

MASTER COPY: PLEASE KEEP THIS "MEMORANDUM OF TRANSMITTAL" BLANK FOR REPRODUCTION PURPOSES. WHEN REPORTS ARE GENERATED UNDER THE ARO SPONSORSHIP, FORWARD A COMPLETED COPY OF THIS FORM WITH EACH REPORT SHIPMENT TO THE ARO. THIS WILL ASSURE PROPER IDENTIFICATION. NOT TO BE USED FOR INTERIM PROGRESS REPORTS; SEE PAGE 2 FOR INTERIM PROGRESS REPORT INSTRUCTIONS.

MEMORANDUM OF TRANSMITTAL

U.S. Army Research Office
ATTN: AMSRL-RO-BI (TR)
P.O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211

Reprint (Orig + 2 copies)

Technical Report (Orig + 2 copies)

Manuscript (1 copy)

Final Progress Report (Orig + 2 copies)

Related Materials, Abstracts, Theses (1 copy)

CONTRACT/GRANT NUMBER:

REPORT TITLE:

is forwarded for your information.

SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION TO (applicable only if report is manuscript):

Sincerely,

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB NO. 0704-0188

Public Reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comment regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188,) Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)		2. REPORT DATE May 2006	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Manuscripts 01 June 2005 – 31 July 2006	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Transport Capacity Regions for Wireless Networks			5. FUNDING NUMBERS W911NF0410224	
6. AUTHOR(S) Christian Peel and A. Lee Swindlehurst				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Brigham Young University Provo, UT 84604			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER N/A	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U. S. Army Research Office P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER N/A	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.				
12 a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.			12 b. DISTRIBUTION CODE N/A	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) <p>We consider the distance-weighted rate achievable with wireless networks which utilize multiple antennas and multi-user links. We give the transport capacity of multi-antenna multiple-access and broadcast channels, and use these topologies at the physical layer of an ad-hoc network to obtain achievable distance-weighted rate regions for a multi-antenna wireless network. These regions are obtained by utilizing interfering multiple-access and broadcast channel topologies in all possible configurations. A Nash-equilibrium-seeking technique is used to optimize the transmit covariance matrices for each configuration. Multi-hop routing is shown to increase the capacity regions significantly. Numerical examples show the benefit of multiple-access topologies over broadcast and point-to-point links for a uniform per-node power constraint, especially at high transmit power, high numbers of antennas, and a large number of nodes. We finally present a distributed algorithm for topology creation which utilizes only local channel state information.</p>				
14. SUBJECT TERMS N/A			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 5	
			16. PRICE CODE N/A	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OR REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION ON THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev.2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18
298-102

Transport Capacity Regions for Wireless Networks with Multi-User Links

Christian B. Peel, A. Lee Swindlehurst

Brigham Young University

Electrical & Computer Engineering Dept.

459 CB, Provo, UT 84602

chris.peel@ieee.org, swindle@ee.byu.edu

Wolfgang Utschick

Lehrstuhl für Netzwerktheorie und Signalverarbeitung

Technische Universität München

Arcisstrasse 21, D-80290 München, Germany

utschick@tum.de

Abstract—We consider the distance-weighted rate achievable with wireless networks which utilize multiple antennas and multi-user links. We give the transport capacity of multi-antenna multiple-access and broadcast channels, and use these topologies at the physical layer of an ad-hoc network to obtain achievable distance-weighted rate regions for a multi-antenna wireless network. These regions are obtained by utilizing interfering multiple-access and broadcast channel topologies in all possible configurations. A Nash-equilibrium-seeking technique is used to optimize the transmit covariance matrices for each configuration. Multi-hop routing is shown to increase the capacity regions significantly. Numerical examples show the benefit of multiple-access topologies over broadcast and point-to-point links for a uniform per-node power constraint, especially at high transmit power, high numbers of antennas, and a large number of nodes. We finally present a distributed algorithm for topology creation which utilizes only local channel state information.

