

Wireless Broadcast Using Network Coding

Dong Nguyen, Tuan Tran, Thinh Nguyen, and Bella Bose, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—Traditional approaches to reliably transmit information over an error-prone network employ either forward error correction (FEC) or retransmission techniques. In this paper, we propose some network coding schemes to reduce the number of broadcast transmissions from one sender to multiple receivers. The main idea is to allow the sender to combine and retransmit the lost packets in a certain way so that with one transmission, multiple receivers are able to recover their own lost packets. For comparison, we derive a few theoretical results on the bandwidth efficiency of the proposed network coding and traditional automatic repeat-request (ARQ) schemes. Both simulations and theoretical analysis confirm the advantages of the proposed network coding schemes over the ARQ ones.

Index Terms—Network coding, throughput, wireless broadcast, wireless networks.

I. INTRODUCTION

BROADCAST is a mechanism for disseminating identical information from a sender to multiple receivers. It is widely employed in many applications, ranging from satellite communications to WiFi networks. In a reliable broadcast session, every receiver must correctly receive information that is sent by the sender. When the communication channels between a sender and receivers are lossy, some appropriate error-control schemes must be used to provide reliable transmissions. Depending on applications, these schemes can be classified into two main approaches—automatic repeat-request (ARQ) and forward error correction (FEC).

Using the ARQ approach, the sender may have to rebroadcast a lost packet to all the receivers, although there may be only one receiver that did not correctly receive that packet. The ARQ approach assumes that a feedback channel is available so that the receiver can communicate to the sender on whether it receives the correct data. On the other hand, using the pure FEC approach, the sender generates some redundancies, then broadcasts both redundant and original information to the receivers [1], [2]. If the amount of lost data is sufficiently small (less than the redundant data), a receiver can recover the lost data using some decoding schemes.

In this paper, we present some efficient retransmission-based broadcast schemes in single-hop wireless networks to be used

Manuscript received April 5, 2007; revised September 10, 2007, April 10, 2008 and May 23, 2008. First published June 24, 2008; current version published February 17, 2009. The review of this paper was coordinated by Dr. S. Vishwanath.

The authors are with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331 USA (e-mail: nguyendo@eecs.oregonstate.edu; trantu@eecs.oregonstate.edu; thinhq@eecs.oregonstate.edu; bose@cs.orst.edu).

Color versions of one or more of the figures in this paper are available online at <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TVT.2008.927729




Fig. 1. (a) Traditional store and forward network and (b) network coding-based network.

for WiFi or WiMAX networks. Specifically, we propose some broadcast schemes that combine network coding and retransmission to efficiently utilize the bandwidth.

The recently introduced network coding theory was the basis for many bandwidth-efficient transmission schemes in wireless networks. Informally, network coding refers to the ability of a node in the network to appropriately encode the incoming data before sending these coded data to the next node. The ability to recode the data at the intermediate nodes results in a substantial bandwidth improvement over that of a traditional store and forward network [3]–[7]. Notably, network coding techniques have been applied to increase bandwidth efficiency in wireless ad hoc networks [8]–[12]. As an illustration, Fig. 1 shows an example of packet exchange between nodes R_1 and R_2 via node R in a wireless ad hoc network.

As shown in Fig. 1(a), without network coding, node R simply relays packet a from R_1 to R_2 and packet b from R_2 to R_1 . As a result, the total number of transmissions that are required for R_1 and R_2 to exchange their packets is four. On the other hand, when network coding is used, intermediate node R is allowed to generate and send a new packet out based on the packets that it receives from nodes R_1 and R_2 . As shown in Fig. 1(b), since nodes R_1 and R_2 can hear the transmission from R , R can generate a new packet by XORing the bits in packets a and b , then broadcasts this new packet $a \oplus b$ to R_1 and R_2 . Upon receiving $a \oplus b$, R_1 can recover b as $a \oplus (a \oplus b)$, and R_2 can recover a as $b \oplus (a \oplus b)$. Clearly, in this case, only three transmissions are required for R_1 and R_2 to exchange their packets.

Instead of employing network coding for packet exchange in wireless ad hoc networks, our proposed schemes are designed for broadcast in single-hop wireless networks. The main idea for the proposed schemes is based on the observation that, at a certain point in time, many receivers may have disjoint lost packets. Thus, the sender may XOR these lost packets together and broadcast them to all the receivers. Upon receiving this XOR packet, a receiver will be able to recover its lost packet by XORing the XOR packet with the certain packets that it has received previously. As such, one transmission from the sender

will enable multiple receivers to recover their lost packets, thus efficiently utilizing the wireless bandwidth. As will be shown later, our proposed schemes have large bandwidth gains over the ARQ schemes when packet losses at different receivers are large and uncorrelated. This bandwidth gain reduces when the packet loss rates decrease and their correlation increases. We note that part of this paper has been presented in [13] and [14].

The organization of this paper is as follows. We first discuss related work in Section II. In Section III, we describe different *retransmission-based* broadcast schemes with and without network coding. We then analyze their performance in terms of bandwidth utilization in Section IV. Section V presents the simulation results that confirm our theoretical predictions.

II. RELATED WORK

Wireless broadcast is a well-explored problem. In his seminal work, Cover [15] modeled a broadcast channel as multiple binary channels, each with a given channel capacity. He found the lower and upper bounds on the capacity regions of jointly achievable transmission rates. Subsequently, there has been much research on efficiently using the broadcast bandwidth. Recently, network coding has been successfully applied to many wireless broadcast and multicast applications. Lun *et al.* [16] proved that the problem of minimum-energy multicast in infrastructureless networks can be exactly solved in polynomial time when employing network coding. This is in contrast with the traditional routing approaches in [17]–[19] that result in nonpolynomial time solutions. In addition, Li and Li [20], [21] proved that network coding could provide some benefits over the nonnetwork coding approaches. Lun *et al.* [22] showed a capacity-approaching coding scheme for unicast or multicast over lossy packet networks in which all nodes perform opportunistic coding by constructing the encoded packets with random linear combinations of previously received packets.

