

**Kybernetika -23 (1987), 3**

ACADEMIA

PRAHA

## ON THE PERFORMANCE AND STABILITY OF A SIMPLE GATED CONFLICT RESOLUTION ALGORITHM

K. SOHRABY, A. N. VENETSANOPOULOS, M. L. MOLLE

A simple "gated" conflict resolution algorithm is described that is simpler than the well-known tree conflict resolution algorithm due to Capetanakis, Tsybakov and Mikhailov. Here each cycle begins with the estimation of the number of contending users to select the number of slots in a frame. Then each contending user transmits its packet in one of those slots, chosen at random. Performance analysis based on Markov chain theory together with the region of stability of the protocol is provided. It is shown that the capacity of this algorithm is slightly less than that of Capetanakis' static algorithm.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Multiple access protocols are used to schedule the transmission of packets over a broadcast communication channel that is shared by a distributed population of stations. We assume the channel to be a resource that can transmit successfully only one packet at a time.

Several factors need to be considered in the selection of a multiple access protocol. While at first it might seem that the most efficient multiple access protocol that yet has been devised must be used, one must keep in mind that achieving maximum capacity is by no means the only goal in choosing a protocol for a network. Simplicity, long term stability, robustness to errors in feedback information and good delay characteristics are also important.

Slotted Aloha is among the simplest multiple access protocols for communication systems, and a viable access technique in certain applications (e.g., a system supporting a large number of lightly loaded users). However, as many authors have pointed out [1–3], it is not stable, even for small traffic intensities, unless it is very carefully controlled.


Protocols based on the tree algorithms are more advanced and take advantage of the feedback that a collision occurred sometimes in the past [4–6]. Such protocols are stable, but suffer two major problems from a practical point of view. The first is failure due to incorrect or inconsistent feedback (e.g., deadlock), the second is that the current “state” of the protocol encodes the channel activity for a long term in the past, so that stations may have difficulty entering or leaving the network.

In this paper we analyze a variation of a simple multiple access protocol introduced by Greenberg [7]. Some numerical results are obtained, along with the region of stability of the protocol. In Section 2 we present the model and description of the protocol. Throughput analysis is presented in Section 3. Finally discussion of results and conclusions are presented in Sections 4 and 5 respectively.

## 2. THE MODEL AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROTOCOL

We assume the standard slotted Aloha channel model. The channel is divided into slots of length equal to one packet transmission time and all the terminals are synchronized to the channel time. Furthermore at the end of each slot, all users can determine whether zero, one or multiple packet transmission took place in that slot. Multiple packets per slot correspond to a collision and under such circumstances none of the packets is successful. The source model is assumed to be Poisson, i.e., an infinite number of independent users that collectively generate  $n$  packets per slot, where  $n$  is a Poisson random variable with mean  $\lambda$ .

The operation of the protocol consists of a sequence of “cycles” and each cycle is composed of two phases. New messages are only permitted to join the protocol at the start of a cycle. Phase I is used to estimate  $k$ , the number of contending users participating in the protocol during that cycle, and phase II is used for transmission of those packets. In the first slot of phase I (slot 0) all the contending users transmit their packets with probability  $1/2^0 = 1$  to signal their participation in the protocol. If zero or one packet is transmitted in this slot, then the cycle is terminated. Other-



C: Collision Slot, Em: Empty Slot and S: Successful Slot

Fig. 1. Example of 4 successful transmissions in a cycle of duration 11 slots.

wise a collision occurred and phase I continues with each of the contending users transmitting with probability  $1/2^i$  in the following slot (slot 1) and so on until slot  $u$  (where each of the contending users transmitted with probability  $1/2^u$ ) which is collision free for the first time. In phase I we found an estimate of  $\log_2 k$ , namely  $u$ . Thus in phase II, we allocate  $2^u - \{\text{number of packets successfully transmitted in the } u\text{th slot}\}$ , and each of the remaining contending users transmits its packet in any of those slots with equal probability. Those users who due to a collision do not succeed in phase II, will join the protocol at the beginning of the next cycle together with new arrivals in the present cycle. The protocol is exemplified for a typical cycle in Figures 1 and 2.




Fig. 2. Structure of a cycle.