I. INTRODUCTION

Multi-antenna and multi-user coding have not been considered fully in recent information theoretical results [1]–[4] or protocol and physical layer development [5], [6]. Capacity regions are found in [7] for a single-antenna per node, with point-to-point multi-hop communication. These important results do not use multiple antennas and do not emphasize multi-user coding as a physical-layer technique in wireless networks. We explicitly include multi-antenna multi-user coding in our analysis, and examine the sum transport capacity as a function of the number of antennas and nodes in the network.

The IEEE 802.11 Medium Access Control MAC protocol [6] in distributed coordination function (DCF) mode attempts to avoid excessive interference at the receivers in an ad-hoc network, again using point-to-point coding techniques. Analysis of the DCF with large networks [8] indicates that the traffic pattern is crucial in determining whether the capacity of the network scales with the number of nodes; in general the disappointing result is that the throughput per node decreases as the density of nodes increases, as in [1]. The transport (distance-weighted) capacity of fading networks using point-to-point coding is found to grow no faster than linearly with the number of nodes in a network in [3]. Several point-to-point coding techniques are used in [7] to give bounds on the capacity region for ad-hoc networks.

Several researchers have investigated the use of multiple antennas in ad-hoc scenarios. Single-user detection and transmission are considered in [9] and found to give an asymptotic spectral efficiency of $4M$ bits/sec/Hz when each node has M antennas. This result assumes that the number of nodes goes to infinity and is independent of the transmit power. The rate regions of [7] are extended for point-to-point MIMO signaling in [10], including average and outage capacity.

This work was supported by the U. S. Army Research Office under the Multi-University Research Initiative (MURI) grant W911NF-04-1-0224.

In our paper, we give the transport capacity for networks with multiple-antenna multiple-access (MA) and broadcast channel (BC) links, and use these results to give achievable distance-weighted rate regions in an ad-hoc network utilizing these multi-user links. Our results are unique in that they focus on the use of multi-user sub-networks and many antennas.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Network Model

Consider a set of K nodes communicating over wireless fading channels using M_k antennas at the k th node. Each node may transmit or receive, but may not do both at the same time. A link is an ordered pair of nodes $[n, m]$ indicating that node n transmits data to node m . A link is active if the transmitting node is radiating a signal designated for the receiving node. Each receiving node collects radiated power from each transmitting node; if any signal is not intended for the receiving node, it is considered to be interference. The level of interference is determined by the fading coefficient between each transmitting and receiving node.

Let \mathcal{T} be the set of all transmitting nodes and let $H_{k,h}$ represent the $M_k \times M_h$ matrix of fading coefficients between nodes h and k ; then the received data at node k is

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{T}} H_{k,h} \mathbf{x}_h + \mathbf{w}_k \quad . \quad (1)$$

Here \mathbf{x}_h is the signal transmitted from node h , and \mathbf{w}_k is the receiver noise observed at node k . Each node has a transmit power constraint P_k . We assume that each node n has full channel state information for all links of the form $[n, m]$ and $[m, n]$ for all m . We assume that $H_{k,h}$ includes the path loss and other attenuation and is typically dependent on $d_{k,h}$, the distance between nodes h and k . For example, in our simulations we assume that the channel between nodes h and k is $H_{k,h} = d_{k,h}^{-\delta} \bar{H}_{k,h}$, where each element of $\bar{H}_{k,h}$ is i.i.d. $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$, and δ is the path-loss exponent. We have not yet made a distinction in (1) between nodes in \mathcal{T} which are transmitting to node k and those which are not and nominally act as interference. In the following we specify several link topologies for which we specify instances of (1) where we separate data-bearing signals and interference. We assume that the channel is static enough that reliable estimates of the coefficients may be obtained, and that these estimates are not so costly as to have a significant impact on the throughput.

B. Link Topologies

There are many different ways that a set of nodes can communicate; they can communicate in a pairwise manner, where each transmitting node designs its signal for only one receiving node. Each receiving node then decodes only the signal intended for it, and treats

signals from other transmitting nodes as interference. Most practical techniques and research has focused on this scenario [3], [5]–[9]. This point-to-point coding methodology is illustrated in Figure 1(a), where three links are activated. The task of a MAC protocol is to control the creation, utilization, and modification of this topology in a distributed manner. For example, slotted ALOHA allows a node to transmit whenever it has data to send, resulting in a collision when the intended receiver is transmitting, or is subject to more interference than it can reject.

