

On Dissemination Time of Random Linear Network Coding in Ad-hoc Networks

Shwan Ashrafi, Sumit Roy and Mohammad H. Firooz

Department of Electrical Engineering

University of Washington

Email: {shwan,sroy,firooz}@u.washington.edu

Abstract

In this work, we consider the canonical problem of information dissemination but over unreliable wireless channels. In such scenarios, *randomized* algorithms have proven their effectiveness. We analyze a unicast-based Random Linear Network Coding (RLNC) approach over random graph. The primary objective is to derive statistical characterization of the *stopping* (or completion) time for this approach. We show that the dissemination process can be fundamentally characterized by a sequence of independent geometric random variables whose parameter (success probability) is state dependant. A tight approximation of the average dissemination time and the corresponding p.m.f is derived and validated via simulation. We then propose an innovation to speed up the convergence of RLNC-based broadcast - via biasing the selection of nodes for subsequent transmissions *based on average innovative information* that they can provided to the rest of the network. Simulation results confirm the efficacy of the approach as quantified by speed-up compared to standard RLNC algorithm where nodes are selected uniformly at random.

Index Terms

Wireless Broadcast, Information dissemination, Random Linear Network Coding, Dissemination Time, Probability Mass Function.

I. INTRODUCTION

Efficient sharing of information between a set of wirelessly connected nodes continues to be a problem of increasing importance. Such information dissemination scenarios can be conveniently classified into a) centralized (classical) broadcast, whereby the information from a *single* source node must be replicated at a set of receivers/sinks; and b) decentralized broadcast wherein (disjoint) information initially residing

at a set of nodes, must be successfully sent to all [1]–[5]. A canonical example of the latter - which is the focus of this work - occurs when a file of common interest is broken up into disjoint pieces (for simplicity, we assume no redundancy) and stored at a set of nodes. An interesting instantiation is the inter-vehicle network as in Fig. 1 that have common interest in a large size file, e.g., a video on Internet. Due to intermittent connectivity between vehicles and roadside infrastructures and limited infrastructure coverage area, each vehicle is only able to download a portion of the whole file. Assuming that the union of the pieces covers the full file, the vehicular nodes may then cooperate with each other via some inter-vehicle communication method (such as Dedicated Short Range Communications [DSRC]) to share their information and reconstruct the full file.

Mobile sensor networks such as the above, are characterized by intermittent connectivity and changing topology resulting from node mobility. Randomized gossip algorithms have been proposed for data dissemination in such scenarios for efficient spreading of information to all nodes in unstructured networks (time-varying topologies). However, such approaches can only provide *probabilistic* guarantees on the dissemination time - which is not desirable in applications (such as broadcast of emergency messages) where hard (deterministic) bounds on latency are desirable. The main objective of this work is to analyze random linear network coding based dissemination and to propose efficient RLNC-based broadcast schemes as superior alternatives to pure randomized gossip protocols.

A. Related Work

Network coding [6] is an elegant technique for improving network throughput for broadcast/multicast scenarios while preserving bandwidth efficiency [7]. In random linear network coding, intermediate nodes in a network construct a linear combination (using random coefficient chosen from a suitable finite field) of their current data, for broadcasting to other nodes in the network. Thus, network coding based protocols have found potential application in *content distribution networks* [8], [9].

Randomized algorithms are effective dissemination mechanisms in dynamic networks with link failures and uncertainty (lack of full knowledge) regarding network topology¹. Gossip based approaches (a class of distributed randomized algorithms) have been extensively studied [1], [2], [4], [10]–[12] as a simple and elegant way for information dissemination. For example, in *uniform gossiping*, node pairs are picked uniformly at random at each instant to communicate and share data; [1] gives an estimate for the

¹With full knowledge of network topology, a suitable deterministic protocol may actually out-perform pure randomized gossip.

dissemination time of a single message over a complete graph. [4] considers the rate at which a rumor spreads over an undirected graph using a unicast protocol. At each step, a node that has the rumor chooses one of its neighbors uniformly at random and sends the rumor to it.

Network coding for decentralized information dissemination was first introduced for multicasting in wired networks [6], [13]–[16]. An interesting advance - *network coding based gossiping* was first proposed in [17] for a fully connected graph of wired nodes. [17] shows that network coding improves dissemination latency - compared to simple sequential gossiping - over complete graphs at the cost of a small overhead, associated with requiring each packet to contain the network coding coefficients. Following this work [18] further analyzed dissemination time of random linear network coding algorithms over *general* topologies and related dissemination time to the *conductance* of the network graph. [19] proposed a projection technique for analyzing RLNC-based protocols with multiple initial messages and obtained asymptotic results for dissemination time based on the spectral properties of underlying graphs.

In contrast to work where network coding is applied to wired networks, wireless network coding presents new challenges, e.g., links are unreliable. The notion of network coding is applied to wireless setting in [7], [20], [21] for efficient broadcasting. [7] shows that RLNC is more bandwidth efficient as opposed to traditional broadcasting schemes. [20] exploited RLNC-based information dissemination and proposed an energy efficient broadcasting scheme in an ad-hoc wireless network. [21] studied practical RLNC-based dissemination for broadcasting in ad-hoc networks by quantifying the impact of realistic random access on the performance of data dissemination.

B. Objectives & Contribution

This work is centered around the dissemination time of RLNC based protocols over a (possibly) changing network topology, where at any instant, node pairs can communicate over a link that exists with a constant probability. At initialization, we assume that all nodes contain exactly one packet, and dissemination process stops when all nodes acquire *all* packets. Our approach and results differ from the literature in the following significant aspects. Most of the existing results on dissemination time of RLNC-based gossip protocols concentrate on uniform gossip and the results are asymptotic in network size. We focus on deriving the probability mass function (p.m.f) for the dissemination time of RLNC-based unicast for any general, finite random graph - these constitute the first and most general results concerning dissemination time p.m.f, to the best of our knowledge. We provide a *tight* approximation to the dissemination time p.m.f for the special case of a random graph with equal link existence probabilities.

Subsequently, in Section IV, we propose an enhanced RLNC-based broadcast protocol which biases the node selection scheme such that selected node has higher average innovation probability (i.e has greater chance to provide innovative packets to the rest of the network) and thus achieves a lower (stochastically dominant) cumulative distribution function (c.d.f) of dissemination time.

Our contribution can be summarized as follows:

- We show that dissemination time of RLNC-based unicast protocol can be modeled as a sequence of independent geometric random variables where the success probability changes with every successful reception of an innovative packet. We then mathematically characterize an approximation for the probability mass function and the average dissemination time for RLNC-based unicast protocol over rapidly-changing network topology with equal link existence probabilities. We show through simulation that our approximation for the p.m.f of dissemination time is tight.
- We derive an upper bound for the c.d.f of dissemination time of RLNC-based broadcast over a general network topology. We then derive optimal dissemination time for two special cases of ring network and random network, i.e, a network with equal link existence probabilities. Furthermore we propose two RLNC-based data dissemination protocols which exploit average innovation probability of a pair of nodes to further reduce information dissemination time. We then use the upper bound as a benchmark to evaluate the performance of our proposed schemes.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II describes network model and communication protocols. Section III presents our analysis for dissemination time of RLNC-based unicast protocol over a rapidly changing topology with identical link existence probabilities. In section IV we characterize an upper bound for the c.d.f of dissemination time of RLNC-based broadcast in a general network topology with non-identical link existence probabilities. We then propose to use more efficient broadcast protocols using a node selection approach and show the performance of the proposed protocols by comparing to the upper bound through simulation. We conclude in Section V.