This paper is rooted in the recent development of network coding for wireless ad hoc networks [8], [11], [23], [24]. Wu *et al.* [8] proposed the basic scheme that uses XOR of packets to increase the bandwidth efficiency of a wireless mesh network. Katti *et al.* [23] implemented a XOR-based scheme in a wireless mesh network and showed a substantial bandwidth improvement over the current approach. Unlike existing approaches, the focus of this paper is on the analysis of the *reliable* wireless broadcast problem in a single-hop wireless network such as wireless local area networks or WiMAX networks. Eryilmaz *et al.* [25] also have recently proposed a similar model. In that work, Eryilmaz *et al.* employed a *random network coding* scheme for multiple users that are downloading a single file or multiple files from a wireless base station. Rather than using XOR operations, their scheme encodes every packet using coefficients that are randomly taken from a sufficiently large finite field [26], [27]. This scheme guarantees that the receivers can decode the original data with a high probability. Another work that is somewhat related to ours is that of Ghaderi and Towsley [8]–[28]. In that work, Ghaderi and Towsley analyzed the reliability benefit of network coding for reliable multicast by computing the expected number of transmissions using link-by-link ARQ compared with network coding.

III. BROADCAST SCHEMES

To describe our proposed schemes, we make the following assumptions for all the broadcast schemes.

- 1) There are one sender and $M > 1$ receivers.
- 2) Data are sent in packets, and each packet is sent in a time slot of fixed duration.
- 3) The sender has access to the information on packet losses of all the receivers at any time slot. This can be accomplished through the use of positive and negative acknowledgments (ACK/NAKs). For simplicity, we assume that all the ACK/NAKs are instantaneous. This assumption is not critical since one can easily incorporate the delay and the bandwidth that are used by ACK/NAKs into the analysis.
- 4) A packet loss at a receiver i follows a Bernoulli trial with parameter p_i . This model is clearly insufficient to describe many real-world scenarios. However, this model is only intended for capturing the essence of wireless broadcast. One can develop a more accurate model at the cost of complicated analysis.

A. Broadcast Schemes Without Network Coding

Scheme A (Memoryless Receiver): In this scenario, a receiver immediately sends a NAK whenever there is a packet loss in the current time slot, regardless of whether it has correctly received this packet in some previous time slots (hence, memoryless). This situation arises when a receiver receives a correct packet, but this packet was lost at some other receivers at some previous time slots. Hence, the sender has to retransmit this packet. If this packet is now lost in the current time slot, a memoryless receiver would automatically request a retransmission, although it has previously received that packet. This scheme is clearly suboptimal in terms of bandwidth utilization, as it implies that the sender has to resend a packet until *all* the receivers receive this packet correctly and *simultaneously*.

Scheme B (Typical ARQ Scheme): In this scenario, the receiver immediately sends a NAK only if there is a packet loss in the current time slot, and this packet has not been correctly received in any previous time slot. This scheme is clearly superior to scheme A in terms of bandwidth utilization since it never requests a retransmission for a packet that it already received successfully.

B. Broadcast Schemes With Network Coding

Scheme C (Time-Based Retransmission): In this scheme, the receiver's protocol is similar to that of the receiver in scheme B in that it immediately sends the NAK if it does not correctly receive a packet. However, the sender immediately does not retransmit the lost packet when it receives a NAK. Instead, the sender maintains a list of lost packets and their corresponding receivers for which their packets are lost. The sender waits until N packets have been transmitted before any retransmission takes place. During the retransmission phase, the sender forms a new packet by XORing a maximum set of the lost packets from different receivers before retransmitting this combined packet




Fig. 2. Combined packets for time-based retransmission. $a_1 \oplus a_3, a_4 \oplus a_5, a_7, a_9; N = 9$.




Fig. 3. Combined packets for improved time-based retransmission. $a_1 \oplus a_3, a_3 \oplus a_4, a_5 \oplus a_9, a_6; N = 9$.

for all the receivers. The *combined* packets may be lost during the retransmission, and these packets will be retransmitted until all the receivers receive this packet. The sender keeps sending out the *combined* packets until there are no more lost packets on the list; it then resumes the transmission of a different set of packets.

Upon successfully receiving a *combined* packet, a receiver is able to recover its lost packet by XORing this combined packet with an appropriate set of previously successful packets. The information on choosing this appropriate set of packets is included in the packets that are sent by the sender. To illustrate this, Fig. 2 shows a pattern of lost packets (denoted by the crosses) for two receivers R_1 and R_2 . The combined packets are $a_1 \oplus a_3, a_4 \oplus a_5, a_7$, and a_9 , where a_i denotes the i th packet. Note that, if packet $a_1 \oplus a_3$ is not correctly received at any receiver, this packet is retransmitted until all the receivers correctly receive this packet but might not be simultaneously. Receiver R_1 recovers packet a_1 as $a_3 \oplus (a_1 \oplus a_3)$. Similarly, receiver R_2 recovers packet a_3 as $a_1 \oplus (a_1 \oplus a_3)$. When the same packet loss occurs at receivers R_1 and R_2 , the encoding process is not needed, and the sender just has to retransmit that packet alone. Note that the sender has to include some bits to indicate to a receiver which set of packets it should use for XORing. Assuming that all the retransmissions are correctly received at all the receivers at the first attempt, then clearly, the number of retransmissions for this scheme is only four, whereas it is six for scheme B.

Scheme D (Improved Time-Based Retransmission): Scheme C is suboptimal because the sender has to retransmit the same combined packet, although some receivers may receive it. An improved scheme is to have the sender dynamically change the combined packets based on what the receivers have received. For example, Fig. 3 shows the same pattern of lost packets as in the previous scenario. Now, suppose that packet $a_1 \oplus a_3$ is lost at receiver R_2 but is correctly received at receiver R_1 . In this case, instead of retransmitting packet $a_1 \oplus a_3$, the sender can transmit packet $a_3 \oplus a_4$. Clearly, on average, the number of transmissions can be further reduced using this scheme.