Though there has been much work on MAC protocols, it is not yet clear what the best medium access protocol is for an ad-hoc network. One approach is to utilize a full search over all topologies; though not necessarily practical, this technique gives results which are useful as a benchmark. In Sections IV and V we use this approach to show that certain topologies are better in terms of distance-weighted throughput than others. As we will show, for per-node power constraints, nodes connected utilizing MA links as in Figure 1(b) perform better than point-to-point and BC links.




Fig. 1. Network link topology when (a) only point-to-point communications links are possible, and (b) when MA communications links are possible.

We partition the set of nodes $\{1, \dots, K\}$ into L non-intersecting subsets, or sub-networks, with N_l nodes in the l th sub-network \mathbf{z}_l . Nodes within a sub-network cooperate to exchange data. Nodes in different sub-networks are assumed to be able to exchange information when they are joined in a sub-network at a later time instant, or by the aid of a higher-layer routing protocol. Denoting the partition as Z , we write

$$Z = \{\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_L\}. \quad (2)$$

A *transmission scheme* controls the way that a sub-network is configured. For example, in a multiple-access scheme each sub-network is configured as a MA channel (this also allows for point-to-point links). We also consider broadcast-channel and point-to-point schemes. Other possible sub-network topologies that we do not have space to consider include the relay channel [2] and multiple node strategies such as cooperative diversity [11].

III. SUB-NETWORKS AND SCHEDULES

A. Sub-Network Capacity

We consider several ways that a single sub-network \mathbf{z} may be configured for information transfer. Figure 1(a) shows three pairs of nodes communicating using point-to-point links, where each receive node only knows about the corresponding transmit node, and treats other received signals as noise. The capacity-achieving transmission technique for a point-to-point network with complete channel state information (CSI) at both terminals [12] utilizes a waterfilling solution to find the power to allocate to each eigenmode of the channel; in the following we express this in the transmit covariance matrix S .

For a transmit, receive pair $[a, b]$, the received data is

$$\mathbf{y}_b = H_{a,b}\mathbf{x}_a + \mathbf{w}_b. \quad (3)$$

The achievable rate is then

$$C(\mathbf{z}) = \max_{\text{tr}(S) \leq P_a} \log_2 \frac{|S_{\mathbf{w}_b}(\mathbf{z}) + H_{a,b}(\mathbf{z})S H_{a,b}^*(\mathbf{z})|}{|S_{\mathbf{w}_b}(\mathbf{z})|}, \quad (4)$$

where $S_{\mathbf{w}_b}(\mathbf{z})$ is the noise covariance. This can be solved via waterfilling to satisfy the power constraint P_a . In our wireless network, we are interested not only in rate, but in the distance that bits are transmitted. Gupta and Kumar defined transport capacity [1] as the distance-weighted rate, maximized over the topology and signaling scheme. The transport capacity for a point-to-point sub-network \mathbf{z} with full CSI is

$$T^{P2P}(\mathbf{z}) = d_{a,b}(\mathbf{z})C(\mathbf{z}). \quad (5)$$

We state this equation as a function of the subnetwork \mathbf{z} to emphasize that the distances $d_{a,b}$ and capacity are dependent on the sub-network topology. For the rest of this section we will not explicitly show this dependence.

The second configuration of a sub-network that we consider is in a MA topology in which many users talk with a single access point. We will use this topology later on to characterize a network that is communicating at the physical layer using several distinct multiple-access links, as shown in Figure 1(b). Consider the case where node b is receiving data from nodes $a_l, l = 1, \dots, K_u$. The system model is thus

$$\mathbf{y}_b = \sum_{l=1}^{K_u} H_{a_l,b}\mathbf{x}_{a_l} + \mathbf{w}_b, \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{w}_b includes both receiver noise and interference from other transmitting nodes, and has covariance matrix $S_{\mathbf{w}_b}$. The rates achievable for transmit covariance matrices S_{a_l} are [13]

$$R_{a_{\pi(l)}} = \log_2 \frac{|S_{\mathbf{w}_b} + \sum_{k=l}^{K_u} H_{a_{\pi(k)},b} S_{a_{\pi(k)}} H_{a_{\pi(k)},b}^*|}{|S_{\mathbf{w}_b}|} - \sum_{k=l+1}^{K_u} R_{a_{\pi(k)}}, \quad (7)$$