### 3. ANALYSIS OF THE PROTOCOL

In this section we derive an expression for the throughput. First we obtain the conditional throughput, given the number of ready users at the beginning of a cycle. Then we use the Markov property to obtain the average throughput. For this derivations we use the following notations:

- $k$ : Number of contending users at the beginning of a cycle
- $P_k(j)$ :  $\Pr(u = j | k)$ , distribution of phase I, given  $k$
- $f_k(i)$ :  $\Pr(0 \text{ or } 1 \text{ transmission in slot } i \text{ of phase I, given } k)$
- $\beta(s | n, m)$ :  $\Pr(s \text{ successful transmission in phase II of given duration } m \text{ slots, where the number of packets participating in this phase is given to be } n)$
- $\gamma_k$ : Conditional throughput, i.e., the ratio of the average number of successful transmission in a cycle to the average duration of a cycle, given  $k$
- $\Pr(i | k)$ : Transition probability of number of contending users at the beginning of a cycle
- $\Pi_k$ : Stationary probability of having  $k$  contending users at the beginning of a cycle.

Now we have (see Figure 2)

$$(1) \quad f_k(j) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^j}\right)^k + \frac{k}{2^j} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^j}\right)^{k-1} = \left(1 + \frac{k}{2^j - 1}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^j}\right)^k$$

In phase I, each user transmits with probability  $1/2^j$  in slot  $j$  until zero or one transmission takes place. Thus

$$(2) \quad P_k(j+1) = \prod_{l=1}^j [1 - f_k(l)] f_k(j+1) \quad \forall k, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

which gives the following recursion:

$$(3) \quad P_k(1) = (k+1) \frac{1}{2^k} \quad \forall k$$

$$P_k(j+1) = P_k(j) \frac{1 - f_k(j)}{f_k(j)} f_k(j+1) \quad \forall k, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

where  $f_k(j)$  is given by (1). Then it can be shown that

$$(4) \quad \gamma_k = \frac{\sum_j \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{k}{k+2^j-1}\right) k \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^j}\right)^{k-1} + \frac{k}{k+2^j-1} \left[ (k-1) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^j-1}\right)^{k-2} + 1 \right] \right\} P_k(j)}{\sum_j \left[ (2^j + j) + \left(1 - \frac{k}{k+2^j-1}\right) \right] P_k(j)}$$

$$k \geq 2$$

$$\gamma_1 = 0$$

$$\gamma_0 = 0$$

The number of contending users at the beginning of a cycle is Markovian. To find the transition probabilities, we note the following occupancy problem [8]: take  $\beta(s | n, m)$  as the probability that exactly  $s$  cells, each having exactly 1 object when  $n$  unlike objects are distributed randomly into  $m$  unlike cells, then we have [8]

$$(5) \quad \beta(s | n, m) = \frac{\binom{m}{s}}{m^n} \sum_{i=0}^{\min(m-s-1, n-s)} (-1)^i \binom{m-s}{i} = \frac{n!}{(n-s-i)!} (m-s-i)^{n-s-i}$$

Conditioning on  $u$ , the conditional transition probability becomes

$$(6) \quad \Pr(i | k, u = j) = \sum_{s=0}^{\min(k, 2^j)} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{k}{k+2^j-1}\right) \beta(s | k, 2^j) + \frac{k}{k+2^j-1} \beta(s-1 | k-1, 2^j) \right] \cdot \frac{(\lambda(2^j + j + 1))^{i-k+s} e^{-\lambda(2^j + j + 1)}}{(i-k+s)!}$$

where

$$\beta(-1 | \cdot, \cdot) \triangleq 0$$




Fig. 5. Conditional throughput of the protocol compare achievable performance with perfect estimate.




Fig. 6. Conditional throughput of the protocol with estimation phase composed of minislots.

average duration of phase I is of the order of  $\log_2^k$ , which is asymptotically negligible compared to phase II.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we analyzed a simple multiple access protocol which allocates the channel capacity by estimating the number of contending users. We showed that stability is achieved with only a slight degradation in the capacity (3123 compare to  $1/e$  of the unstable slotted Aloha).

Finally as a source of improvement we remark that if in phase II the stations were to monitor the proportion of idle, successful and collision slots, the estimate of the number of contending users could be improved: by having too many idle or collision slots, the stations might conclude that their estimate is high or too low respectively and accordingly shorten or expand the remainder of phase II. One algorithm for doing this was given by Hajek and Van Loon [3]. The idea of using an estimation process is also useful in more complicated algorithms. For example, Schoute [11] has been able to achieve a capacity of 426 using a more complex estimation process and a slightly different cycle structure.

(Received November 18, 1985.)