Remarks: Note that a larger buffer size N results in better bandwidth efficiency. However, it may incur an unnecessary long delay for some packets. This may be acceptable for file transfer but may not be suitable for multimedia applications. Choosing an optimal value for N for the multimedia applications with certain delay requirements is beyond the scope of this paper. However, we envision that a good scheme is one that

dynamically changes the value of N based on the current network conditions and the application delay requirement. When $N = 1$, the network coding scheme reduces to scheme B. In Section IV, we derive a few theoretical results on transmission bandwidths for different schemes with infinite and finite buffer sizes.

IV. TRANSMISSION BANDWIDTH ANALYSIS

We define the transmission bandwidth as the average number of transmissions that are required to successfully transmit a packet to all the receivers. Let η_A, η_B, η_C , and η_D denote the transmission bandwidths using schemes A, B, C, and D, respectively. Let M denote the number of receivers, and let p_i denote the packet loss probability of receiver i . We first discuss the nonnetwork coding schemes A and B.

A. Nonnetwork Coding Schemes A and B

We begin with a special case where there are only two receivers with packet loss probabilities of p_1 and p_2 . We have the following results.

Proposition 1: The transmission bandwidth of scheme A with two receivers is

$$\eta_A = \frac{1}{(1 - p_1)(1 - p_2)} \tag{1}$$

and, using scheme B, is

$$\eta_B = \frac{1}{1 - p_1} + \frac{1}{1 - p_2} - \frac{1}{1 - p_1 p_2}. \tag{2}$$

Proof: For scheme A, the proof is simple. As described in Section III, the sender has to retransmit the packets until both receivers simultaneously receive the correct packets. Since the packet loss is independent and uncorrelated between the receivers (Bernoulli trial), the number of transmission attempts before both receivers correctly receive the data follows a geometric distribution with parameter $(1 - p_1)(1 - p_2)$. Therefore, the average number of transmissions per successful event is $1/(1 - p_1)(1 - p_2)$.

For scheme B, let X_1 and X_2 be the random variables denoting the numbers of attempts to successfully deliver a packet to R_1 and R_2 , respectively. Then, the number of transmissions that are needed to successfully deliver a packet to both receivers is the random variable $Y = \max\{X_1, X_2\}$. We have

$$P[Y \leq k] = P[\max\{X_1, X_2\} \leq k] = \prod_{i=1}^2 (1 - p_i^k). \tag{3}$$

Therefore

$$P[Y = k] = \prod_{i=1}^2 (1 - p_i^k) - \prod_{i=1}^2 (1 - p_i^{k-1}) \tag{4}$$

and the average number of transmissions per successful packet is

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_B &= E[Y] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \left(\prod_{i=1}^2 (1 - p_i^k) - \prod_{i=1}^2 (1 - p_i^{k-1}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - p_1} + \frac{1}{1 - p_2} - \frac{1}{(1 - p_1 p_2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Theorem 1: The transmission bandwidth of scheme A with M receivers is

$$\eta_A = \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^M (1 - p_i)} \quad (6)$$

and, using scheme B, is

$$\eta_B = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_M} \frac{(-1)^{i_1 + i_2 + \dots + i_M - 1}}{1 - p_1^{i_1} p_2^{i_2} \dots p_M^{i_M}} \quad (7)$$

where $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_M \in \{0, 1\}$, $\exists i_j \neq 0$.

Proof: For scheme A, using the same argument for two receivers, the number of transmissions before all M receivers correctly receive a packet follows a geometric distribution with parameter $\prod_{i=1}^M (1 - p_i)$. Therefore, the average number of transmissions per successful packet is $\eta_A = 1 / \prod_{i=1}^M (1 - p_i)$.

For scheme B, let R_1, R_2, \dots, R_M denote the receivers with corresponding packet loss probabilities p_1, p_2, \dots, p_M , respectively. The number of transmissions that are needed to successfully deliver a packet to all receivers is the random variable $Y = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \{X_i\}$, where X_i is the random variable denoting the number of attempts to successfully deliver a packet to R_i . We know that $P[Y \leq k] = P[\max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \{X_i\} \leq k] = \prod_{i=1}^M (1 - p_i^k)$. Therefore

$$P[Y = k] = \prod_{i=1}^M (1 - p_i^k) - \prod_{i=1}^M (1 - p_i^{k-1}). \quad (8)$$

Thus, the average number of transmissions per successful packet is

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_B &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \left(\prod_{i=1}^M (1 - p_i^k) - \prod_{i=1}^M (1 - p_i^{k-1}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_M} \frac{(-1)^{i_1 + i_2 + \dots + i_M - 1}}{1 - p_1^{i_1} p_2^{i_2} \dots p_M^{i_M}} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_M \in \{0, 1\}$, and $\exists i_j \neq 0$.

Note that, with $p_1 = p_2 = \dots = p_M = p$

$$\eta_B = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k-1} \binom{M}{k}}{1 - p^k}. \quad (10)$$

B. Network Coding Schemes C and D

Unlike schemes A and B, scheme C has one additional parameter, namely, the size of the buffer that is used to maintain

a list of receivers and their corresponding lost packets. When a small buffer is used, there may not be sufficiently many lost packets for generating the combined packets, which can reduce the bandwidth efficiency. On the other hand, when a large buffer is used, the bandwidth efficiency improves at the expense of increased delays for some packets. This approach is acceptable for file transfer applications. We now provide an asymptotic result when buffer size N and number of packets to be sent T are sufficiently large. Since it is not beneficial to have $N > T$, we assume that $T = N$, and N is sufficiently large. We have the following results for two receivers.