for $l = 1, \dots, K_u$, where π represents the decoding order (user $\pi(1)$ is decoded first). The boundary of the capacity region is found by maximizing

$$\mu_1 R_{a_1} + \dots + \mu_{K_u} R_{a_{K_u}} \quad (8)$$

over $S_{a_l}, l = 1, \dots, K_u$ which satisfy $\text{tr}(S_{a_l}) \leq P_{a_l}$, and where the non-negative weights satisfy $\sum_k \mu_k = 1$. Each set of covariance matrices thus found gives a point on the capacity region boundary. In our simulations, we use an approximation to the rate region boundary obtained after one iteration of the sum-capacity-achieving technique of [13]. Simulations and analysis [13] show that this approximation is quite good.

Lemma 1: Let π be a permutation such that $d_{a_{\pi(1)},b} \leq d_{a_{\pi(2)},b} \leq \dots \leq d_{a_{\pi(K_u)},b}$. The transport capacity of the MA channel (6) is found by decoding users in the order $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(K_u)$, with exact value given by:

$$T^{MA} = \max_{\text{tr}(S_{a_{\pi(k)}}) \leq P_{a_{\pi(k)}}} \sum_k d_{a_{\pi(k)},b} R_{a_{\pi(k)}}(S_{a_{\pi(1)}}, \dots, S_{a_{\pi(K_u)}}). \quad (9)$$

Proof: By letting $\mu_k = d_{a_k,b} / \sum_j d_{a_j,b}$ in (8) we can find the transmit covariance matrices and rates which achieve the sum transport capacity, then use (9) to obtain the exact value. An argument

similar to that in [14] for the scalar MA channel gives the decoding order. ■

The multi-antenna BC has received considerable attention recently, including [15], [16]. Consider the case where node a transmits to nodes $b_l, l = 1, \dots, K_d$, then the system model is:

$$\mathbf{y}_{b_l} = H_{a,b_l} \mathbf{x}_a + \mathbf{w}_{b_l}, \quad l = 1, \dots, K_d, \quad (10)$$

where \mathbf{w}_{b_l} includes interference from other transmitting nodes and receiver noise, and has covariance matrix $S_{\mathbf{w}_{b_l}}$. The rates achievable for a fixed set of covariance matrices $S_{b_l}, l = 1, \dots, K_d$ for the BC satisfy [16], [17]

$$R_{b_{\pi(n)}} \leq \log_2 \frac{|\sum_{k=n}^{K_d} H_{a,b_{\pi(n)}} S_{b_{\pi(k)}} H_{a,b_{\pi(n)}}^* + S_{\mathbf{w}_{b_{\pi(n)}}}|}{|\sum_{k=n+1}^{K_d} H_{a,b_{\pi(n)}} S_{b_{\pi(k)}} H_{a,b_{\pi(n)}}^* + S_{\mathbf{w}_{b_{\pi(n)}}}|}, \quad (11)$$

where the S_{b_k} satisfy the sum power constraint $\sum_{k=1}^{K_d} \text{tr}(S_{b_k}) \leq P_a$, and π is the decoding order.

The boundary of the rate region is characterized by the set of rate vectors which solve the following optimization problem

$$\max_{S_{b_k} : \text{tr}(S_{b_k}) \leq P_a} \sum_{k=1}^{K_d} \mu_k R_{b_k}(S_{b_1}, \dots, S_{b_{K_d}}), \quad (12)$$

for weight vectors such that $\sum_{k=1}^{K_d} K_d \mu_k = 1$. Because the rate region for a set of covariance matrices is a polymatroid, the best decoding order is that where $\mu_{\pi(1)} \geq \mu_{\pi(2)} \geq \dots \geq \mu_{\pi(K_u)}$. An efficient algorithm for solving this convex optimization problem is presented in [18]. This algorithm solves for transmit covariance matrices for the dual MA channel, which can then be converted to BC covariance matrices using the method of [15].

