

# Interference in Wireless Multi-hop Ad-hoc Networks

R. Hekmat and P. Van Mieghem

Delft University of Technology

Information Technology and Systems

P.O. Box 5031, 2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands

Email: R.Hekmat@its.tudelft.nl, P.VanMieghem@its.tudelft.nl

**Abstract**— In this paper we propose a new model to calculate interference levels in wireless multi-hop ad-hoc networks. This model computes the expected value of Carrier to Interference ratio ( $C/I$ ) by taking into account the number of nodes, density of nodes, radio propagation aspects, multi-hop characteristics of the network, and the amount of relay traffic. Our model uses a regular lattice for possible locations of mobile nodes. This enables us to calculate the expected values of  $C/I$ , without having detailed information about movement patterns and exact location of all nodes at any moment. Based on this model we have evaluated effects of variations in the network size, network density and traffic load on  $C/I$ , and consequently throughput of the network. Our calculations suggest that interference is upper-bounded in wireless ad-hoc networks that use carrier sensing for medium access. Further, our calculations indicate that in large networks traffic increase due to routing overhead does not have a significant impact on network throughput.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In wireless ad-hoc networks communication between nodes takes place over radio channels. As long as all nodes use the same frequency band for communication, any node-to-node transmission will add to the level of interference experienced by other users. Variations in network size (number of nodes), network density (relative positions of nodes) and traffic per node could have strong influence on interference experienced by mobile nodes throughout the network.

It is well known that radio channel capacity decreases as the wanted signal carrier power to interference ratio ( $C/I$ ) decreases<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, for performance evaluation of mobile wireless ad-hoc networks, it is important to have good estimates of interference levels. To the knowledge of the authors, little work has been carried out so far to provide a mathematical frame work for estimation of the expected values of carrier to interference ratio in wireless ad-hoc networks. The IETF working group MANET [1] is concentrating mostly on routing protocols and routing protocols optimization. However, in proposed protocols (e.g. [2], [3]) each node acts according to its local traffic without considering possible inference from other nodes or towards other nodes. Valuable papers also have been published so far where different routing protocols and different access technologies are compared qua performance, stability and scalability ([4]-[7]). However, these comparisons are mostly based on simulations or in some occasions on field trial

measurement results; and no mathematical modeling is used. Further, in these papers the specific influence of radio interference on network performance is not highlighted. In [8] a theoretical study is presented for bandwidth reservation in ad-hoc networks with interference, but carrier to interference ratio and the link between changing network parameters and interference levels is not considered.

In this paper we propose a new model for calculation of interference levels in wireless multi-hop ad-hoc networks. This model takes into account the number of nodes, density of nodes, multi-hop characteristics of the network, and relay traffic.

In mobile ad-hoc networks users could move around freely at all times. Therefore, finding good estimations for the expected values of  $C/I$  requires access to accurate information regarding movement patterns and the exact location of all nodes at any moment. Our model in this paper uses a regular lattice for possible locations of mobile nodes. We show here that this simplifies the problem regarding localization of mobile nodes and allows us to calculate the expected values of  $C/I$ .

The structure of this article is as follows. In section II we describe and justify our model. The interference level depends not only on generated new traffic per node, but also on relay traffic that is hopping from a source to a destination throughout the network. The amount of relay traffic in an ad-hoc network depends directly on the number of hops from any arbitrary source to any other destination. We compute in section III the exact hop distribution in our proposed model. In section IV we show the relation between the mean value of traffic per node (the sum of a node's own traffic and traffic relayed by that node) and the average hopcount. In section V we derive formulas for computation of the expected values of carrier to interference ratio in wireless ad-hoc networks. Our analysis of  $C/I$ , enables us to study the effect of increasing network size, changing network density and routing overhead on performance and stability of the network. In section VI we evaluate our model critically and propose follow-up studies. We summarize our conclusions in section VII.

## II. MODEL DESCRIPTION

In this section we describe our model for a multi-hop ad-hoc network. We will discuss in the remainder of this report how this model facilitates analytic computation of the hopcount, traffic per node and the expected value of carrier to interference ratio.

<sup>1</sup>See for example [12, Chapter 8]

### A. Model assumptions

The main assumptions that form the basis for our model and our calculation of interference are described in sections II-A.1 to II-A.3. At the end of this paper, in section VI we evaluate our model critically, highlight its restrictions and propose improvements for future research.