II. NETWORK MODEL

Consider the scenario (See Fig. 1) where a group of agents (nodes) have a common interest in a file. The file is partitioned into n parts and each node possesses only one specific part. We call each file part an information packet. The network is modeled as an undirected graph $G = (V, E_t)$ where $V = [n] := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ represents the vertex set (nodes) and E_t is the link set, i.e., the set of available

communication links that changes from time to time. For a general network topology the link success probability is denoted by p_{uv} where u and v are the transmitting and receiving nodes respectively. In Section III we focus on a random graph where $p_{uv} = p$ for all $u, v \in V$. This is a reasonable assumption if nodes are in a small range so that all the links have almost the same path loss. In a random graph, the underlying topology changes from one time instant to the next one. In each time step, the graph is not fully-connected and each link exists with the probability p . We assume that if a link exists, it is perfect, i.e., there is no transmission error. Let CNR represent the ratio of channel power to receiver noise power. Then, there exists a link from node u to node v , at time t , if $\text{CNR}_{uv}(t) > \text{CNR}_{\text{TH}}$, i.e., the link quality is above a minimum acceptable threshold. We take CNR_{uv} s to be i.i.d. exponential random variables with the same mean value as $\overline{\text{CNR}} = \overline{\text{CNR}_{uv}}$. Thus, we assume that nodes operate over a small enough area such that the channel between each pair can be considered stationary. Let p represent the probability that a link exists, from node u to node v , at a given time. Assuming exponentially-distributed multipath fading, we have $p = \text{prob}(\text{CNR}_{uv}(t) > \text{CNR}_{\text{TH}}) = e^{-\text{CNR}_{\text{TH}}/\overline{\text{CNR}}}$.

We assume that nodes are synchronized and have access to a common clock and all transmissions occur synchronously with the common clock [11]. Therefore, transmissions are slotted and every node transmits at the start of a slot. Furthermore, we assume that during each time slot, a node $v \in V$ transmits exactly one packet.

We study two communication protocols, namely RLNC-based unicast and broadcast. In each time slot, nodes communicate with each other if an active link exists between them. In RLNC-based unicast a pair of nodes is chosen uniformly at random as a transmitter/receiver pair at time t . One node then applies a linear network coding operation to the packets it has collected until time t and transmits the coded packet to the receiver. In RLNC-based broadcast protocol, a node is chosen uniformly at random for transmission and all other nodes can potentially receive the coded packet if there exist active links between the transmitting and receiving nodes. In both unicast and broadcast scenarios, a coded packet is generated as a linear combination of the packets possessed by a transmitter and transmitter does not know which nodes will receive the coded packet.

III. RLNC-BASED UNICAST PROTOCOL

Consider a network where each node $u \in V$ has initially one information packet m_u to be shared with every other nodes in the network. So the set of unique information packets in the network at all times is given by $\{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$ for a network with n nodes. Each packet is a vector of b symbols, where each




Fig. 1. Cooperative downloading: a group of vehicle trying to get access to full information by exchanging pieces of a file downloaded partially by each vehicle.

symbol is an element of a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ where $q \geq 2$ is a prime integer power. Thus $m_u \in \mathbb{F}_q^b$ for each node $u \in V$. For convenience, assume that q divides the length of packets transmitted. If this is not the case zero padding is applied. In addition, all packets are linearly independent vectors with elements in $\mathbb{F}_q$ [22], reflecting the fact that nodes have different information to share.

As the RLNC-based data dissemination protocol evolves, each node receives a sequence of random linear combinations of the information packets initially possessed by the nodes. The multiplication and addition are over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Therefore, after a sequence of transmissions, node $u \in V$ possesses a set of linearly independent coded packets. Let x_i denote the i th coded packet which can be represented as $x_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{i,j} m_j$ where $\alpha_{i,j}$ is the *network coding coefficient* corresponding to packet m_j . For a coded packet x_i , some of the coefficients $\alpha_{i,j}$ s may be zero if the node chosen for transmission does not contain the corresponding information packet. Additionally, the coding coefficients of each coded packet are available through the header of the packet containing x_i . As discussed in [23], in a network coding system, each packet consists of two parts: a header that contains the network coding coefficients and a body that carries the coded packet. This header is a price to pay to use network coding. However, if the size of the information packet and hence the size of the coded packet is reasonably large, this overhead is negligible. That being said, for each coded packet x_i at node u , network coding coefficients are available. Thus the vectors of

coding coefficients received at node u span a subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ at any time t . Let $\mathbb{S}_u(t)$ denote the subspace spanned by the coding coefficient vectors of node u at time t , then

$$\mathbb{S}_u(t) = \text{span}\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{|\mathbb{S}_u(t)|}\}, \quad (1)$$

where $|\mathbb{S}_u(t)| = \dim(\mathbb{S}_u(t))$ is the dimension of subspace $\mathbb{S}_u(t)$.

The RLNC-based dissemination protocol terminates when all the nodes are able to decode the received coded packets and recover a copy of n information packets.

Definition 1. Let T_s denote the first time that all the nodes communicating using RLNC-based dissemination protocol can decode the information packets. T_s represents dissemination time and is defined as follows

$$T_s = \min_{t \in \mathbb{P}} \{t : r_u(t) = n, \forall u \in [n]\}, \quad (2)$$

where $r_u(t)$ is the rank of node u at time t which is $r_u(t) = \dim(\mathbb{S}_u(t))$ and $\mathbb{P}$ is the set of positive integers.

Definition 2. Network dimension increase $d(t)$, at time t is defined as $d(t) = \sum_{u=1}^n r_u(t) - n$. Furthermore, define total dimension of the network at time t by $D(t) = d(t) + n$.

Definition 3. A coded packet received by node u at time t is called an *innovative packet* if $\dim(\mathbb{S}_u(t)) > \dim(\mathbb{S}_u(t-1))$.

Definition 4. The innovation probability is the probability that a coded packet received by node u at time t be an innovative packet, i.e., $\Pr(\dim(\mathbb{S}_u(t)) > \dim(\mathbb{S}_u(t-1)))$.

A. Analysis of RLNC-based protocol

We assume a RLNC-based unicast scenario over a random graph with link existence probability p . At every iteration t , two nodes are chosen uniformly at random as a transmitter and receiver pair. Then one node transmits to the other node a random linear combination of the packets it has collected until time t . In order for all the nodes to be able to decode all the information packets, network dimension increase needs to be $n(n-1)$. Our goal is to find a tight approximation for the probability mass function and the average of dissemination time. In fact, dissemination time in RLNC-based unicast is a random variable and is considered as a sequence of independent geometric random variables whose success probabilities change with every successful reception of an innovative packet. Next, we characterize an approximation

for the average networked innovation probability.