Proposition 2: The transmission bandwidth of scheme C with two receivers, where $p_1 \leq p_2$ and N is sufficiently large, is

$$\eta_C = 1 + \frac{p_1}{1 - p_1} + \frac{p_2}{1 - p_2} - \frac{p_1}{1 - p_1 p_2}. \quad (11)$$

Proof: The key to our proof is the following observation. The transmission bandwidth depends on how many pairs of lost packets one can find to generate the combined packets. When the number of packets to be sent is sufficiently large, the probability that the number of lost packets at receiver R_1 is smaller than that of receiver R_2 is arbitrarily close to 1. Furthermore, the average numbers of lost packets for R_1 and R_2 are Np_1 and Np_2 , respectively. This implies that, on average, one can combine Np_1 pairs of lost packets since $Np_1 \leq Np_2$. As a result, there are $Np_2 - Np_1$ lost packets from R_2 that need to be retransmitted alone. Therefore, the total number of transmissions that are required to successfully deliver all N packets to two receivers is simply

$$n = N + Np_1 E[X_1] + N(p_2 - p_1) E[X_2] \quad (12)$$

where X_1 and X_2 are the random variables denoting the numbers of transmission attempts before a successful transmission for the combined and noncombined packets. Now, $E[X_2] = 1/(1 - p_2)$ since X_2 follows a geometric distribution. From Proposition 1, we have

$$E[X_1] = \frac{1}{1 - p_1} + \frac{1}{1 - p_2} - \frac{1}{1 - p_1 p_2}. \quad (13)$$

Replacing $E[X_1]$ and $E[X_2]$ in (12) and dividing n by N , we arrive at Proposition 2. \blacksquare

We can generalize the result to M receivers.

Theorem 2: The transmission bandwidth of scheme C with M receivers and sufficiently large N is

$$\varphi_M = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_M} \frac{(-1)^{i_1 + i_2 + \dots + i_M - 1}}{1 - p_1^{i_1} p_2^{i_2} \dots p_M^{i_M}} \quad (14)$$

and $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_M \in \{0, 1\}$, $\exists i_j \neq 0$, $p_1 \leq p_1 \leq \dots \leq p_M$.

Proof: After a sufficiently large number of transmissions N , the numbers of lost packets at receivers R_1, R_2, \dots, R_M are Np_1, Np_2, \dots, Np_M , respectively. Since $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots \leq p_M$, we have $Np_1 \leq Np_2 \leq \dots \leq Np_M$. We can conceptually count the number of combinations for XORING the lost packets and transmit these packets in different rounds. In particular, in round 1, there are Np_1 lost packets of R_1 that can be

combined with the lost packets of R_2, R_3, \dots, R_M . After these combinations, the numbers of lost packets that remain for $R_1, R_2, R_3, \dots, R_M$ are $0, N(p_2 - p_1), N(p_3 - p_1), \dots$, and $N(p_M - p_1)$, respectively. Next, in round 2, the remaining $N(p_2 - p_1)$ lost packets at R_2 are combined with the remaining lost packets at R_3, R_4, \dots, R_M . Thus, the remaining lost packets for receivers R_1 to R_M are now $0, 0, N(p_3 - p_2), \dots, N(p_M - p_{M-1})$. The same reasoning applies until there are no more lost packets. Therefore, the average number of transmissions that are required to successfully deliver all N packets to all the receivers is equal to

$$n = N + Np_1\phi_1 + N(p_2 - p_1)\phi_2 + N(p_3 - p_2)\phi_3 + \dots + N(p_M - p_{M-1})\phi_M \quad (15)$$

where ϕ_i denotes the average number of transmissions that are required to successfully transmit a combined packet in round i .

Now, using Theorem 1, the average number of transmission attempts in order for all K receivers to correctly receive a packet is

$$\varphi_K = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_K} \frac{(-1)^{i_1+i_2+\dots+i_K-1}}{1 - p_1^{i_1} p_2^{i_2}, \dots, p_K^{i_K}} \quad (16)$$

where $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_K \in \{0, 1\}$, $\exists i_j \neq 0$, and $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots \leq p_K$. Setting $\phi_i = \varphi_{M+1-i}$ and dividing n by N , the proof follows directly. ■

Theorem 3: The transmission bandwidth of scheme D with M receivers and sufficiently large N is

$$\eta_D = \frac{1}{1 - \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \{p_i\}}. \quad (17)$$

Proof: We begin with the case of two receivers. Without loss of generality, we assume that $p_1 \leq p_2$. As discussed in Section III, the combined packets in scheme D are dynamically formed based on the feedback from the receivers. If a combined packet is correctly received at one receiver but not at the other, a new combined packet is generated to ensure that the receivers with the correct packet will be able to obtain the new data using the new combined packet. This implies that, in the long run, the number of losses will be dominated by the number of losses at the receiver with the largest error probability, i.e., R_2 . Therefore, the total number of transmissions to successfully deliver N packets to two receivers is equal to the number of transmissions to successfully deliver N packets to R_2 alone, i.e., $N/(1 - p_2)$ or $N/(1 - \max\{p_1, p_2\})$. Using a similar argument, we can generalize this result to the case with M receivers, i.e.,

$$n = \frac{N}{1 - \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \{p_i\}}. \quad (18)$$

Therefore, the transmission bandwidth is

$$\eta_D = \frac{n}{N} = \frac{1}{1 - \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \{p_i\}}. \quad (19)$$

■

For many real-time applications, it is necessary to reduce to the packet delay. This implies that the retransmission of lost packets from the sender to the receivers must be done promptly, that is, N should be sufficiently small. However, by doing so, the chance of combining the lost packets decreases. Thus, we want to quantify the bandwidth efficiency for scheme D with finite buffer size N . We have the following theorem.

Theorem 4: The transmission bandwidth of scheme D with M receivers and buffer size N is

$$\eta_D^N = \frac{\sum_{k=N}^{\infty} k \left(\prod_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=0}^{k-N} Q_{ij} - \prod_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=0}^{k-N-1} Q_{ij} \right)}{N} \quad (20)$$

where

$$Q_{ij} = \begin{cases} p_j^i (1 - p_j)^N \sum_{l=1}^i \binom{N}{l} \binom{i-1}{l-1}, & \text{with } i \leq N \\ p_j^i (1 - p_j)^N \sum_{l=1}^N \binom{N}{l} \binom{i-1}{l-1}, & \text{with } i > N \end{cases}$$

and p_j is the loss probability at receiver R_j .

Proof: The proof is provided in the Appendix. ■

Note that we have not been able to obtain a reasonable closed-form expression for the transmission bandwidth of scheme C with a finite buffer. Thus, we omit the analysis for this case.