1) *Radio model*: Our interference calculations in this paper will be based on the path-loss power law model for radio propagation [14]. According to this model, the mean value of received signal power indicated by  $p_a$  (in Watts) is a decreasing function of distance  $d$  between the transmitter and the receiver and can be represented as:

$$p_a = c \cdot d^{-\eta} \quad (1)$$

where  $c$  is a constant that depends on transmitted power, the receiver and the transmitter antenna gains and the wavelength [14];  $\eta$  is the path loss exponent and varies between 2 and 6 depending on the environment and terrain structure<sup>2</sup>. Higher values for  $\eta$  indicate faster decay of radio signals. This simple model does not include small scale and large scale fading variations around signal's mean power.

With this radio model, we define the *coverage area* of a node as a circle with radius  $R$  around this node. The received power from transmitted signals from the central node inside the coverage area is higher than or equal to a threshold value  $\gamma$ . It is realistic to assume that  $\gamma$  is equal to the receiver sensitivity<sup>3</sup>. A node can have direct communication with all nodes that fall inside its coverage area.

2) *Medium Access Control (MAC)*: We have assumed that on the data link layer, the ad-hoc network uses a multiple access scheme with carrier sensing. Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collision Avoidance (CSMA/CA) is an example. In the basic form of medium access in CSMA/CA, nodes that overhear each other will not transmit simultaneously [11]. When a node, say node 0, is transmitting there will be no interference from other nodes inside the coverage area of node 0. In the worst case situation, the first set of interfering signals will come from signals transmitted from nodes just outside the coverage area of node 0 (at distance  $R + \epsilon$  to node 0). For example, in Figure 1 the first interfering signal could come from node 1. When node 0 and node 1 are transmitting simultaneously, the next interfering signal could only come from nodes outside the coverage areas of both these nodes. Node 2 at the crossing point of two circles with radius  $R + \epsilon$  in Figure 1 could be the second interference source. Adding new interfering nodes in this way produces the constellation of nodes shown in Figure 1, with node 0 in the center of the constellation. As depicted in this




Fig. 1. Constellation of interfering nodes closest to node 0, when basic form of carrier sensing with collision avoidance is used.

figure, there are at most 6 interfering nodes at distance  $R + \epsilon$  to node 0. On the next interfering ring at distance  $2(R + \epsilon)$ , there are at most 12 interfering nodes. This maximum number of interfering nodes will be taken into consideration in section II-A.3 where we choose a lattice form to represent the ad-hoc network.

3) *Uniform distribution of nodes*: Our model assumes uniform distribution of nodes over a two-dimensional area with limited size. We call this area the *service area* of the ad-hoc network. Normally inside the service area any position ( $x$ - and  $y$ -coordinate) is equally probable to be occupied by a mobile node. However, in our approach we simplify this by introducing a regular lattice to which the position of mobile nodes is restricted. It will be shown in section V how this restriction regarding the permissible positions for mobile nodes enables the estimation of the expected value of  $C/I$ , without having accurate knowledge about movement patterns and exact location of all nodes at any moment.

Introduction of a regular lattice can be seen as enforcing a certain granularity on the two-dimensional plane for the position of mobile nodes. On this lattice each node has a number of *adjacent* nodes, that we define as nodes in direct vicinity and with the same distance to that node. Uniform distribution of nodes requires that 1) all nodes that are not at the borders of the service area should have the same number of adjacent nodes, and 2) adjacent nodes should be at the same distance from each other. Geometrically, two lattices fulfill these requirements. These lattices are the rectangular lattice and the hexagonal lattice shown in Figure 2. In the rectangular lattice the number of adjacent nodes for any node is four, while in the hexagonal lattice, each node has six adjacent nodes. In mobile ad-hoc networks communication between nodes takes place over radio channels and each node may have direct communication with all nodes inside its coverage area. It should

<sup>2</sup>Path loss exponents obtained based on measurements in different mobile radio environments are shown in the following table [12]:

Environment	Path loss exponent, $\eta$
free space	2
urban area	2.7 to 3.5
shadowed urban area	3 to 5
in building (obstructed)	4 to 6

<sup>3</sup>A realistic value for  $\gamma$  in Wireless LAN systems is -82 dBm.




Fig. 2. Nodes uniformly positioned on a (a) rectangular lattice, (b) hexagonal lattice (honey grid)

be noticed that, depending on the transmission power and radio propagation conditions, the coverage area of a node may contain more nodes than its adjacent nodes.