Lemma 2: Let π be a permutation such that $d_{a\pi(1),b} \geq d_{a\pi(2),b} \geq \dots \geq d_{a\pi(K_u),b}$. The transport capacity of the broadcast channel (10) is

$$T^{BC} = \max_{\text{tr}(S_{b_{\pi(k)}}) \leq P_a} \sum_{k=1}^{K_d} d_{a,b_{\pi(k)}} R_{b_{\pi(k)}}(S_{b_1}, \dots, S_{b_{K_d}}). \quad (13)$$

By letting $\mu_k = d_{a,b_k} / \sum_j d_{a,b_j}$ in (12) we can find the transmit covariance matrices and rates which achieve the sum transport capacity, then use (13) to obtain the exact value.

IV. SINGLE-HOP ROUTING AND SUM CAPACITY

For a network of K nodes, the Bell number B_K gives the number of ways the network can be separated into sub-networks:

$$B(K) = \left[\frac{1}{e} \sum_{m=1}^{2K} \frac{m^K}{m!} \right]. \quad (14)$$

Let $\{b_1^i, \dots, b_{L_i}^i\}$ denote the sizes of sub-networks in the i th Bell partition (we assume that nodes in sub-networks of size one are silent, and that the corresponding $b_j^i = 0$), where L_i is the number of active sub-networks in the i th partition. There are N ways to arrange a sub-network of size N into an MA network; for every Bell partition there are $\prod_{j=1}^{L_i} b_j^i$ possible MA partitions. The number of possible schedules for a network of K nodes using only MA coding is

$$N^{MA}(K) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{B(K)} \prod_{j=1}^{L_i} b_j^i, \quad (15)$$

where the "1" term is added to include the possibility of no nodes being active. We note that this is also the number of possible ways to configure a network into BC networks, without using MA coding: $N^{BC}(K) = N^{MA}(K)$. A similar technique can be used to find

the number of point-to-point schedules possible [7], which we label N_K^{P2P} .

Table I lists values of $B(K)$, $N^{P2P}(K)$, and $N^{MA}(K)$ for $K = 1, \dots, 10$, as found by enumerating all Bell partitions, finding the corresponding values of b_j^i and calculating $N^{MA}(K)$ using (15). Though a network of size $K = 10$ is not exceptionally large, there are over two million ways that it can be separated into MA or BC networks.

K	$B(K)$	$N^{P2P}(K)$	$N^{MA}(K)$
1	1	1	1
2	2	3	3
3	5	7	10
4	15	25	41
5	52	81	196
6	203	331	1057
7	877	1303	6322
8	4140	5379	41393
9	21147	26785	293608
10	115975	133651	2237921

TABLE I

NUMBER OF POSSIBLE SCHEDULES USING POINT-TO-POINT AND MA NETWORKS. BELL'S NUMBER IS INCLUDED FOR REFERENCE.

Let \mathcal{Z}^{P2P} , \mathcal{Z}^{BC} , and \mathcal{Z}^{MA} be sets of all possible point-to-point, BC, and MA schedules, respectively. The network transport capacity when considering all possible MA, BC and point-to-point topologies is given by the following equations:

$$T^{P2P} = \max_{Z_j \in \mathcal{Z}^{P2P}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in Z_j} T^{P2P}(\mathbf{z}), \quad (16)$$

$$T^{BC} = \max_{Z_j \in \mathcal{Z}^{BC}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in Z_j} T^{BC}(\mathbf{z}), \quad (17)$$

$$T^{MA} = \max_{Z_j \in \mathcal{Z}^{MA}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in Z_j} T^{MA}(\mathbf{z}). \quad (18)$$

Interference between sub-networks is included in these bounds through noise covariance matrices. For simplicity, we use a distributed algorithm which successively optimizes the covariance matrices for each sub-network, while maintaining the transmit covariance matrices for other sub-networks constant. Considering the covariance optimization problem as a non-cooperative game between the sub-networks, our method seeks a Nash equilibrium, or the set of covariance matrices such that the distance-weighted rate for a sub-network would decrease by changing only its own covariance matrices. The distributed nature of this algorithm could be implemented in a similar way to (e.g.) the progressive ramp up algorithm (PRUA) for power control in ad-hoc networks [5]. Our simulations show that this method typically converges to a Nash equilibrium (for all types of sub-network) in one or two full iterations. The covariance matrices were initialized to be scaled identities, then successively optimized. A similar algorithm was presented in [19] for point-to-point multi-antenna networks.