C. Receivers With a Correlated Loss

The previous results are obtained based on a simple Bernoulli model for a packet loss in a wireless medium. In many scenarios, packet losses at different receivers are highly correlated. For example, if two wireless receivers are closely located to each other and behind an obstacle, then, most likely, they will have correlated losses. Thus, the assumption on independent packet losses among the receivers is no longer accurate. In this section, we would like to investigate the performance gain of network coding schemes under such scenarios. In particular, we first assume that packet losses at different receivers in a given time slot can be correlated, and their loss probabilities are given by a joint probability. Second, we assume that packet losses in different time slots are uncorrelated.

We now have the following results on transmission bandwidths for M receivers with correlated losses.

Theorem 5: The transmission bandwidth for an M -receiver scenario with correlated losses and sufficiently large buffer using scheme B is

$$\eta_{\text{cor}}^B = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k P[Y_M = k] \quad (21)$$

and, using scheme C, is

$$\eta_{\text{cor}}^C = 1 + \sum_{l=0}^{M-1} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k (p_{l+1} - p_l) P[Y_{M-l} = k] \quad (22)$$

where $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots \leq p_M$, $p_0 = 0$, and $P[Y_{M-l} = k]$ is the probability that the sender needs k transmissions to successfully deliver a packet to all $M - l$ receivers R_l, R_{l+1}, \dots, R_M .

Proof: The proof can be found in the Appendix. ■

The theorem above indicates that to compute the transmission bandwidth, one needs to compute probabilities $P[Y_M = k]$ and $P[Y_{M-l} = k]$. We show how to compute these probabilities in the Appendix.

The transmission bandwidth with correlated losses in scheme D is the same as that in the case of independent receivers, i.e.,

$$\eta_{\text{cor}}^D = \frac{1}{1 - \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \{p_i\}}.$$

This is because, in the long run, regardless of whether the packet losses are correlated, the number of transmissions to successfully deliver N packets to M receivers will be dominated by the one with the largest loss probability.

D. Remarks on Network Coding Gain

In the previous section, we analyzed the transmission bandwidths of different schemes. We now define the coding gain of one scheme over the other by the ratio of their transmission bandwidths. In particular, the coding gains of schemes C and D over scheme B for two receivers are

$$G_C = \frac{\eta_B}{\eta_C} = \frac{\frac{1}{1-p_1} + \frac{1}{1-p_2} - \frac{1}{1-p_1 p_2}}{1 + \frac{p_1}{1-p_1} + \frac{p_2}{1-p_2} - \frac{p_1}{1-p_1 p_2}} \quad (23)$$

$$G_D = \frac{\eta_B}{\eta_D} = \frac{\frac{1}{1-p_1} + \frac{1}{1-p_2} - \frac{1}{1-p_1 p_2}}{\frac{1}{1-\max\{p_1, p_2\}}}. \quad (24)$$

For the case $p_1 = p_2 = p$, (23) and (24) become

$$G_C = \frac{1 + 2p}{1 + p + p^2} \quad (25)$$

$$G_D = \frac{1 + 2p}{1 + p}. \quad (26)$$

Note that when p_1 or p_2 is equal to zero, (23) and (24) indicate no gain for network coding schemes, e.g., $G_C = G_D = 1$. However, this scenario is only true when considering only two receivers. A typical scenario is likely to involve more users with different packet loss rates. Even in the presence of lossless receivers, if there are a few lossy receivers (more than one), our schemes still provide higher bandwidth efficiency. We will continue this discussion in Section V.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We use simulations to 1) verify the analytical derivations for the transmission bandwidths and 2) set light on the typical performance of different broadcast schemes for real-world settings. Instead of using Rayleigh fading parameters, we use packet loss rates to characterize the wireless channel. Also, our simulations do not take into account the interaction between the medium-access control protocol and the higher layer protocols such as the transmission control protocol (TCP). Under some




Fig. 4. Transmission bandwidth versus packet loss probability.

settings, this interaction may reduce the coding gain for the proposed schemes. Recently, Dong *et al.* [29] have provided a discussion on possible performance degradation of network coding when the TCP is employed in wireless ad hoc networks. As such, the authors provided a *loop-coding* scheme that simultaneously improves the network throughput and the TCP throughput. Modeling such complex interactions is very useful; however, it is beyond the scope of this paper.

That said, the simulations are divided into three categories. In category 1, packet losses are assumed independent and uncorrelated across the receivers. In category 2, packet losses are also assumed independent across the time slots, but they are correlated among the receivers. In both of these categories, we attempt modeling the realistic performance of the proposed scheme by using the simulated packet loss rates for the IEEE 802.11 standard as reported in the literature [30], [31]. Finally, in category 3, we model the channel as a two-state Markov chain to capture the burst losses.

A. Independent and Uncorrelated Packet Loss Model

Fig. 4 shows the simulation and theoretical results on the transmission bandwidths (e.g., the average number of transmissions per successful packet) of schemes A, B, C, and D for the scenario consisting of one sender and two receivers R_1 and R_2 with independent and uncorrelated packet losses. For schemes C and D, we use buffer size $N = 1000$ packets, which sufficiently simulates an infinite size buffer in this setting. The packet loss probability of R_1 varies, as shown on the x -axis, whereas that of R_2 remains at 10%. As seen, the simulation and theoretical curves match almost exactly for all the schemes, verifying the results of our derivations. Furthermore, the number of transmissions per successful packet in scheme D is the smallest, whereas that of scheme A is the largest, which confirms our earlier intuitions about these schemes. We note that, although scheme D is slightly more efficient than scheme C, the hardware implementation of scheme D might be a little more complex




Fig. 5. Network coding gain versus packet loss probability.

than that of scheme C due to its dynamic selection of the retransmitted packets.

We now show the coding gains of different schemes. Ideally, scheme A has the worst performance and should be used as the baseline for comparison. However, most wireless devices with limited memory will be able to implement scheme B. Furthermore, scheme B is the traditional ARQ scheme. Therefore, we compare our proposed schemes C and D against scheme B by examining their coding gains over scheme B. Fig. 5 shows the coding gains of schemes C and D as functions of the packet loss probability of R_1 . It is interesting to note that the gain is largest when both the loss probabilities of R_1 and R_2 are equal to each other. This is intuitively plausible as, in this special case, the maximum number of lost packet pairs is achieved. In other words, more combined packets can be generated, reducing the number of retransmissions that are required otherwise.