From the two lattices shown in Figure 2 we have chosen in this paper to base our model on the hexagonal lattice. In this model, that we for obvious reasons will call the honey-grid model, the permissible positions of nodes on the lattice overlap perfectly with the position of interfering nodes in the maximum interference constellation shown in Figure 1. Therefore, the honey-grid model is most suitable for studying interference effects under *worse case* conditions, because it allows for the maximum number of interfering signals to be taken into account when carrier sensing is used for medium access.

### B. Model parameters

From the view point of the center node in a honey-grid lattice, as illustrated in Figure 3, other nodes are positioned on co-centered hexagons. We call each of these hexagons a *ring*. The first hexagonal ring has a side of size  $\Delta$ , and contains 6 nodes. The  $i^{th}$  hexagonal ring has a side of size  $i\Delta$  and contains  $6i$  nodes. The size of the network can be expressed in terms of  $k$  co-centered hexagonal rings around node 0, or by  $N$  the total number of node in this configuration.  $N$  and  $k$  are linked through the formulas:

$$N = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k 6i = 1 + 3k(k+1), \quad (2)$$

$$k = \left\lceil \sqrt{1/4 + (N-1)/3} - 1/2 \right\rceil$$

where the sign  $\lceil x \rceil$  indicates rounding up to the nearest integer (because the last hexagonal ring may be partially filled).

In Figure 3 we have depicted the coverage area for node 0 in the center of the configuration. The number of nodes inside the coverage area of each node is called the node's *degree*, and is indicated by  $n$ . We assume that an entire ring is either included or excluded from the coverage area. We define a node's *reach* as the number of hexagonal rings that fall inside the coverage area of that node. We indicate the reach of a node by symbol  $a$




Fig. 3. The honey-grid model showing all nodes.

(for example,  $a = 2$  in Figure 3). The degree of a node that is not at the borders of the service area is

$$n = \sum_{i=1}^a 6i = 3a(a+1). \quad (3)$$

Each node may communicate directly with all nodes inside its coverage area. For reaching other destinations multi-hopping must be used. There are basically two ways for reaching each destination: If node 0 in Figure 3 wishes to communicate with a node positioned on ring 3, it either can hop through a node on ring 1 and then a node on ring 2; or it can skip ring 1 and hop directly to a node on ring 2 before reaching the destination. The first method perseveres energy [9] while the second method keeps the number of hops minimum. We will show that our model can work with both routing methods.

If we consider minimum hop routing, certain intermediate rings on the way from source to destination can be skipped. Figure 4 shows in tick lines the subset of rings that can be used for multi-hop routing to any destination. We will call these rings *relay rings*. When packets are routing throughout the network, there may be multiple paths to the same destination. For example, the source (node 0) and the destination (node 3) shown in Figure 4 may be connected by the path going through nodes 0-1-3 or the path going through nodes 0-2-3. In our calculation of interference it is important to know the amount of relay traffic caused by multiple hops from source to destination, but the exact path from source to destination is not relevant. Therefore, for us both these paths are the same as they both consists of two hops. In Figure 4 where  $a = 2$ , we see that the first relay ring has a side of the size  $2\Delta$  and contains 6 *relay nodes*. Relay nodes are those nodes on each relay ring that need to be used to reach any arbitrary destination (for example, when nodes 1 and 4 are relay nodes, node 2 is not chosen as a relay node because all destinations that could be reached through node 2




Fig. 4. Relay rings and relay nodes in a honey-grid. Thick lines show relay rings, and dark circles show relay nodes. Hollow circles are other nodes in the network.

are already reachable through either node 1 or node 4). Generally, if  $a$  is the reach of node 0, the number of co-centered relay rings seen from node 0 is  $l = \lfloor k/a \rfloor$ , where the sign  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  indicates rounding down to the nearest integer. The number of relay nodes (source node included) is then:

$$N_r = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^l 6i = 1 + 3l(l+1). \quad (4)$$

We mentioned earlier in this section that our model can handle energy efficient routing as well as minimum hop routing. If parameter  $a$  is chosen to equal 1, regardless of the reach of mobile nodes, the hopcount (see section III), traffic estimation (see section IV) and carrier to interference ratio (see section V) are found for energy efficient routing. If parameter  $a$  is chosen equal to the maximum radio reach of mobile nodes, the hopcount, traffic estimation and carrier to interference ratio are found for minimum hop routing.