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. J. Ferguson: On the control stability and waiting time in slotted Aloha random access system. *IEEE Trans. Comm. COM-23* (1975), 1306—1311.
- [2] L. Kleinrock and S. S. Lam: Packet switching in a multiaccess broadcast channel: performance evaluation. *IEEE Trans. Comm. COM-23* (1975), 410—423.
- [3] B. Hajek and T. V. Loon: Decentralized dynamic control of a multiaccess broadcast channel. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control AC-27* (1982), 559—569.
- [4] J. F. Hayes: Adaptive technique for local distribution. *IEEE Trans. Comm. COM-26* (1978), 1178—1186.
- [5] B. Tsybakov and V. A. Mikhailov: Free synchronous packet access in a broadcast channel with feedback. *Problems Inform. Transmission 14* (1979), 259—280.
- [6] J. J. Capetanakis: Tree algorithms for packet broadcasting channels. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory IT-25* (1979), 505—515.
- [7] A. G. Greenberg: On the Time Complexity of Broadcast Communication Schemes. Technical Report 82-04-02. April 1982, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Washington.
- [8] V. F. Kolchin, B. A. Sevast'yanov and P. P. Chistyakov: *Random Allocations*. V. H. Winston and Sons, Washington, D. C. 1978.
- [9] S. Karlin and H. M. Taylor: *A First Course in Stochastic Processes*. Second Edition. Academic Press, New York 1975.
- [10] G. Fayolle, E. Gelenbe and J. Labetoulle: Stability and optimal control of the packet switching broadcast channel. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.* 24 (1977), 375—386.
- [11] F. C. Schoute: Dynamic frame length ALOHA. *IEEE Trans. Comm. COM-31* (1983), 565—568.

*Dr. Khosrow Sohraby, INRS Télécommunications, 3 Place du Commerce, Verdun, P. Q. H3E 1H6, Canada.*

*Prof. Anastanos N. Venetsanopoulos, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Toronto, Toronto M5S 1A4, Canada.*

*Dr. Mari L. Molle, Computer Systems Research Institute, University of Toronto, Toronto, M5S 1A4, Canada.*

K otištění v časopise „Kybernetika“ se přijímají rukopisy dosud nepublikovaných nebo jinam k publikaci nezaslaných prací. Příspěvky mají být psány stručně a jasně, jejich rozsah nemá v průměru přesahovat 20 stran strojopisu (s 30 řádkami po 60 úhovech). Příspěvky zasílejte dvojmo.

Zároveň s rukopisem dodejte jeho stručnou charakteristiku (max. 10 řádek). K rukopisu připojte svou přesnou adresu, která bude otištěna na konci článku. Redakce považuje rukopis za konečnou verzi práce, změny při korekturách nejsou přípustné.

Úplnější informace pro autory jsou uvedeny v prvním čísle tohoto ročníku.

“Kybernetika” will consider for publication papers which have not been published or submitted for publication elsewhere. Articles should not on average exceed 20 typewritten pages (30 lines of 60 characters) and should be expressed in a concise and clear manner. Two copies of all contributions should be submitted to the Editorial Office.

A concise abstract (max. 10 lines) should also accompany the manuscript. The author's full postal address should be included with the manuscript and will be published at the end of the paper. The Editor assumes the manuscript to be in its final form: changes cannot normally be made at the galley-proof stage.

For further information authors may refer to the first issue of this volume.

---

Kybernetika. Ročník 23 (1987)

Vydává Ústav teorie informace a automatizace ČSAV v Akademii, nakladatelství ČSAV, Vodičkova 40, 112 29 Praha 1. — Redakce: Pod vodárenskou věží 4, 182 08 Praha 8. — Tiskne Polygrafia, n. p., závod 6 - Prometheus, Rudé armády 171, 182 00 Praha 8. — Rozšiřuje PNS. Informace o předplatném podá a objednávky přijímá každá administrace PNS, pošta, doručovatel a PNS-ÚED Praha. Objednávky do zahraničí vyřizuje PNS - ústřední expedice a dovoz tisku Praha, závod 01, administrace vývozu tisku, Kafkova 19, 160 00 Praha 6. Vychází šestkrát ročně. Cena jednotl. sešitu Kčs 14,—, roční předplatné Kčs 84,—. Objednávky ze socialistických zemí vyřizuje ARTIA, Ve Smečkách 30, 111 27 Praha 1.

Toto číslo vyšlo v květnu 1987.

Kybernetika. Volume 23 (1987)

Published bimonthly under the auspices of the Institute of Information Theory and Automation of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences by Academia. Publishing House of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Vodičkova 40, 112 29 Praha 1. — Address of the Editor: Pod vodárenskou věží 4, 182 08 Praha 8. — Printed by Polygrafia, n. p., závod 6 - Prometheus, 182 00 Praha 8. — Orders and subscription from the socialist countries should be sent to ARTIA, Ve Smečkách 30, 111 27 Praha 1. — Annual subscription rate Kčs 84.—. Sole agent for all western countries: Kubon & Sagner, P. O. Box 34 01 08, D-8 000 München 34, G.F.R.

Annual subscription: Vol. 23 (1987) (6 issues) DM 190.—.

Published in May 1987.

© ACADEMIA, Praha 1987.