We can pick a basis for $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ in $(q^n - 1)(q^n - q) \cdots (q^n - q^{n-1})$ number of ways. We can also choose a subspace of dimension k of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ in $(q^n - 1)(q^n - q) \cdots (q^n - q^{k-1})$ number of ways. For each of these subspaces there are $(q^k - 1)(q^k - q) \cdots (q^k - q^{k-1})$ distinct basis vectors. Therefore, the number of distinct k -dimensional subspaces² of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ is $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q := \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{q^{n-i}-1}{q^{k-i}-1}$ which is the q -analog of binomial coefficient (q -binomial coefficient) or *Gaussian polynomial*.

Lemma 1. *In RLNC-based unicast protocol over a network with link existence probability p , the conditional probability that the dimension of receiver increases by one given that the transmitter and receiver have ranks a and b respectively and their intersection subspace is of dimension j equals*

$$p_{inv} = p (1 - q^{-(a-j)}) . \quad (3)$$

Proof. In order for the network dimension to increase by one, the transmitter should send a vector not in the intersection subspace of the transmitter and receiver. Furthermore, an innovative packet is received if a link exist. $\square$

We then have the following result for the average probability of innovation conditioned on the transmitter and receiver ranks.

Proposition 1. *Assume that the ranks of nodes u and v are a and b respectively. If u transmits a random linear combination of its packet to node v over $\mathbb{F}_q$, then the average conditional innovation probability at any time is upper bounded by*

$$p^{inv}(a, b) < p \frac{\left(\frac{q^n-1}{q^n-q} \right)}{\begin{bmatrix} n \\ b \end{bmatrix}_q} \sum_j q^{(a-j)(b-j)} \begin{bmatrix} a \\ j \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} n-a \\ b-j \end{bmatrix}_q \left(1 - \frac{1}{q^{a-j}} \right),$$

where $\max\{a + b - n, 0\} \leq j \leq \min\{a, b\}$.

Proof. We consider two cases:

Case 1: The subspace of node u contains the information packet of node v : In this case there are $\begin{bmatrix} n-2 \\ a-2 \end{bmatrix}_q$ distinct subspaces of dimension a for node u . From these possibilities, there are $\begin{bmatrix} a-1 \\ j-1 \end{bmatrix}_q$ distinct subspaces of dimension j that nodes u and v span both. For node v , we need to pick $b - j$ basis. However, we can not pick vectors from the subspace of node u , thus, there are $q^n - q^a$ vectors from which we pick $b - j$ vectors. This can be done in $(q^n - q^a)(q^n - q^{a+1}) \cdots (q^n - q^{a+b-j-1})$ number of ways. Any of such

²We use k -subspace instead of the term k -dimensional subspaces in short.

b -subspaces will arise exactly $(q^b - q^j)(q^b - q^{j+1}) \dots (q^b - q^{j+b-j-1})$ times in this manner because we have already fixed j vectors in the intersection subspace of nodes u and v .

$$\begin{aligned} \#\{\text{distinct subspaces of dimension } b-j \text{ disjoint from subspace of } u\} &= \frac{(q^n - q^a)(q^n - q^{a+1}) \dots (q^n - q^{a+b-j-1})}{(q^b - q^j)(q^b - q^{j+1}) \dots (q^b - q^{j+b-j-1})} \\ &= \frac{q^a \dots q^a}{\underbrace{q^j \dots q^j}_{b-j \text{ times}}} \prod_{i=0}^{b-j-1} \frac{q^{n-a-i} - 1}{q^{b-j-i} - 1} = q^{(a-j)(b-j)} \begin{bmatrix} n-a \\ b-j \end{bmatrix}_q. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: The subspace of node u does not contain the information packet of node v : The discussion is along the same line with that of case 1. Therefore, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} p^{\text{inv}}(a, b) &< p \sum_j \left(q^{(a-j)(b-j)} \frac{\begin{bmatrix} n-2 \\ a-2 \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} a-1 \\ j-1 \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} n-a \\ b-j \end{bmatrix}_q}{\begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ a-1 \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ b-1 \end{bmatrix}_q} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + q^{(a-j)(b-j-1)} \frac{\left(\begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ a-1 \end{bmatrix}_q - \begin{bmatrix} n-2 \\ a-2 \end{bmatrix}_q \right) \begin{bmatrix} a \\ j \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} n-a-1 \\ b-j-1 \end{bmatrix}_q}{\begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ a-1 \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ b-1 \end{bmatrix}_q} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{q^{a-j}} \right) \\ &= p \sum_j \frac{q^{(a-j)(b-j)}}{1 - q^{n-1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q^{a-j}} \right) \left(\frac{1 - q^{a-1}}{1 - q^a} (1 - q^j) + q^{j-1} - q^{b-1} \right) \frac{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ j \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} n-a \\ b-j \end{bmatrix}_q}{\begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ b-1 \end{bmatrix}_q} \\ &< p \frac{\left(\frac{q^n - 1}{q^n - q} \right)}{\begin{bmatrix} n \\ b \end{bmatrix}_q} \sum_j q^{(a-j)(b-j)} \begin{bmatrix} a \\ j \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} n-a \\ b-j \end{bmatrix}_q \left(1 - \frac{1}{q^{a-j}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, j can not be less than $\max\{a+b-n, 0\}$. This is the minimum possible dimension of the intersection subspace of two arbitrary nodes. Let $\mathbb{S}_u(t)$ and $\mathbb{S}_v(t)$ denote the subspaces spanned by nodes u and v at time t respectively. $n \geq \dim(\mathbb{S}_u(t) \cup \mathbb{S}_v(t)) = \dim(\mathbb{S}_u(t)) + \dim(\mathbb{S}_v(t)) - \dim(\mathbb{S}_u(t) \cap \mathbb{S}_v(t)) = a + b - j$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 1. Note that the average conditional innovation probability obtained above is an upper bound for the actual average innovation probability. This is due to the fact that some subspace arrangements of packets occur with zero probability. For instance consider three nodes with unordered initial subspace arrangement of $\{\{m_1\}, \{m_2\}, \{m_3\}\}$. If at time t the unordered set of subspace dimensions of these nodes is $\{1, 2, 2\}$, then it is not possible to have $\{\{m_1\}, \{m_2, m_1 + m_3\}, \{m_3, m_1 + m_2\}\}$ as it requires that packets m_1 and m_3 to be already in a node so that it is possible to compute their linear combination. Let $\mathcal{S}_q$ denote the projective spaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ which is the set of all subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$. Also let $\mathcal{S}(t)$ denote the subspace arrangement of nodes at time t . As RLNC-based protocol evolves, at any time, only $\mathcal{S}(t) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$

is the possible set of subspace arrangements. Now suppose that x is a coded packet in the subspace of node $u \in V$. Since any subspace arrangement is not possible at a certain time, hence $x \in \mathbb{S}_u(t) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(t)$. We then have $p^{\text{inv}}(a, b) = \Pr(x \in \mathbb{S}_u(t) \text{ be innovative to node } v) \leq \Pr(x \in \mathcal{S}_q \text{ be innovative to node } v)$ which shows that the average conditional innovation probability derived in Proposition 1 is an upper bound for the actual average conditional innovation probability.

Definition 5. The ordinary generating function of a finite sequence $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1})$ is the power series

$$g(x) = a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots + a_{k-1}x^{k-1}, \quad (4)$$

where x is regarded as a place-holder.