### III. HOPCOUNT IN THE HONEY-GRID MODEL

For the honey-grid model with parameters  $k$  and  $a$ , the exact number of hops needed to reach from any source node any destination node is computed. The method of computation is explained in the Appendix. From the exact hopcount distribution, the mean and the variance of the hopcount are derived in, respectively, (11) and (12) (see Appendix).

The average hopcount in the entire network for the case that  $a = 1$  is found directly by (11). However, in the case that  $a \neq 1$ , (11) produces the average hopcount over relay nodes. We assume a node that is not situated on a relay ring will hop its traffic first to a relay node positioned on a relay ring. Consequently, if both the source and the destination nodes are not on relay rings, the average hopcount from source to destination is




Fig. 5. Mean value of the hopcount in a honey-grid structure for different number of nodes ( $N$ ) and different values of  $a$  ( $a$  node's reach).

two hops more than the average value found over relay nodes. The formula for average value of hopcount is then:

$$E[h] \simeq 0.53N^{0.5} + 2 \left( 1 - \frac{N_r}{N} \right). \quad (5)$$

In this formula,  $N$  is the number of nodes in the configuration,  $N_r$  (see (4)) is the number of nodes on the relay rings seen from the center node and  $(1 - N_r/N)$  represents the probability that either the source or the destination node is not a relay node.

Figure 5 shows the mean value of the hopcount calculated with (5) for different number of nodes in a honey-grid structure.

The mean-hopcount determines the expected traffic load in the entire network, as will be explained in the next section.

### IV. TRAFFIC PER NODE

The amount of interference in an ad-hoc network is directly related to the traffic produced per node. This traffic consists of the node's own traffic that is generated by the host connected to the mobile node (we will call this traffic new traffic) and the traffic that the node relays for other nodes. Because of relay traffic, the total amount of traffic per node is strongly related to the multi-hop characteristics of the ad-hoc network. In this section we derive a formula to compute the total amount of traffic per node. Our basic assumption here is that the new traffic generated by the hosts connected to mobile nodes is Poisson distributed and occur independent from each other. All hosts are similar and have the same traffic generation behavior. In other words, mean generated new traffic per host per time interval is the same for all hosts. We denote the mean value of new traffic per time slot per node by  $\lambda$ .

Consider two nodes  $i$  and  $j$ . When the average hopcount is  $E[h]$ , there are in average  $E[h] - 1$  relay nodes between any source and any destination. Node  $i$  may be a relay station for

node  $j$  with the probability  $(E[h] - 1)/(N - 1)$ , and the expected value for relay traffic arriving at node  $i$  from node  $j$  is then  $\lambda(E[h] - 1)/(N - 1)$ . Any node in the ad-hoc network may be a relay node for  $N - 1$  other nodes. Therefore, the expected amount of relay traffic at any node is:  $\lambda(E[h] - 1)$ . The total traffic per node,  $\Lambda$ , is the sum of the node's own traffic,  $\lambda$ , and all relay traffic that reach that node:

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda &= \lambda + \lambda(E[h] - 1) \\ &= \lambda E[h].\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

In this formula,  $E[h]$  is the expected value of the hopcount which is found through (5).

## V. INTERFERENCE CALCULATION

In this section we find a formula for the amount of interference experienced by users in a wireless ad-hoc network.

With uniform distribution of nodes, each node has  $n$  other nodes inside its coverage area (except for nodes on the edges of the network). As explained in section II, around node 0 the first set of interfering signals will come from signals that are transmitted from nodes just outside the coverage area of node 0. Recalling our assumption that an entire ring is either included or excluded from the coverage area, the first ring of interference consists of 6 nodes positioned at distance  $(a + 1)\Delta$  to node 0. Generally, if  $a$  is the reach of node 0, the number of co-centered interference rings seen from node 0 is  $m = \lfloor k/(a + 1) \rfloor$ , and the number of interfering nodes is:

$$N_i = \sum_{i=1}^m 6i = 3m(m + 1). \quad (7)$$

Figure 6 shows interfering rings and interfering nodes observed from the centre node in a honey-grid model with  $a = 1$ .

Nodes in the center of the configuration have the most number of potential interfering nodes around them in all directions. Therefore, we choose the amount of interference experienced at node 0 as representative for the maximum level of interference inside this network. In the remainder of this section, a closed expression for interference at node 0 is derived. If the level of interference is acceptable at node 0, we can assume that it is also acceptable for other nodes.