Figure 2 shows (16), (17), and (18) as a function of the power constraint P_k for a system with $K = 5$ nodes and $M = 4$ antennas per node. Two full iterations of the Nash-equilibrium-seeking covariance optimization algorithm were used, with results included regardless of whether or not convergence occurred. The MA bound is higher at all power levels, but has a more significant advantage at high power. Though the BC bound is better than the point-to-point bounds, the advantage is not as dramatic as for the MA case.




Fig. 2. The lower bounds (16), (17), and (18) on the transport capacity of a network as a function of the power constraint P_k for a system with $K = 5$ nodes and $M = 4$ antennas. The MA bound gives higher throughput than use of point-to-point or BC constraints.

V. MULTI-HOP ROUTING AND CAPACITY REGIONS

We now turn to multi-hop routing, utilizing the multi-user transmission schemes presented above. Modern transmission schemes move packets along a path involving several nodes, which obviates the requirement that each node communicate directly to every other node in the network. Because of the flexibility induced, multi-hop routing increases the range of rates at which data can be transferred. Our work is novel in that we allow multi-user links, in contrast to the point-to-point links of [7], [10]. For simplicity, we do not allow successive interference cancellation, power control, and transmission at a fixed set of rates; we expect these techniques to add to the basic rate performance similar to their use in single-antenna scenarios [7].

To enable mathematical manipulation, we represent the distance-weighted rates achievable on various links in a transmission scheme with **rate matrices**. For a network with K nodes, a $K \times K$ rate matrix T has as elements

$$t_{ij} = \begin{cases} d_{ij}r, & \text{if node with index } j \text{ receives information} \\ & \text{at rate } r \text{ with node } i \text{ as the original} \\ & \text{source,} \\ -d_{ij}r, & \text{if node } j \text{ transmits information at rate} \\ & r \text{ with node } i \text{ as the original source,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where d_{ij} is the distance between nodes i and j . Figure 1(b) shows rates next to the links in a MA sub-network. The rate matrix for this network assuming single-hop routing and $d_{1,2} = d_{2,4} = d_{5,3} = 1$ is

$$T_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & -3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

Another option is that all the data originates at node 5, in which case the rate matrix is

$$T_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 3 & 3 & -2 & -3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

For each transmission scheme, a finite set of rate matrices are possible; the previous section enumerates the single-hop possibilities; the rate matrices for each are readily found using the power constraints P_k , the channels $H_{j,k}$ and (e.g.) (5). In contrast, we are interested in multi-hop communication; in this case the number of possible rate matrices is increased significantly, since the data transferred on each link may originate at any of the K nodes in the network. This readily leads to an equation for the number of multi-hop rate matrices in a network of size K

$$N_{MH}^{MA}(K) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{B(K)} \prod_{j=1}^{L_i} i^j K^{b_j^i - 1}, \quad (22)$$

which is also the number of BC matrices ($N_{MH}^{BC}(K) = N_{MH}^{MA}(K)$). The number of point-to-point multi-hop matrices $N_{MH}^{P2P}(K)$ is similarly defined [7].

Given a set of N_M distance-weighted rate matrices $\{T_1, \dots, T_{N_M}\}$ the transport capacity region is

$$\mathcal{T} = \text{Co}(\{T_i\}) \cap \mathcal{P}_n, \quad (23)$$

where \mathcal{P}_n is the set of all $K \times K$ matrices with zeros along the diagonal and nonnegative elements off the diagonal, and $\text{Co}(\{T_i\})$ indicates the convex hull of the set of matrices $\{T_i\}$. Capacity matrices for multi-hop networks utilizing point-to-point, BC, and MA links can be calculated using equations (5), (9), and (13), respectively. The corresponding multi-hop capacity regions are