Definition 6. A constrained composition of an integer n is a sequence $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1})$ of positive integers such that $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i = n$ where $a_i \in \chi \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. Define $c_\chi(n, k)$ to be the number of constrained compositions of n into k parts with parts picked from the set χ .

Lemma 2. Consider a network with n nodes where each node initially possesses one information packet. Information packets are assumed to be mutually linearly independent. Nodes communicate over a rapidly-changing network topology using RLNC-based unicast protocol. Let $d(t)$ denote network dimension increase until time t . Furthermore, let I_t and J_t represent the sets of indices of the nodes at time t for which $r_u(t) = a$ and $r_v(t) = b$ for all $u \in I_t$ and $v \in J_t$. Assume that $|I_t| = n_a$ and $|J_t| = n_b$. Define $\kappa := n - n_a - n_b$ and $\delta := D(t) - an_a - bn_b$. Then, the number of ordered rank arrangements for $V \setminus \{I_t \cup J_t\}$ is

$$c_{[n] \setminus \{a, b\}}(\delta, \kappa) = \sum_{0 \leq i_2 \leq i_1 \leq \kappa} (-1)^{i_1} \binom{\kappa}{i_1} \binom{i_1}{i_2} \binom{\delta - 1 - ai_1 - (b-a)i_2}{\kappa - i_1 - 1}.$$

Proof. Network dimension at time t is $D(t)$ and we know that there are n_a and n_b nodes with ranks a and b respectively. Therefore, $\delta = D(t) - an_a - bn_b$ is the sum of the rank of $\kappa = n - n_a - n_b$ nodes remained. This is equivalent to the number of compositions of δ into κ parts subject to the constraint that we are not allowed to use numbers a and b . We use the method of generating functions to find the number of compositions. Let $\chi = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-2}\}$ represent the set of allowable values to generate such compositions. We can write the generating function for $n - n_a - n_b$ nodes as follows

$$g(x) = (x^{s_1} + x^{s_2} + \dots + x^{s_{n-2}})^{n-n_a-n_b}. \quad (5)$$

After expanding $g(x)$, a typical term of $g(x)$ is $x^{i_1 s_1 + i_2 s_2 + \dots + i_{n-2} s_{n-2}}$. Furthermore, we need to have $i_1 s_1 + i_2 s_2 + \dots + i_{n-2} s_{n-2} = \delta$. Therefore, we can collect all such terms to find the number of compositions. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
g(x) &= \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{P} \setminus \{a, b\}} x^i \right)^\kappa = \left(\sum_{i \geq 1} x^i - x^a - x^b \right)^\kappa \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \left(\frac{x}{1-x} - x^a - x^b \right)^\kappa \\
&= \left(\frac{x}{1-x} \right)^\kappa (1 - (1-x)(x^{a-1} + x^{b-1}))^\kappa \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{0 \leq i_2 \leq i_1 \leq \kappa} (-1)^{i_1} \binom{\kappa}{i_1} \binom{i_1}{i_2} x^{(b-1)i_1 + (a-b)i_2 + \kappa} (1-x)^{-(\kappa-i_1)} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i_2 \leq i_1 \leq \kappa \\ i_3 \geq 0}} (-1)^{i_1} \binom{\kappa}{i_1} \binom{i_1}{i_2} \binom{\kappa - i_1 + i_3 - 1}{i_3} x^{(b-1)i_1 + (a-b)i_2 + i_3 + \kappa}. \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

In (a) the formula for the sum of geometric series is used. In (b) and (c) binomial and extended binomial theorems are applied. Finally, substituting $i_3 = \delta - (b-1)i_1 - (a-b)i_2 - \kappa$ in (6) to obtain the coefficient of x^δ results in the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 3. *For the network of Lemma 2 the number of possible ordered rank arrangements at time t is*

$$w(d(t), n) = \sum_j (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \left(\binom{n}{d(t) - jn} \right), \tag{7}$$

where $0 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{d(t)}{n} \rfloor$.

Proof. Consider a constrained ball and bin problem where ball and bin are tantamount to rank value and node respectively. Define $A_j = \{\text{placements of balls such that at least } j \text{ bins contain more than } n \text{ balls}\}$. We pick j bins in $\binom{n}{j}$ ways and place jn balls in them. Then we need to place $d(t) - jn$ balls in n bins. This is the number of $d(t) - jn$ combinations of $[n]$ with repetitions which is $\left(\binom{n}{d(t) - jn} \right) = \binom{d(t) - jn + n - 1}{n - 1}$ [24]. Now applying the principle of inclusion-exclusion with $|A_j| = \binom{n}{j} \left(\binom{n}{d(t) - jn} \right)$ gives the lemma. $\square$

Proposition 2. *Consider the network of Lemma 2. Nodes u and v are chosen uniformly at random to communicate. If there is n_a and n_b number of nodes with ranks a and b respectively, then for the probability of $\{r_u(t) = a, r_v(t) = b | d(t), n_a, n_b\}$ we have Eq. (8).*

Proof. Assume that $a \neq b$. Given that n_a and n_b number of nodes have ranks a and b respectively, there is $c_\chi(\delta, \kappa)$ with $\chi = \mathbb{P} \setminus \{a, b\}$ number of constrained compositions according to Lemma 2 for the remaining

$$\Pr(r_u(t) = a, r_v(t) = b | d(t), n_a, n_b) \approx \begin{cases} \frac{(n-2)!}{(n-n_a-n_b)!(n_a-1)!(n_b-1)!} \frac{c_\chi(d(t)-(a-1)n_a-(b-1)n_b, n-n_a-n_b)}{w(d(t), n)}, & \text{if } a \neq b \\ \frac{(n-2)!}{(n-n_a)!(n_a-2)!} \frac{c_\chi(d(t)-(a-1)n_a, n-n_a)}{w(d(t), n)}, & \text{if } a = b \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

κ nodes to have a total dimension equal to $\delta = D(t) - an_a - bn_b$. Now consider one such composition. Suppose that the ranks in this composition are labeled r_1 through r_κ . Fig. 2 shows an ordered rank arrangement of such composition along with $n_a + n_b$ nodes whose ranks are either a or b .




Fig. 2. A permutation of the ranks for a specific composition of ranks not equal to a and b .

As can be seen from Fig. 2, there are $\binom{n}{n_a} \binom{n-n_a}{n_b}$ such arrangements for a specific composition. Therefore, total number of such arrangements is $\binom{n}{\kappa} \frac{(n_a+n_b)!}{n_a!n_b!} c_\chi(D(t) - an_a - bn_b, \kappa)$.