To calculate the amount of interference experienced at node 0, we add the interference power received at node 0 from all interfering nodes. The first interference ring contains 6 nodes at distance  $(a + 1)\Delta$ . The second ring consists of 12 nodes from which 6 nodes in the corners of the hexagonal ring are at distance  $2(a + 1)\Delta$  to node 0 and 6 other nodes are at distance  $\sqrt{3}(a + 1)\Delta$  to node 0. The distance of nodes on each ring to node 0 can be calculated exactly. However, in our calculations in this paper we use a simplification: we assume that the distance between all interfering nodes on each ring to node 0 is equal to the distance of the corner nodes to node 0. This is not an inaccurate approximation, especially when the service area is large. In the following table we have shown the number of




Fig. 6. Honey-grid with interfering rings (thick lines) for  $a = 1$ .

interfering signals and the expected interfering power coming from each interfering ring.

ring	distance	number of nodes	mean power of interfering signals
1	$(a + 1)\Delta$	6	$6qc((a + 1)\Delta)^{-\eta}$
2	$2(a + 1)\Delta$	12	$12qc(2(a + 1)\Delta)^{-\eta}$
3	$3(a + 1)\Delta$	18	$18qc(3(a + 1)\Delta)^{-\eta}$
$m$	$m(a + 1)\Delta$	$6m$	$6mqc(m(a + 1)\Delta)^{-\eta}$

In this table the mean power of interfering signals is calculated using (1) and  $q$  represents the probability of transmission (transmission of own signals or relay signals) per node. The total amount of interference mean power is then:

$$I = 6qc((a + 1)\Delta)^{-\eta} \sum_{i=1}^m i^{-(\eta-1)}. \quad (8)$$

When network size increases  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , and the above formula can be written as:

$$I_{\infty} = 6qc((a + 1)\Delta)^{-\eta} \zeta(\eta - 1)$$

where for  $\text{Re}(s) > 1$ ,  $\zeta(s) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-s}$  is the Riemann-Zeta function [15]. When the path loss exponent  $\eta > 2$ ,  $\zeta(\eta - 1)$  is a converging series with positive terms and is upper-bounded by [16]:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-(\eta-1)} \leq 1 + \int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^{\eta-1}} dx = \frac{\eta - 1}{\eta - 2}.$$

Based on the above formula we can conclude that the amount of interference power in a mobile ad-hoc network with CSMA/CA protocol for multiple access control is upper-bounded by the following expression:

$$I \leq 6qc((a+1)\Delta)^{-\eta} \frac{\eta-1}{\eta-2}. \quad (9)$$

For correct reception of radio signals, the carrier to interference ratio  $C/I$  needs to be higher than a certain threshold value (for example 7 dB).  $C/I$  is the ratio between the mean power of wanted signal and the mean power of the sum of interfering signals. In the honey-grid model the lowest expected value for wanted signal power,  $C$ , is related to the situation that the wanted signal (signal from the source) is transmitted from the farthest neighbor of node 0 at distance  $a\Delta$ . The highest value of  $C$  is related to the situation that wanted signal is transmitted from the nearest neighbor of node 0, which is at distance  $\Delta$ . The expected value for  $C$  is found then by taking into account all possible positions of the wanted signal transmitter:

$$\begin{aligned} E[C] &= \sum_{i=1}^a \frac{6i}{3a(a+1)} c \cdot (i\Delta)^{-\eta} \\ &= \frac{2c\Delta^{-\eta}}{a(a+1)} \sum_{i=1}^a i^{-(\eta-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

In mobile ad-hoc networks based on W-LAN technologies, mostly spread-spectrum techniques are used. In these cases we should only consider the amount of interference power that coincides with the wanted signal after de-spreading process. The reduction in interference power is indicated by "processing gain"<sup>4</sup>,  $g$ . Based on the previous two formulas, the following formula calculates the expected value of  $C/I$  for a node in the center of an ad-hoc network.

$$\begin{aligned} E[C/I] &= \frac{\frac{2c\Delta^{-\eta}}{a(a+1)} g \sum_{i=1}^a i^{-(\eta-1)}}{6qc((a+1)\Delta)^{-\eta} \sum_{i=1}^m i^{-(\eta-1)}} \\ &= \frac{g \sum_{i=1}^a i^{-(\eta-1)}}{3a(a+1)^{-(\eta-1)} q \sum_{i=1}^m i^{-(\eta-1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above formula we see that the expected value of carrier to interference ratio,  $E[C/I]$ , depends on the path-loss exponent  $\eta$  and the probability of transmission per node,  $q$ . The later depends directly on the mean value of generated traffic per node  $\Lambda$  (see (6)). Because we assumed a Poisson arrival process for traffic per node, for  $q$  we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} q &= 1 - e^{-\Lambda} \\ &= 1 - e^{-\lambda E[h]}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting  $q$  in the above formula gives:

$$E[C/I] = \frac{g \sum_{i=1}^a i^{-(\eta-1)}}{3a(a+1)^{-(\eta-1)} (1 - e^{-\lambda E[h]}) \sum_{i=1}^m i^{-(\eta-1)}}. \quad (10)$$