On the other hand, when two receivers have disparate packet loss rates, e.g., $p_1 = 0.01$ and $p_2 = 0.9$, using the network coding techniques, roughly 1% of the combined packets and 89% of individual lost packets must be retransmitted. Since network coding techniques depend on the number of lost packets that can be combined, it would not produce much coding gain in this scenario. At one extremity, if one receiver has no packet loss, and the other has some nonzero packet loss rates, e.g., 10%, then the performance of the network coding technique is identical to that of scheme B, which is the traditional ARQ technique, that is, the coding gain over scheme B is equal to 1.

In addition, the coding gains for schemes C and D over scheme B seem to be the piecewise linear functions of loss rate p_1 (with fixed p_2). However, this is simply a coincidence for this range of values for p_1 and p_2 . The coding gains of scheme D over scheme B can be easily calculated as $((1/(1 - p_1)) + (1/(1 - p_2)) - (1/(1 - p_1 p_2)))(1 - p_2)$ for the first segment and $((1/(1 - p_1)) + (1/(1 - p_2)) - (1/(1 - p_1 p_2)))(1 - p_1)$ for the second segment. These functions are clearly not linear functions, but their plots resemble linear plots. Also, note that the cusp in the graph is due to the sudden change of $\max\{p_1, p_2\}$ from p_2 to p_1 . Recall that, for




Fig. 6. Transmission bandwidth versus the number of receivers.

scheme D, the transmission bandwidth is $1/(1 - \max\{p_1, p_2\})$ since p_2 is fixed, and p_1 changes along the x -axis. Therefore, the transmission bandwidth remains constant at $1/(1 - p_2)$ until p_1 exceeds p_2 . After this point, the transmission bandwidth starts varying with p_1 , creating a cusp in the graphs.

To investigate the effectiveness of our proposed techniques as functions of the number of receivers, Fig. 6 shows the average number of transmissions that are required to successfully deliver a packet to all receivers for schemes A, B, C, and D. In this scenario, the loss probabilities of all the receivers are set to 0.1. The network coding schemes C and D significantly outperform schemes A and B when the number of receivers is large. As the number of receivers increases, the transmission bandwidths for schemes A and B increase significantly. This is because it is much harder to successfully transmit a packet to all the receivers due to the increase in likelihood that a lost packet can occur at any receiver. For example, if the packet loss rate of receiver R_1 is p_1 , then the average number of transmissions that are required to successfully transmit a packet is $1/(1 - p_1)$. Now, if one is required to also successfully transmit the same packet to receiver R_2 with packet loss rate p_2 , then using scheme A, one needs an average of $1/(1 - p_1)(1 - p_2)$ transmissions. Note that the denominator is the product of terms that are less than 1, which quickly reduces to a small number when the number of receivers increases. As a result, the transmission bandwidth increases quickly. On the other hand, the transmission bandwidth for scheme C increases very slightly and is unchanged for scheme D. As shown in the analysis, the transmission bandwidths of these network coding schemes depend, more or less, on the receiver with the highest packet loss rate. Since the loss rates are set to 0.1 for all the receivers, we should not expect to see much increase in the transmission bandwidth. In fact, for scheme D, the transmission bandwidth should not increase at all since it is equal to $1/(1 - \max\{p_1, \dots, p_7\}) = 1/(1 - 0.1) = 1.1$, which is not a function of the number of receivers. Intuitively, although there are more packet losses with more receivers, using network




Fig. 7. Network coding gains versus packet loss probability in a five-receiver scenario.

coding techniques, most of these lost packets can be combined, effectively reducing the total number of retransmissions.

Fig. 7 shows the theoretical and simulated coding gains (over scheme B) for five receivers with different loss probabilities for schemes C and D as a function of packet loss probability p_1 at receiver R_1 . The packet loss probabilities at other receivers are set as follows: $p_2 = p_3 = 0$, $p_4 = p_1 + 0.3$, and $p_5 = 0.3$, that is, there are packet losses at receivers R_1 , R_4 , and R_5 but not at R_1 and R_2 . As seen, the network coding gain of scheme D is 15% when $p_1 = 0.1$. Note that, even if there are two receivers without a packet loss, our network coding schemes are still better than the traditional retransmission scheme. This is plausible since whenever there are pairs of disjoint packet losses at two or more receivers, the XOR packets are formed and transmitted in the network coding schemes, leading to better performance.

Up until now, we have shown the results of different schemes under the infinite buffer assumption. In practice, one must use a finite buffer. To characterize the performance of the best scheme (scheme D) with a finite buffer, Fig. 8 shows the transmission bandwidth as a function of buffer size N for scheme D at $p_1 = p_2 = 0.2$. As expected, as the buffer size increases, the number of opportunities for combining lost packets increases, resulting in a smaller number of retransmissions. When the buffer size is large, e.g., more than 40, and $p_1 = p_2 = 0.2$, the transmission bandwidth changes very slightly. This is because such a buffer size is sufficiently large and can be thought of having an infinite value, and thus, the transmission bandwidth remains constant according to Theorem 3. Under high loss rates, one can use a shorter buffer and still achieve the performance of the scheme with an infinite buffer. On the other hand, one needs to use a larger buffer when packet losses are infrequent to achieve the performance limit. Clearly, using a larger buffer size results in a longer delay for certain packets and may not be acceptable for some real-time applications. An interesting question is how to find an optimal buffer size under the delay constraints. We have partially addressed this question in [32].




Fig. 8. Transmission bandwidth versus buffer size for scheme D in a two-receiver scenario.




Fig. 9. Coding gain versus packet loss probability in a scenario with correlated losses.