Furthermore, from Lemma 3, the total number of ordered rank arrangements given that network dimension increase is $d(t)$ equals $w(d(t), n)$. Given any ordered rank arrangement the probability that a pair of transmitter and receiver with ranks a and b is chosen is $\frac{n_a n_b}{n(n-1)}$. The case of $a = b$ is along the same line of proof. This completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 3. *For the network of Lemma 2 the average innovation probability at time t is approximated by*

$$\bar{p}_{d(t)}^{inv} \approx \sum_{a,b=1}^n \sum_{\substack{1 \leq n_a \leq n-1 \\ 1 \leq n_b \leq n-n_a}} p^{inv}(a, b) \Pr(r_u(t) = a, r_v(t) = b | d(t), n_a, n_b). \quad (9)$$

Proof. Combining the results from Propositions 1 and 2 and averaging over a , b , n_a and n_b yields the result. $\square$

B. Dissemination time p.m.f of RLNC-based unicast

So far we have characterized an approximation for the average innovation probability of RLNC-based unicast data dissemination over random graph. In this subsection, we derive the probability mass function of the dissemination time based on the average innovation probability we obtained.

A geometric random variable is a sequence of independent Bernoulli trials with constant probability of success. Consider a sequence of independent geometric random variables such that the probability of success at the i th geometric random variable varies with the number of successes. The dissemination time of RLNC-based protocol can be seen as a sequence of geometric random variables whose success probability at time t depends on the number of successes until t . In other words, the innovation probability in RLNC-based protocol varies every time network dimension increases. Let $\bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}}$ represent the ‘success’ probability at the i th geometric sequence. It is clear that $\bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}} = 0$ for all $i \geq n(n-1)$ as $n(n-1)$ is the maximum value of network dimension increase so that all the nodes are able to decode the information packets.

Theorem 4. *The probability mass function of dissemination time for the network of Lemma 2 is approximated by*

$$Pr(T_s = t) \approx \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n(n-1)} \bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}} \right) S(t-1, n(n-1)-1; \bar{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{inv}}), \quad (10)$$

$$\forall t \geq n(n-1)$$

where $S(\cdot, \cdot; \cdot)$ is the generalized Stirling number of the second kind, $\bar{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{inv}} = \mathbf{1} - \bar{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{inv}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{inv}} = [\bar{p}_1^{\text{inv}}, \bar{p}_2^{\text{inv}}, \dots, \bar{p}_{n(n-1)}^{\text{inv}}]^T$, $\mathbf{1}$ is $1 \times n(n-1)$ all-one vector and ^{T} represents transpose operation.

Proof. The dissemination time T_s can be splitted into intervals such that each interval represents the time required until network dimension increases by 1, i.e., an innovative packet is received. Let X_i denote the time (number of transmissions) required in the i th interval until an innovative packet is received successfully. The i th interval corresponds to a state where network dimension is $d(t) = i$. Given that network dimension increase is i , we model the number of iterations X_i , until the next network dimension increase occurs to be a geometric random variable, i.e., $X_i \sim \text{Geo}(\bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}})$. Therefore, $T_s = X_1 + X_2 + \dots +$

$X_{n(n-1)}$. It is easy to see that the probability generating function of X_i is $G_{X_i}(z) = \frac{\bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}} z}{1 - (1 - \bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}})z}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_T(z) &= \mathbb{E}[z^T] = \prod_{i=1}^{n(n-1)} G_{X_i}(z) \\
 &= z^{n(n-1)} \prod_{i=1}^{n(n-1)} \bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}} \prod_{i=1}^{n(n-1)} \left(\frac{1}{1 - (1 - \bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}})z} \right) \\
 &= z^{n(n-1)} \prod_{i=1}^{n(n-1)} \bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}} \sum_{j=n(n-1)}^{\infty} S(j-1, n(n-1)-1; \bar{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{inv}}) z^{j-n(n-1)} \\
 &= \sum_{j=n(n-1)}^{\infty} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n(n-1)} \bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}} \right) S(j-1, n(n-1)-1; \bar{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{inv}}) z^j.
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

□

Next we derive the mean dissemination time.

Corollary 1. *For the network of Lemma 2 the average dissemination time is approximated by*

$$\mathbb{E}[T_s] \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n(n-1)} \frac{1}{\bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}}}. \tag{12}$$

Proof. Since $T_s = \sum_{i=1}^{n(n-1)} X_i$ and $X_i \sim \text{Geo}(\bar{p}_i^{\text{inv}})$ we conclude the Corollary. □

Fig. 3 shows the average innovation probability for different network parameters. It can be seen that our approximation matches the simulation considerably well.




Fig. 3. Approximated innovation probability for different network parameters.

Furthermore, the average innovation probability has ultimately a decreasing trend. In some cases,

however, it is initially non-decreasing. For instance, for small values of q , e.g. $q = 2$, the average innovation probability increases counterintuitively for a while and then shows a non-increasing behavior. We can show by an example that innovation probability is not necessarily non-increasing.

Example 1: Consider a network with $n = 3$ nodes and $p_{uv} = 1$ for all $u, v \in [n]$ and $u \neq v$. Nodes start communicating using RLNC-based unicast protocol. At $t = 0$ each transmission will be innovative unless the coding coefficient chosen by the transmitter is zero, i.e., $\alpha_i = 0$ which occurs with probability $1/2$. Therefore, innovation probability for any chosen pair is $1 - 1/2 = 1/2$ which is the average innovation probability as any pair is chosen with equal probability. After one innovative packet is exchanged between the nodes, the total dimension of the network raises to 4 and the only possible unordered rank arrangement is $\{1,1,2\}$. In this case, it is easy to see that the average innovation probability is $11/12$ which is greater than $1/2$ which is the innovation probability at $t = 0$. This example shows that for $q = 2$ the average innovation probability is not a non-increasing curve for a few transmission at the start of RLNC-based protocol.

Table I shows the average dissemination time compared to the approximation in (12). It can be seen that the approximation is very tight as the average dissemination time is close to simulation results. Furthermore, Fig. 4 shows the simulated p.m.f of dissemination time and p.m.f approximation in (??). It can also be seen that approximated p.m.f is considerably close to the simulated p.m.f.

TABLE I
AVERAGE APPROXIMATED AND SIMULATED DISSEMINATION TIME IN RLNC-BASED UNICAST PROTOCOL.

network size	field size	link exist. prob.	avg. dissemination time $\mathbb{E}[T_s]$	
n	q	p	sim.	approx.
5	64	1	34	36
5	2	.8	71	73
5	64	.8	43	44
9	64	1	115	128
9	64	.3	424	400
12	64	1	206	227
20	2	.8	810	887

IV. EFFICIENT RLNC-BASED BROADCAST

Conventionally, in random linear network coding, a node is chosen uniformly at random at time t and it transmits a random linear combination of the packets it has collected until time t . As the subspaces of the nodes grow in time, the intersection subspaces between the nodes grow as well. Hence the probability




Fig. 4. Simulated and approximated p.m.f of dissemination time.

of exchanging an innovative packet decreases. In other words, initially the propagation of information is fast, however, it becomes less likely that nodes transmit innovative packets as their subspaces grow and they more likely span a larger common subspace. As such, dissemination time of the protocol mainly depends on the propagation rate of innovative packets in the network. Therefore, in order to achieve better dissemination times, it is essential that nodes get chosen for transmission in a more intelligent way such that a node that possesses more innovative information get higher chance for transmission. In this section we discuss two transmission schemes in RLNC-based broadcast protocol based on a node selection mechanism.