$$\mathcal{T}_{MH}^{P2P} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N_{MH}^{P2P}(K)} \alpha_i T_i^{P2P} : \sum_{i=1}^{N_{MH}^{P2P}(K)} \alpha_i \leq 1 \right\} \cap \mathcal{P}_n, \quad (24)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{MH}^{BC} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N_{MH}^{BC}(K)} \alpha_i T_i^{BC} : \sum_{i=1}^{N_{MH}^{BC}(K)} \alpha_i \leq 1 \right\} \cap \mathcal{P}_n, \quad (25)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{MH}^{MA} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N_{MH}^{MA}(K)} \alpha_i T_i^{MA} : \sum_{i=1}^{N_{MH}^{MA}(K)} \alpha_i \leq 1 \right\} \cap \mathcal{P}_n, \quad (26)$$

where in all cases the coefficients α_i satisfy $\alpha_i \geq 0$. Single-hop capacity regions for networks utilizing point-to-point, BC, and MA links may be similarly defined.

This convex combination of basic rate matrices defines a rate for each of K nodes talking with the remaining $K - 1$ nodes; a $K(K - 1)$ -dimensional rate region results. We note that the routing scheme defined by (23) is not necessarily causal; packets may be transmitted from a relay node before they arrive. A start-up period in which a large backlog of packets is distributed around the network takes care of this problem, as has been noted in [7].

As an example, consider the three-node network consisting of only nodes 1, 2, and 4 in the MA configuration shown in Figure 1(b). Using the techniques described in Section IV for a given set of channel coefficients, power constraints, and node locations, a rate matrix for this configuration can be specified. This rate matrix will characterize the point on the capacity region boundary for this multiple-access channel which gives the highest distance-weighted sum rate; a rate matrix such as in (20) can easily be written to characterize these rates. We note, however, that other points contained in the capacity region of the MA channel may be of interest, for example in a larger network the transmit nodes may be forwarding data for other nodes, in which case the rate should be weighted by the end-to-end distance, rather than the distance the bits travel along the link. We do not pursue this possibility further in the present work,




Fig. 3. This figure shows transport rate regions for rates $T_{1,2}$ versus $T_{3,4}$ for a six-node network where underlying links are allowed to be configured as point-to-point channels, BC, and MA channels. The multi-hop regions are calculated using (24), (25), (26), respectively. Transmission schemes which allow multi-user links and multi-hop routing give higher performance than network topologies which use point-to-point links and single-hop routing.

but note that sampling the capacity region of sub-networks to better approximate the full capacity region leads to an exponential increase in the number of rate matrices with the number of nodes in a network (beyond the already-factorial growth shown in Table I).

Figure 3 shows transport rate regions for several transmission schemes. Transmission schemes which use MA links or broadcast links outperform point-to-point links as investigated in [10]. Single-hop schemes have lower achievable throughput than multi-hop techniques. The simulation shows results for a single five-node network, with node locations chosen independently from a zero-mean circularly-symmetric Gaussian distribution with variance $1/\sqrt{2}$ in each direction. The channel coefficients are also chosen from an i.i.d. distribution as described in Section II-A with path-loss exponent $\delta = 2$. All end-to-end rates besides the rates of interest ($T_{1,2}$ and $T_{3,4}$) are constrained to be 0.4 bit-meters/sec, regardless of the routing or type links allowed. In the figure, the transmission scheme which allows multi-hop communication and MA links has a significantly higher throughput than the other methods.

Though capacity regions characterize all achievable rates, other metrics are also useful. The sum capacity defined in Section IV is one important measure. It is straightforward to show using the convexity of the multi-hop capacity region definition (23), that the sum capacity for single-hop and multi-hop routing are the same. Another useful tool is the *uniform capacity* [7] which is the maximum distance-weighted rate t in a multi-hop network such that every end-to-end link achieves transport rate t . Simulations show that this metric has much the same behavior as the sum capacity of Section IV.

VI. DISCUSSION

Important topics for further study include the best way to acquire the channel state, the benefit of transmit CSI over receive-only CSI, and whether CSI for adjacent nodes is required in addition to CSI for channels impinging on a node. It is apparent that methods for obtaining the best network topology are needed which are of lower complexity than a full search over all possible network combinations. Preliminary investigation shows that polynomial (in the number

of nodes) algorithms can approach the performance of full-search techniques. It is also not obvious whether a simple MAC protocol such as ALOHA or the widespread CSMA/CA technique is sufficient or if other new protocols are prescribed.