B. Independent But Correlated Packet Loss Model

In this model, the receivers are assumed to have correlated packet losses. In particular, we assume that there are two receivers with the following loss characteristics: whenever there is a packet loss at R_1 with a probability of 0.7 that a packet is also lost at R_2 and whenever a packet is successfully received at R_1 with a probability of 0.9 that a packet is also successfully received at R_2 . Note that both conditional probabilities are above 0.5, which imply positive correlations between successful receptions as well as packet losses at these two receivers. We note that these conditional probabilities can be computed from the given joint probability mass function. Fig. 9 shows the network coding gains versus the packet loss probability for schemes C and D in the case of two receivers with correlated losses. As seen, as the packet loss probability of R_1 increases, the network coding gain also increases. However, the network




Fig. 10. Coding gain versus conditional packet loss probability in a scenario with correlated losses.

coding gain for correlated loss receivers is not as large as that of receivers with independent losses.

This is intuitively plausible by considering one extremity where packet losses at the receivers are 100% correlated. In this case, the network coding scheme simply reduces to the traditional retransmission scheme since the packet receptions at two receivers are completely identical. Fig. 10 confirms in this phenomenon that as the correlation between the two receivers increases, the network coding gain reduces.

C. Two-State Markov Model

Using the two-state Markov model, the state of a channel is classified into “bad” and “good” states. When the channel is in the good state, packet loss probability p_{good} is small, and when it is in the bad state, packet loss probability p_{bad} is much larger. The channel state changes at each transmission slot with transition probabilities $\alpha = p_{\text{good} \rightarrow \text{bad}}$ and $\beta = p_{\text{bad} \rightarrow \text{good}}$. The stationary probabilities for the channel in the good and bad states are $\pi_{\text{good}} = \beta / (\beta + \alpha)$ and $\pi_{\text{bad}} = \alpha / (\beta + \alpha)$, respectively.

We evaluate the performance of different schemes for a five-receiver scenario, with each receiver having identical channel conditions. For simplicity, we set β to a constant value while varying α . Fig. 11 shows the transmission bandwidths of different schemes. When $\alpha = 0$, the channel quickly converges and stays in the good state, which has a very small loss probability. Thus, the performances of all schemes are almost identical. As α increases while β is unchanged, the portion of time that the channel has a high loss probability becomes larger. As a result, there are more lost packets, and more combined packets to be transmitted, leading to large performance gaps between network coding schemes (C and D) and non-network coding schemes (A and B). In other words, the transmission bandwidths for network coding schemes do not increase as fast as those of the nonnetwork coding schemes as the channel gets progressively worse.

Remark: Our proposed network coding technique can be used together with FEC. Adding FEC simply changes the




Fig. 11. Transmission bandwidth versus state transition probability using the two-state Markov error model in a five-receiver scenario.

packet loss probabilities. However, bandwidth redundancy for FEC must be taken into account. In [33], we provided some analysis for jointly optimizing network coding and channel coding techniques for given channel parameters, which can further improve network performance.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have proposed some network coding techniques to increase the bandwidth efficiency of reliable broadcast in a wireless network. Our proposed schemes combine different lost packets from different receivers in such a way that multiple receivers are able to recover their lost packets with one transmission by the sender. The advantages of the proposed schemes over the traditional wireless broadcast have been shown through simulations and theoretical analysis.

APPENDIX

Proof of Theorem 4

We consider the scenario with one sender and one receiver. Let X denote the number of transmissions for the receiver to successfully get N packets. X can be $N, N + 1, N + 2, \dots$. We compute the probabilities for different values of X . If exactly N transmissions are required, then there must be no loss during transmitting N packets. We have

$$P[X = N] = \binom{N}{0} p^0 (1-p)^N.$$

If $N + 1$ transmissions are required, then there must be only one lost packet and one successful retransmission. We have

$$P[X = N + 1] = \left[\binom{N}{1} p(1-p)^{N-1} \right] (1-p) = \binom{N}{1} p(1-p)^N.$$

If $N + 2$ transmissions are required, then there could be one loss during the transmissions of the first N packets and two retransmissions before the lost packet is received successfully, or there could be two losses during the transmissions of the first

N packets and two successful retransmissions: one for each lost packet. We have

$$\begin{aligned} P[X = N + 2] &= \left[\binom{N}{1} p(1-p)^{N-1} \right] p(1-p) \\ &\quad + \left[\binom{N}{2} p^2(1-p)^{N-2} \right] (1-p)^2 \\ &= \left[\binom{N}{1} + \binom{N}{2} \right] p^2(1-p)^N. \quad (\text{A.27}) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can show that

$$P[X = N + i] = \begin{cases} p^i(1-p)^N \sum_{l=1}^i \binom{N}{l} \binom{i-1}{l-1}, & \text{with } i \leq N \\ p^i(1-p)^N \sum_{l=1}^N \binom{N}{l} \binom{i-1}{l-1}, & \text{with } i > N. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

Now, we consider the case of one sender and two receivers.

The number of transmissions using network coding to guarantee that both receivers successfully receive N packets is $Y = \max_{j \in \{1,2\}} \{X_j\}$, where X_j is a random variable denoting the number of transmissions for receiver j to successfully get N packets. Then

$$P[Y \leq k] = \prod_{j=1}^2 \sum_{i=0}^{k-N} P[X_j = i + N]. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

Therefore, we have the average number of transmissions so that both receivers successfully receive a packet, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_D^N &= \sum_{k=N}^{\infty} k P[Y = k] \\ &= \sum_{k=N}^{\infty} k \left(\prod_{j=1}^2 \sum_{i=0}^{k-N} Q_{ij} - \prod_{j=1}^2 \sum_{i=0}^{k-N-1} Q_{ij} \right) \quad (\text{A.30}) \end{aligned}$$

where $Q_{ij} = P[X_j = N + i]$, which can be computed from (A.28).

It is straightforward to extend the proof to obtain the result in (20) for the case of M receivers.