<sup>4</sup>In 802.11 DSSS (Direct Sequence Spread Spectrum) the processing gain is realized by modulating each data bit with an 11 bit Barker code (pseudo random sequence). Processing gain is therefore 11:1, or 10.4 dB [11].




Fig. 7. Expected value of  $C/I$  for a node in the center of a honey-grid structure for different values of a node's own traffic,  $\lambda$ . In all cases the node's reach,  $a$ , is 1 and the processing gain is 10.4 dB.

Here,  $\eta$  is the path loss exponent,  $g$  is processing gain,  $a$  is the reach of nodes in the center of the configuration,  $m$  is the number of interference rings seen from the center node ( $[m = k/(a+1)]$ ),  $\lambda$  is the mean arrival rate of new packets per node per time slot (node's own traffic) and  $E[h]$  is the average number of hops which is found by (5).

#### A. Effect of network size and network density on $C/I$

Figure 7 shows the calculated values of  $E[C/I]$  according to (10) for different values of path loss exponent and different number of nodes (in all cases  $a = 1$ ). Figure 8 shows the calculated values of  $E[C/I]$  according to (10) for a fixed value of path loss exponent and the node's own traffic but with different values for  $a$ . From these two figures we can conclude that for large networks the expected value of  $C/I$  tends to an asymptotic value that depends only on the path loss exponent and the value of  $a$ . In other words, for large ad-hoc networks, the expected value of  $C/I$  depends on the network density (which is directly related to  $a$ ) and the path loss exponent. In indoor environments, with higher values of path loss exponent, an ad-hoc network performs better than in outdoor environments where due to lower path loss values radio signals travel to farther distances and cause more interference. Previously in (9) we showed that interference is upper bounded in ad-hoc networks that use carrier sensing for medium access. When interference is upper-bounded we expect  $E[C/I]$  to be under-bounded. Results shown in Figures 7 and 8 confirm this expectation.

#### B. Effect of routing overhead on $C/I$

New traffic per node,  $\lambda$ , consists of two parts: the data traffic and routing overhead. Data traffic is the actual communication




Fig. 8. Expected value of  $C/I$  for a node in the center of a honey-grid structure for different values of a node's reach,  $a$ . In all cases the path loss exponent is 2.4, the node's own average traffic rate is 0.1 packets per time slot and the processing gain is 10.4 dB.




Fig. 9. Effect of traffic increase due to routing overhead on  $E[C/I]$  in an ad-hoc network with different number of nodes. In all cases  $a = 1$ ,  $\eta = 2.4$ , and processing gain is 10.4 dB.

data to be transmitted from a source to a destination (for example the content of an e-mail). Routing overhead consists of all traffic generated by a node for finding new routes, or for keeping routing information up-to-date. We can use (10) to study the effect of traffic increase due to routing overhead on the performance of a mobile ad-hoc network. Figure 9 shows calculated results for a few examples. In this figure, degradation of  $E[C/I]$  along the y-axis is the difference between  $E[C/I]$  with routing overhead and  $E[C/I]$  for the same value of data traffic with zero routing overhead.

From Figure 9 one may conclude that routing overhead does not have a significant influence on  $E[C/I]$  and, consequently on the throughput of the network.

## VI. MODEL ASSESSMENT

In mobile wireless ad-hoc networks nodes may move freely inside the whole service area. Our introduction of the regular honey-grid lattice seems to contradict this freedom of movement. Therefore, the question may be raised whether our model can cope with moving nodes.

Our main purpose in this paper is to estimate the expected levels of interference in mobile ad-hoc networks. To be more precise, we showed in section V that interference in wireless mobile ad-hoc networks is upper-bounded. By increasing or decreasing the size of hexagons in our model we are able to cope with low or high density of nodes, but we do not model movement of nodes. However, our calculations of  $E[C/I]$  remain valid as long as uniform node distribution is not affected by moving nodes. Even when uniform distribution of nodes is disturbed; with the medium access control scheme assumed in this paper, the *maximum* number of interfering nodes and their

relative position would have to match the constellation of interfering nodes discussed in section II-A.2. Therefore, as far as the maximum number of interfering signals concerns, our computations are not affected by moving nodes.

