B. Bollobás, M. Walters. *Random Transceiver Networks*. In preparation.
- [3] M. Franceschetti, L. Booth, M. Cook, R. Meester and J. Bruck, *Percolation in multi-hop wireless networks*. Submitted to IEEE Trans. on Information Theory, 2003.
- [4] E.N. Gilbert, *Random plane networks*, Journal of the Society for Industrial Applied Mathematics **9** (1961), 533-543.
- [5] F. Xue and P. R. Kumar, *The Number of Neighbors Needed for Connectivity of Wireless Networks*, Wireless Networks, 2004. To appear. Available at <http://black.cs1.uiuc.edu/~prkumar>.
- [6] M.D. Penrose, A strong law for the largest nearest-neighbour link between random points. J. London Math. Soc. **60** (1999) 951-960
- [7] M.D. Penrose, Extremes for the minimal spanning tree on normally distributed points. Adv. in Appl. Probab. **30** (1998). 628-639

¹Research supported by NSF grant EIA-0130352.

²Also with Trinity College, Cambridge CB2 1TQ, UK. Research supported by NSF grants DMS-9970404 and EIA-0130352 and DARPA grant F33615-01-C1900

³Research supported by NSF grant ECS 03-29766 and DARPA grant F30602-01-2-0526.

⁴Also with Trinity College, Cambridge CB2 1TQ, UK. Research supported by NSF grant EIA-0130352.

⁵Although a reasonable bound could be proved.

⁶They are examples of a more general result [2], and part (2) was independently and simultaneously proved in [3] and [1].