A. Upper bound for cdf of broadcast dissemination time

Suppose that in every iteration of RLNC-based broadcast protocol an innovative packet is transmitted and if a node receives a packet its rank increases by one. Under this assumption, broadcast dissemination time only depends on the number of active links between the transmitter and receivers. Let T_o be the random variable corresponding to the dissemination time under the assumption that network dimension increase is equal to the number of active links from a transmitter to receivers. Therefore, T_s is stochastically dominated by T_o . We then characterize the c.d.f of T_o which gives us an upper bound for the cdf of the actual dissemination time. The upper bound is then used as a baseline for performance evaluation of the algorithms we propose for faster data dissemination. We have the following proposition:

Proposition 5. *Consider a network with n nodes where each possesses one information packet at $t = 0$. Assume a synchronous broadcast scenario using RLNC-based protocol where at each iteration one node is*

chosen uniformly at random to transmit a packet over a rapidly-changing topology. We have the following upper bound for dissemination time T_s :

$$\Pr(T_s = t) \leq Q \left(\frac{n(n-1) - \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{u,v=1}^n p_{uv} - 1 \right) t}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{u,v=1}^n p_{uv} - \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{v=1}^n \left(\sum_{u=1}^n p_{uv} \right)^2 \right) t}} \right), \quad (13)$$

where $Q(\cdot)$ is the Q -function and $Q(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_x^\infty e^{-\frac{z^2}{2}} dz$.

Proof. Let $X_u(t)$ be a random variable that represents the dimension increase of the network at the t th iteration (time t) due to transmission from node u . $X_u(t)$ can take any value in $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. Let $d(t) := \min \left\{ \sum_{\tau=1}^t X_u(\tau), n(n-1) \right\}$ represent the total network dimension increase at time t . If each node initially possesses one information packet then the network dimension increase required so that all the nodes can decode all the information packets is $n(n-1)$. Therefore, we are interested in $\Pr(T_s = t) = \Pr(d(t) \geq n(n-1))$. Let $Z_{uv}(\tau)$ be a Bernoulli random variable defined such that $Z_{uv}(\tau) = 1$ with probability p_{uv} if node v receives an innovative packet from node u at time τ and $Z_{uv}(\tau) = 0$ otherwise. We write $X_u(\tau) = \sum_{\substack{v=1 \\ v \neq u}}^n Z_{uv}(\tau)$. It is straightforward to characterize the mean and variance of $d(t)$. We have $\mu_{d(t)} = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{u,v=1}^n p_{uv} - 1 \right) t$ and $\sigma_{d(t)}^2 = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{u,v=1}^n p_{uv} - \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{v=1}^n \left(\sum_{u=1}^n p_{uv} \right)^2 \right) t$ for the mean and variance of $d(t)$. Evoking central limit theorem (CLT) yields the proposition. $\square$

Next we evaluate the upper bound of Proposition 5 to obtain the dissemination time of two widely used networks, namely random graph and ring topology.

1) Special Case: Random Topology: Consider a network where each pair of nodes communicate with probability $p_{uv} = p$ for all $u, v \in [n]$. From Proposition 5 we have $\Pr(T_s = t) \leq Q \left(\frac{(n-1)(n-pt)}{\sqrt{(1+(n-1)p) \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{n-1}{n} p \right) t}} \right)$. As such $t = T_{\text{rand}}$ is dissemination time with high probability (w.h.p³) only if the argument of Q -function approaches $-\infty$. Therefore, $T_{\text{rand}} = O\left(\frac{n}{p}\right)$ and for sufficiently large n we have $T_{\text{rand}} = (1 + \epsilon) \frac{n}{p}$ for any arbitrary small $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, T_{rand} approaches $\frac{n}{p}$ as n becomes larger.

³An event occurs with high probability if its probability is at least $1 - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ where $f(x) = O(g(x))$ iff there exists a positive constant M such that $f(x) \leq Mg(x)$ for all sufficiently large values of x .

2) *Special Case: Ring Topology*: Consider a ring topology with link existence probability of p for any adjacent pair of nodes. From Proposition 5 we have $\Pr(T_s = t) \leq Q\left(\frac{n(n-1)-2pt}{\sqrt{(1+2p-\frac{(1+2p)^2}{n})t}}\right)$. Along the same line as we did for random topology we get $T_{\text{ring}} = O(\frac{n^2}{2p})$ and for sufficiently large n , $T_{\text{ring}} = (1 + \epsilon)\frac{n^2}{2p}$ w.h.p for any arbitrary small $\epsilon > 0$.

Next we propose two RLNC-based data dissemination transmission scheme in broadcast networks that are more efficient and have smaller dissemination time compared to standard RLNC protocol where nodes are chosen uniformly at random for transmission.

B. RLNC-based data dissemination with ACK

Let $\beta_u = [\beta_u(1), \dots, \beta_u(n)]^T$ denote the coding coefficient vector of a packet transmitted from node u where $\beta_u(j) \in \mathbb{F}_q$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. The coding coefficient vector is embedded in the header of a transmitted coded packet. Furthermore, let $f_u \in \{0, 1\}^n$ denote the *subspace footprint* of node u defined as follows

$$f_u(j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if node } u \text{ contains a vector with } \beta_u(j) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where $f_u(j)$ denotes the j th entry of vector f_u .

The subspace footprint of a node is a measure of the dimension of the subspace spanned by that node. Fig. 5 shows an example of a subspace footprint of a node for a network with $n = 5$. It can be seen that the node possesses coded packets with non-zero coding coefficients corresponding to m_1 , m_4 and m_5 . Note that subspace footprint of a node is not necessarily equal to the dimension of the subspace

1	0	0	1	1
m_1	m_2	m_3	m_4	m_5

Fig. 5. An example of subspace footprint of a node in a network with $n = 5$ information packets.

spanned by the node. It rather tells us what information packets with non-zero coding coefficient exists in the subspace of a node. This is a useful information in the sense that it relatively reflects the helpfulness (innovation) of the subspace of a node.

Suppose that after every broadcast, transmitter gets acknowledgment (ACK) packets containing the footprint of the subspace of each receiver that has received the transmitted packet successfully. On the

receiver side, the footprint can be easily generated using the coding coefficients in the header of coded packets received and then embedded in the ACK packet.

In the ACK-based approach we assume that ACKs of a receiver can be heard by all other nodes.⁴ RLNC with ACK for broadcast is a practical scheme in small size networks. In large size network due to large number of ACKs we face ACK implosion problem. However, we show in the simulations that the dissemination time of RLNC with ACK is very close to the upper bound (5) which shows that footprint information - which is not full information about a node subspace - improves dissemination time considerably. Once footprint information of a successful broadcast are received, each node calculates the weighted correlation of its subspace footprint with that of all other nodes, i.e., $\rho_{\text{ACK},u} := \sum_{v \neq u}^n p_{uv} f_u^T \cdot f_v$ for all $i \in [n]$, where $f_u^T \cdot f_v$ is the inner product between the subspace footprints of nodes u and v . We assume that link existence probabilities from a node to its neighbors are known to the transmitter. Small values of $\rho_{\text{ACK},u}$ indicates that the subspace of node u has potentially more innovative information for other nodes in the network as compared to its neighbors. Therefore, it would be reasonable to give more opportunity to the nodes that would transmit innovative packets with higher probability. As such, at every broadcast a node with smaller $\rho_{\text{ACK},u}$ should be chosen to transmit a packet and the access probability of each node should be inversely proportional to $\rho_{\text{ACK},u}$.