In our calculation of interference we have taken into account the expected amount of relay traffic per node, which is found based on the exact hopcount distribution over the honey-grid. Deviation from the uniform node distribution could affect the hopcount, and consequently the total amount of traffic per node. The effect of this point on  $C/I$  calculations requires further investigation. However, regardless of the total traffic per node, the probability of transmission per node,  $q$  in (9), could never exceed 1. Hence, we still could conclude that interference in mobile ad-hoc networks remains upper-bounded even when uniform distribution of nodes is not the case.

In future work we may consider studying the effects of node mobility in detail. One possible way of doing this is to introduce a probability of "node presence" at each vertex of the honey-grid. This probability will depend on the movement patterns of mobile nodes.

Further, we intend to use time variant radio propagation models (like log-normal shadowing model) to estimate the level of interference. We also intend to study the combination of the honey-grid model with a wider range of MAC protocols (for example CSMA/CA with reservation).

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

The model proposed in this paper for calculation of interference in mobile ad-hoc networks takes into account the number of nodes, density of nodes, multi-hop characteristics of the network, and relay traffic. Based on this model we have evaluated effects of network size change, network density change and traffic variation on the expected value of carrier to interference

ratio, and consequently throughput of the network. Our study presented in this paper offers new insights about scalability and optimization of routing protocols for of ad-hoc networks. We summarize the main results here:

- 1) The expected amount of interference in mobile ad-hoc networks that use carrier sensing for medium access is upper-bounded to a value that does not depend on the network size (in terms of the number of nodes).
- 2) When network density increase and more nodes fall within each other's direct reach, the aggregate relay traffic reduces and carrier to interference ratio improves. However, due to carrier sensing mechanism, less nodes are allowed to transmit simultaneously which would increase the delay.
- 3) In contrast to our intuitive expectation that minimization of routing overhead could improve network performance substantially, here we have shown that traffic increase due to routing overhead does not affect network throughput significantly. This is specially true for large networks with high data traffic volumes (e.g., degradation of the expected value of  $C/I$  is less than 0.8 dB for 20% routing overhead for the values depicted in Figure 9).

The model presented in this paper for computation of the expected values of  $C/I$  is based on some simplifications, and could be improved. In future studies we intend to focus on the points summarized in section VI.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] IETF Mobile Ad-hoc Networks (MANET) Working Group web site, <http://www.ietf.org/html.charters/manet-charter.html>.
- [2] "Optimized Link State Routing Protocol", IETF-draft, IETF MANET Working Group, September 2001.
- [3] "Ad hoc On-Demand Distance Vector (AODV) Routing", IETF-draft, IETF MANET Working Group, January 2002.
- [4] E.M. Royer; C-K. Toh, "A Review of Current Routing Protocols for Ad-hoc Mobile Wireless Networks", IEEE Personal Communications , Volume: 6 Issue: 2, April 1999.
- [5] D.A. Maltz; J. Broch; D.B. Johnson, "Lessons from a full-scale multi-hop wireless ad hoc network testbed" IEEE Personal Communications, Volume: 8 Issue: 1, Feb. 2001.
- [6] C.E. Perkins; E.M. Royer; S.R. Das; M.K. Marina, " Performance comparison of two on-demand routing protocols for ad hoc networks", IEEE Personal Communications, Volume: 8 Issue: 1, Feb. 2001 .
- [7] Z.J. Haas; M.R. Pearlman, "The performance of query control schemes for the zone routing protocol", IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking, Volume: 9 Issue: 4, Aug. 2001.
- [8] K. Bertet; C. Chaudet; I.G. Lassous; L. Viennot, "Impact of interferences on bandwidth reservation for ad hoc networks: a first theoretical study", Global Telecommunications Conference, 2001. GLOBECOM '01. IEEE , Volume: 5 , 2001.
- [9] V. Rodoplu and T.H.-Y. Meng, "Minimum Energy Mobile Wireless Networks," IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, Vol. 17, No. 8, August, 1999.
- [10] P. Van Mieghem; G. Hooghiemstra; R. W. van der Hofstad, "Scaling Law for the Hopcount", Delft University of Technology, report 2000125, January 2000.
- [11] ANSI/IEEE Std 802.11, 1999 Edition, Part 11: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications.
- [12] T.S. Rappaport, "Wireless Communications, Principles and Practice", Upper Saddle River Prentice-Hall PTR, 2002.
- [13] H.L. Bertoni, "Radio Propagation for Modern Wireless Systems", Prentice-Hall PTR, 2000.