The distributed algorithm for covariance optimization that we present (which seeks a Nash equilibrium) could be improved using (e.g.) a gradient projection optimization [19]. Though such a technique would give results useful for comparison and analysis, the global CSI required does not engender the distributed approach required for practical algorithms. In future ad-hoc networks, nodes will obtain packets from neighboring nodes, then cooperate to re-transmit and forward it on. One investigation [2] found that the capacity of a relay channel is the same as a distributed multi-antenna array in certain cases; another scheme builds on space-time coding techniques [11]. Similar bounds to the BC and MA bounds proposed above could be constructed using these cooperative transmission topologies.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Gupta and P. Kumar, "The capacity of wireless networks," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 388–404, March 2000.
- [2] G. Kramer, M. Gastpar, and P. Gupta, "Capacity theorems for wireless relay channels," in *Proc. 41st Annual Allerton Conf. on Commun., Control and Comp.*, Monticello, IL, USA, October 2003, pp. 1074–1083.
- [3] F. Xue, L.-L. Xie, and P. Kumar, "The transport capacity of wireless networks over fading channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 834–847, March 2005.
- [4] E. T. Oliver L ev eque, "Information theoretic upper bounds on the capacity of large extended ad-hoc wireless networks," *Submitted to the IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2005.
- [5] S. Toumpis and A. Goldsmith, "Performance, optimization, and cross-layer design of media access protocols for wireless ad hoc networks," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Communications*, vol. 3, Anchorage, AK, USA, May 2003, pp. 2234–2240.
- [6] "IEEE Std 802.11-1997 Wireless Lan Medium Access Control And Physical Layer Specifications," pp. i–445, November 1997.
- [7] S. Toumpis and A. Goldsmith, "Capacity regions for wireless ad hoc networks," *Wireless Communications, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 736–748, July 2003.
- [8] J. Li, C. Blake, D. S. D. Couto, H. I. Lee, and R. Morris, "Capacity of ad hoc wireless networks," in *MobiCom '01: Proceedings of the 7th annual international conference on Mobile computing and networking*. New York, NY, USA: ACM Press, 2001, pp. 61–69.
- [9] B. Chen and M. J. Gans, "Limiting throughput of MIMO ad hoc networks," in *Proceedings IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, vol. 3, March 2005, pp. 393–396.
- [10] S. Ye and R. S. Blum, "On the rate regions for wireless mimo ad hoc networks," in *Proc. Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC)*, Los Angeles, Sept. 2004, pp. 1648–1652.
- [11] J. Laneman and G. Wornell, "Distributed space-time-coded protocols for exploiting cooperative diversity in wireless networks," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 2415–2425, October 2003.
- [12] I. E. Telatar, "Capacity of multi-antenna Gaussian channels," *European Trans. Telecommunications*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 585–595, Nov/Dec 1999.
- [13] W. Yu, W. Rhee, S. Boyd, and J. M. Cioffi, "Iterative water-filling for Gaussian vector multiple-access channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 145–152, January 2004.
- [14] G. Gupta, S. Toumpis, J. Sayir, and R. R. M uller, "On the transport capacity of Gaussian multiple access and broadcast channels," in *Proc. IEEE ISIT*, Adelaide, Australia, September 2005.
- [15] S. Vishwanath, N. Jindal, and A. Goldsmith, "Duality, achievable rates and sum capacity of Gaussian MIMO broadcast channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 2658–2668, August 2003.
- [16] H. Weingarten, Y. Steinberg, and S. Shamai, "The capacity region of the Gaussian MIMO broadcast channel," in *Proceedings Conf. on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS)*, Princeton, NJ, March 2004.

- [17] P. Viswanath and D. Tse, "Sum capacity of the vector Gaussian broadcast channel and uplink-downlink duality," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, no. 8, pp. 1912–1921, August 2003.
- [18] H. Viswanathan, S. Venkatesan, and H. Huang, "Downlink capacity evaluation of cellular networks with known-interference cancellation," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 802–811, June 2003.
- [19] S. Ye and R. S. Blum, "Optimized signaling for MIMO interference systems with feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 51, no. 11, pp. 2839–2848, Nov. 2003.