C. rank-based approach

ACK-based approach is not a practical scheme for large scale networks due to ACK implosion problem. ACK implosion may occur with a multicast/broadcast protocol in which many ACKs are sent back to a transmitter due to large number of users in the network. Instead, we propose to use a more practical scheme that we call rank-based approach. Suppose that in a broadcast scenario transmitter has the knowledge of the rank of all the other nodes. We will see that the performance of standard RLNC-based protocol can be considerably improved if at any node the rank values of all other nodes are available. We first characterize a lower bound for the average innovation probability of a transmission conditioned on the ranks of a transmitter and receiver pair.

Lemma 4. *Consider the network in Proposition 5. Suppose that the subspace dimensions of nodes u and*

⁴This is a reasonable assumption if the network is of small size. Moreover, ACK packets are small and we assume no ACK loss in the network.

v are a and b respectively. The conditional innovation probability at any time is lower bounded by

$$p_{LB}^{inv}(a, b) > \frac{1}{(n-1)\binom{n-1}{b-1}} \sum_j \left(b - \frac{j}{a}\right) \binom{a}{j} \binom{n-a}{b-j} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q^{a-j}}\right),$$

where $\max\{a + b - n, 0\} \leq j \leq \min\{a, b\}$.

Proof. If no network coding operation is performed, the innovation probability is less than RLNC-based approach due to higher probability of transmitting redundant packets. Therefore, we assume that information packets are communicated until time t without network coding operation and at time t we characterize the innovation probability if a coded packet is to be transmitted. Thus the innovation probability is less than RLNC-based protocol. Initially two arbitrary nodes u and v have one packet that are independent from each other. There are $\binom{n-1}{a-1}\binom{n-1}{b-1}$ ways to choose from n packet such that the rank of nodes u and v become a and b respectively. Now suppose that the information packet in node v is chosen and added to node u . Also suppose that the intersection subspace is of dimension j . There are $\binom{n-2}{a-2}$ ways to increase the rank of node u to a . There are also $\binom{a-1}{j-1}$ ways to choose $j-1$ packets such that they belong to the intersection subspace of nodes u and v . Next, for node v we have $\binom{n-a}{b-j}$ possible ways to increase its rank to b . Combining these together we have $\binom{n-2}{a-2}\binom{a-1}{j-1}\binom{n-a}{b-j}$ ways to have the ranks of nodes u and v to be a and b respectively conditioned on the fact that the information packet of node v is chosen and added to node u . Similarly we can argue for the case where the information packet of node v does not belong to node u . There are $\binom{n-2}{a-1}\binom{a}{j}\binom{n-a-1}{b-1-j}$ ways to do so. Therefore, if the ranks of nodes u and v are a and b respectively, then the probability that they have j vector in the intersection subspace is as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(|\mathbb{S}_u(t) \cap \mathbb{S}_v(t)| = j | r_u(t) = a, r_v(t) = b) \\ &= \frac{\binom{n-2}{a-1}\binom{a}{j}\binom{n-a-1}{b-j-1} + \binom{n-2}{a-2}\binom{a-1}{j-1}\binom{n-a}{b-j}}{\binom{n-1}{a-1}\binom{n-1}{b-1}} \\ &= \frac{\frac{n-a}{n-1}\binom{n-1}{a-1}\binom{a}{j}\frac{b-j}{n-a}\binom{n-a}{b-j} + \frac{a-1}{n-1}\binom{n-1}{a-1}\frac{j}{a}\binom{a}{j}\binom{n-a}{b-j}}{\binom{n-1}{a-1}\binom{n-1}{b-1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{n-1} \left(b - j + \frac{a-1}{a}j\right) \frac{\binom{a}{j}\binom{n-a}{b-j}}{\binom{n-1}{b-1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{(n-1)\binom{n-1}{b-1}} \left(b - \frac{j}{a}\right) \binom{a}{j} \binom{n-a}{b-j}. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Furthermore, $\Pr(\text{packet from } u \text{ is innovative to } v | |\mathbb{S}_u(t) \cap \mathbb{S}_v(t)| = j) = 1 - \frac{q^j}{q^n}$. Combining this with Eq.

(15) and averaging over all possible values of j yields the result. $\square$

In Lemma 4 we derived a lower bound for the average innovation probability conditioned on the ranks of transmitter and receiver. Any node knows about its rank and thus the lower bound obtained in Lemma 4 can be computed at each node if the ranks of all other nodes are available. Once the innovation probability is computed at all the nodes, each node transmits with an access probability proportional to weighted sum of innovation probabilities computed. The weights are link existence probabilities of outgoing links from the transmitting node. We then can write

$$p_{\text{rank},u}(t) \propto \frac{1}{N_u(t)} \sum_{\substack{v=1 \\ v \neq u}}^n p_{uv} p_{\text{LB}}^{\text{inv}}(r_u(t), r_v(t)), \quad (16)$$

where $p_{\text{LB}}^{\text{inv}}(r_u(t), r_v(t))$ is the lower bound in Lemma 4. Further, $N_u(t)$ is the number of transmission of node u until time t . $N_u(t)$ is included in (16) so that no node can get access to channel forever.

The rank-based approach improves dissemination time as compared to standard RLNC-based protocol where a node is chosen uniformly at random. However, this technique requires that the rank values of all the nodes be available at the transmitter. In order to provide nodes with the rank information, we assume that the header of any transmitted packet contains the rank of the transmitter along with the coding coefficients. Assume that node u transmits a packet with its header containing its rank and the coding coefficient vector of the packet being transmitted. Furthermore, assume that node v receives this packet at time t_0 . So node v has $r_u(t_0)$ at time t_0 . Now suppose that at some later time, say $t_0 + t$, node v is chosen to broadcast a packet and assume that t_0 is the last time when node v has successfully received a coded packet from node u . If this is not the case then node v can update its information about the rank of node u . At time $t_0 + t$ node v does not know about the rank of node u which might have increased due to transmissions from other nodes. However, $r_u(t_0) \leq r_u(t_0 + t) \leq r_u(t_0) + t$ always holds. Therefore, we assume that the rank of node u is uniformly distributed over $[r_u(t_0), r_u(t_0) + t]$ and $r_u(t_0 + t)$ is estimated as $r_u(t_0 + t) = r_u(t_0) + \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor$. The ranks of all nodes are estimated in the same fashion and consequently innovation probabilities are computed from Lemma 4.

Fig. 6 shows the c.d.f of rank-based and ACK-based approaches as compared to the standard RLNC-based protocol. We consider a tandem network in which every node has two neighbors. It can be seen that exploiting the rank of nodes as side information considerably improves the performance in terms of dissemination time.




Fig. 6. Dissemination time of rank-based, ACK-based and standard RLNC protocols in a network with $n = 7$.

Tables II and III show the rank evolution of nodes over time for standard RLNC-based protocol and that of rank-based approach respectively. It can be seen that in rank-based approach the rank evolution of the nodes occurs more uniformly in time as compared to the standard RLNC protocol. As expected, choosing nodes that can provide innovative packets to other nodes at every broadcast keeps the ranks evolution close to each other whereas in RLNC-based approach, it takes longer for some nodes to become full rank due to non-innovative transmissions and the fact that nodes are chosen uniformly at random without considering their innovation to other nodes.