- [14] R. Prasad, "Universal Wireless Personal Communications", Artech House Publishers, 1998.
- [15] M. Abramowitz; I. R. Stegun, "Handbook of Mathematical Functions", Dover Publications, 1970.
- [16] C.H. Edwards, "Calculus : with analytic geometry", Upper Saddle River Prentice-Hall, 1998.

#### APPENDIX

We have found the exact hop distribution for the honey-grid structure. The mean and the variance are derived directly from the exact distribution of the hopcount.

The method for finding hopcount distribution in the honey-grid model is discovered by finding the exact hopcount for several network configurations (from  $k = 1$  to  $k = 8$ ) and extrapolating the observed systematics to higher vales of  $k$ . The algorithm found in this way is presented here.

```

begin
k = number of rings
a = a node's reach
s = k/a [note: s should be an integer, and k>a]
form matrix A(2s, s) with all values zero
form matrix B(2s, s) with all values zero
form matrix C(2s, s) with all values zero
form array h(2s) with all values zero
for j = 1 to s
    A(1, j) = 3
    A(i, j) = A(i-1, j) + 2, for i=2 to j
    A(i, j) = A(i-1, j), for i=j+1 to 2j
    B(i, j) = 2, for i=1 to 2j-1
    B(2j, j) = 2j+1
    A(i, j) = B(i, j)/2 + (A(i, j) - B(i, j)), for i=1 to 2j
    h = h + 6j A(:, j) [note: A(:, j) denotes column j of A]
end for loop
C(1, j) = C(1, j-1) + (j-1), for j=2 to s
C(i, j) = C(i-1, j-1)+C(1, j-i+1), for i=2 to s-1 and j=i to s
C(i, j) = -C(2j-i+1, j), for j=2 to s and i=j+1 to 2j
h = h + 6C(:, s) [note: C(:, s) denotes column s of C]
end

```

At the end of this procedure, array h contains the exact number of node combination that are at distance 1, 2, ...,  $2(k/a)$  hops from each other. As an example, Figure 10 shows the distribution of hopcount for three different values of  $k$ . In all cases it is assumed that  $a = 1$ .

When  $a = 1$ , this calculation method produces the exact number of hops from any source to any other destination in the entire network. We have used the above described procedure to find the mean and variance of hopcount for different number of nodes  $N$ . The results, in logarithmic scale, are shown in Figure






Fig. 10. Hop distribution for  $k=5$  (91 nodes),  $k=10$  (331 nodes) and  $k=15$  (721 nodes). In all cases  $a=1$ .




Fig. 11. Mean and variance of the hop count. Results are found through the procedure for finding exact hop distribution in honey-grid model.

11.

As observed in this figure, on logarithmic scale, the mean and the variance of the hopcount seem to be linear functions of the number of nodes. This is confirmed by first order curve fitting results:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln E[h_N] &\simeq 0.50 \ln(N) - 0.64 \\ \ln var[h_N] &\simeq \ln(N) - 2.81 \end{aligned}$$

These linear approximations fit almost perfectly with computed values<sup>5</sup>. Based on these formulas we find the following approximation for the average and variance of the hopcount:

<sup>5</sup>For  $k = 500$ , the root mean square error (rmse) of the linear fit for the average hopcount is of the order  $10^{-4}$ , and the rmse for the linear fit of the variance is of the order  $10^{-3}$ .

$$E[h_N] \simeq 0.53 N^{0.5} \quad (11)$$

$$var[h_N] \simeq 0.06 N \quad (12)$$

It is interesting to mention that the formulas found here for the mean and the variance of the hopcount in honey-grid model are in-line with expressions found in [10] for *rectangular*  $d$ -lattice graphs. When applied to  $d = 2$ , in [10] is found:  $E[h_N] \simeq 2/3 N^{1/2}$ , and  $var[h_N] \simeq 1/9 N$ . In comparison to (11) and (12) we see only a coefficient difference due to a form factor (difference between a hexagonal and rectangular lattice). It should be noticed that (11) and (12) are valid for small as well as large values of  $N$ , while expressions in [10] are found for large values of  $N$ .