V. DISCUSSION

In this paper we analyzed dissemination time of random linear network coding unicast protocol used for information dissemination in ad-hoc networks. We derived a tight approximation for average networked innovation probability conditioned on network dimension increase. The approximation was then used to obtain the average dissemination time and the probability mass function of dissemination time which is modeled as a sequence of geometric random variables with varying ‘success’ probability. The ‘success’ probability of the sequence of geometric random variables changes every time network dimension increases by one, i.e., after every successful reception of an innovative packet. This model captures the dynamic of information flow in the network.

We also proposed to use two RLNC-based broadcast protocols, namely ACK-based and rank-based approaches. In both of these approaches, a node that is more likely to provide innovative information to other nodes gets higher opportunity for transmission. In the ACK-based approach the footprint of a node

TABLE II
RANK EVOLUTION OF NODES OVER TIME IN
STANDARD RLNC-BASED PROTOCOL - WITHOUT
NODE SELECTION SCHEME - FOR A NETWORK WITH
 $n = 7$ AND $p = 1$.

t	r_1	r_2	r_3	r_4	r_5	r_6	r_7
0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1
2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2
3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2
4	2	3	3	2	3	2	2
5	2	3	4	3	3	3	3
6	2	3	4	4	4	4	3
7	3	3	5	5	5	4	4
8	3	4	5	5	5	5	5
9	3	4	6	5	5	5	5
10	3	5	6	5	5	5	5
11	4	6	6	6	5	6	5
12	4	6	6	6	5	6	5
13	4	6	6	6	5	6	5
14	4	7	6	6	5	6	5
15	4	7	6	6	5	6	5
16	4	7	6	6	5	6	5
17	4	7	6	6	5	6	5
18	5	7	6	6	6	6	6
19	5	7	6	6	6	6	6
20	6	7	6	6	6	6	6
21	6	7	6	6	6	6	6
22	6	7	6	6	6	6	6
23	6	7	6	6	6	6	6
24	6	7	6	6	6	6	6
25	7	7	7	7	6	7	6
26	7	7	7	7	6	7	6
27	7	7	7	7	6	7	6
28	7	7	7	7	6	7	6
29	7	7	7	7	6	7	6
30	7	7	7	7	6	7	6
31	7	7	7	7	6	7	6
32	7	7	7	7	7	7	6
33	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

TABLE III
RANK EVOLUTION OF NODES OVER TIME IN
RANK-BASED APPROACH FOR A NETWORK WITH
 $n = 7$ AND $p = 1$.

t	r_1	r_2	r_3	r_4	r_5	r_6	r_7
0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	3	2	2	1	1
3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3
5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4
6	5	5	6	5	5	4	5
7	5	6	7	6	6	5	5
8	6	7	7	7	7	6	5
9	7	7	7	7	7	7	6
10	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

is assumed to be embedded in the ACK packets and received by all other nodes. In rank-based approach the rank of a transmitter is sent in the header of the transmitted coded packet. We showed that these techniques achieve a better dissemination time as opposed to standard RLNC-based protocol where nodes are chosen for transmission uniformly at random without considering the amount of innovation they can provide to other nodes.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Pittel, "On spreading a rumor," *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. pp. 213–223, 1987. [Online]. Available: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2101696>
- [2] R. Karp, C. Schindelhauer, S. Shenker, and B. Vocking, "Randomized rumor spreading," in *Foundations of Computer Science, 2000. Proceedings. 41st Annual Symposium on*, 2000, pp. 565–574.
- [3] D. W. Krumme, G. Cybenko, and K. N. Venkataraman, "Gossiping in minimal time," *SIAM J. on Computing*, vol. 21, pp. 111–139, 1992.
- [4] U. Feige, D. Peleg, P. Raghavan, and E. Upfal, "Randomized broadcast in networks," *Random Struct. Alg.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 447–460, 1990.
- [5] D. Mosk-Aoyama and D. Shah, "Fast distributed algorithms for computing separable functions," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 2997–3007, 2008.
- [6] R. Ahlswede, N. Cai, S.-Y. Li, and R. Yeung, "Network information flow," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 1204–1216, 2000.
- [7] D. Nguyen, T. Tran, T. Nguyen, and B. Bose, "Wireless broadcast using network coding," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 914–925, 2009.
- [8] C. Gkantsidis and P. Rodriguez, "Network coding for large scale content distribution," in *INFOCOM 2005. 24th Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies. Proceedings IEEE*, vol. 4, 2005, pp. 2235–2245 vol. 4.
- [9] M. Hayashi, K. Iwama, H. Nishimura, R. R. H. Putra, and S. Yamashita, *Quantum Network Coding*, 2007.
- [10] D. Kempe, A. Dobra, and J. Gehrke, "Gossip-based computation of aggregate information," in *Foundations of Computer Science, 2003. Proceedings. 44th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, 2003, pp. 482–491.
- [11] S. Boyd, A. Ghosh, B. Prabhakar, and D. Shah, "Randomized gossip algorithms," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 52, no. 6, pp. 2508–2530, 2006.
- [12] S. Boyd, P. Diaconis, and L. Xiao, "Fastest mixing markov chain on a graph," *SIAM REVIEW*, vol. 46, pp. 667–689, 2003.
- [13] S.-Y. Li, R. Yeung, and N. Cai, "Linear network coding," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 371–381, 2003.
- [14] T. Ho, M. Medard, J. Shi, M. Effros, and D. R. Karger, "On randomized network coding," in *In Proceedings of 41st Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, 2003.
- [15] R. Koetter and M. Medard, "An algebraic approach to network coding," *Networking, IEEE/ACM Transactions on*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 782–795, 2003.
- [16] T. Ho, M. Medard, R. Koetter, D. Karger, M. Effros, J. Shi, and B. Leong, "A random linear network coding approach to multicast," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 4413–4430, 2006.

- [17] S. Deb, M. Médard, and C. Choute, “Algebraic gossip: A network coding approach to optimal multiple rumor mongering,” *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 6, pp. 2486–2507, 2006.
- [18] D. Mosk-Aoyama and D. Shah, “Information dissemination via network coding,” in *Information Theory, 2006 IEEE International Symposium on*, 2006, pp. 1748–1752.
- [19] B. Haeupler, “Analyzing network coding gossip made easy,” in *Proceedings of the 43rd annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, ser. STOC ’11. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2011, pp. 293–302. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1993636.1993676>
- [20] C. Fragouli, J. Widmer, and J. Le Boudec, “Efficient broadcasting using network coding,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. Networking*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 450–463, 2008.
- [21] A. Asterjadhri, E. Fasolo, M. Rossi, J. Widmer, and M. Zorzi, “Toward network coding-based protocols for data broadcasting in wireless ad hoc networks,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Communications*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 662–673, 2010.
- [22] R. McEliece, *Finite fields for computer scientists and engineers*. Springer, 1987.
- [23] P. Chou, Y. Wu, and K. Jain, “Practical network coding,” in *Proceesings of 41st Allerton Conference on Communication Control and Computing*, Oct. 2003.
- [24] R. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.