Proof of Theorem 5, Scheme B (Outline)

We start with the case of two receivers and then generalize to M receivers. Denote X_1 and X_2 as the number of attempts that are needed to successfully deliver a packet to receivers R_1 and R_2 , respectively, and $Y = \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \{X_i\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} P[Y = k] &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k P[X_1 = i, X_2 = j] \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} P[X_1 = i, X_2 = j] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k P[X_1 = i, X_2 = k] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} P[X_1 = k, X_2 = i]. \quad (\text{A.31}) \end{aligned}$$

Number of attempts	1	2	...	i-1	i	i+1	...	k-1	k
R_1	x	x	...	x	o	-	...	-	-
R_2	x	x	...	x	x	x	...	x	o

Fig. 12. Number of attempts to successfully deliver a packet to both receivers: R_1 needs i , whereas R_2 needs k attempts (“ x ” and “ o ” indicate unsuccessful and successful attempts, respectively).

Fig. 12 shows that after $X_1 = i$ and $X_2 = k$ attempts ($i \leq k$), a packet is successfully received at R_1 and R_2 , respectively. Assume that we know the joint packet loss probability. Let us denote p_{xx} , p_{xo} , p_{ox} , and p_{oo} as the probabilities that a packet is lost at both receivers, a packet is lost at R_1 but received at R_2 , a packet is received at R_1 but lost at R_2 , and a packet is received at both receivers, respectively. We have

$$P[i, j] = \begin{cases} p_{xx}^{i-1} p_{ox} (p_{ox} + p_{xx})^{j-i-1} (p_{oo} + p_{xo}), & \text{with } i \leq j \\ p_{xx}^{j-1} p_{xo} (p_{xo} + p_{xx})^{i-j-1} (p_{oo} + p_{ox}), & \text{with } i > j \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

where $P[i, j]$ denotes $P[X_1 = i, X_2 = j]$. From (A.31) and (A.32), we can derive the average number of transmissions that are required to successfully send a packet to both receivers.

Now, examine the case of M receivers. Let X_i denote the number of attempts for a packet to be successfully received at receiver R_i , $Y_M = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \{X_i\}$, and $P[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_M] = P[X_1 = j_1, X_2 = j_2, \dots, X_M = j_M]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} P[Y_M = k] &= \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_M \in Z_k} P[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_M] \\ &\quad - \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_M \in Z_{k-1}} P[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_M] \quad (\text{A.33}) \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_k = \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $Z_{k-1} = \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. Note that Z_k and Z_{k-1} are defined to make k the largest among j_1, j_2, \dots, j_M .

Now, we can compute $P[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_M]$ in terms of the joint packet loss probabilities. Let vector (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_M) denote the status reception of a packet at all the receivers; $a_h = “o”$ and $a_h = “x”$ indicate successful and unsuccessful receptions at receiver R_i , respectively. Let p_{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_M} denote the probability of this event. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j_1, \dots, j_M \in Z_k} P[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_M] \\ &= \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_M \in Z_k} \left(p_{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_M}^{j_1} p_{o_1 x_1, \dots, x_M} \prod_{h=1}^{M-1} \right. \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_{a_h \in \{o_h, x_h\}} p_{a_1, \dots, a_h, x_{h+1}, \dots, x_M} \right)^{l_{h+1} - l_h - 1} \\ &\quad \left. \times \left(\sum_{a_h \in \{o_h, x_h\}} p_{a_1, \dots, a_h, o_{h+1} x_{h+2}, \dots, x_M} \right) \right) \quad (\text{A.34}) \end{aligned}$$

where sequence $\{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_M\}$ is an ascending sorted sequence of $\{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_M\}$. For instance, if $\{j_1, j_3, j_2\}$ is the ascending sorted sequence of $\{j_1, j_2, j_3\}$, then $l_1 = j_1$, $l_2 = j_3$, and $l_3 = j_2$.

The key to obtaining the above equation is to set up a table, as shown in Fig. 12, and multiply the joint probability as was done in (A.32) for the two-receiver case.

Given $P[Y_M = k]$, the transmission bandwidth for M receivers with correlated losses using scheme B is

$$\eta_{\text{cor}}^B = E[Y] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} kP[Y_M = k]. \quad (\text{A.35})$$

Proof of Theorem 5, Scheme C

Consider the two-receiver scenarios. We use the same notations above and assume that $p_1 \leq p_2$. In the long run, the average number of lost packets at receiver 2 will be larger than that at receiver 1. Then, the average number of transmissions to successfully deliver a packet to two receivers is

$$\eta_{\text{cor}}^C = 1 + p_1 E[\max\{X_1, X_2\}] + (p_2 - p_1)E[X_2] \quad (\text{A.36})$$

where $E[\max\{X_1, X_2\}]$ is obtained from (A.31) and (A.32), and $E[X_2] = 1/(1 - p_2)$.

For the general case of M receivers, we also assume that $p_i \leq p_j$ for all $i < j$. Similarly, in the long run, the number of lost packets at receiver i is smaller than that of receiver j . Using the same argument for the case of two receivers, we can derive the average number of transmissions that are required to successfully deliver a packet to M receivers as


$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\text{cor}}^C &= 1 + p_1 E\left[\max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \{X_i\}\right] + (p_2 - p_1) \\ &\quad \times E\left[\max_{i \in \{2, \dots, M\}} \{X_i\}\right] + \dots + (p_M - p_{M-1})E[X_M] \\ &= 1 + \sum_{l=0}^{M-1} (p_{l+1} - p_l) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} kP[Y_{M-l} = k] \\ &= 1 + \sum_{l=0}^{M-1} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k(p_{l+1} - p_l)P[Y_{M-l} = k] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.37})$$

where $p_0 = 0$, and $P[Y_{M-l} = k]$ is the probability that the sender needs k transmissions to successfully deliver a packet to all $M - l$ receivers R_l, R_{l+1}, \dots , and R_M . $P[Y_{M-l} = k]$ can be computed using (A.34). Note that, to shorten the notation, we add a virtual receiver R_0 with $p_0 = 0$.

REFERENCES


- [1] G. C. Clark and J. B. Cain, *Error-Correction Coding for Digital Communications*. New York: Plenum, 1982.
- [2] S. Wicker, *Error Control Systems for Digital Communication and Storage*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1995.
- [3] R. Ahlswede, N. Cai, R. Li, and R. W. Yeung, "Network information flow," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 1204–1216, Jul. 2000.
- [4] R. Koetter and M. Medard, "Beyond routing: An algebraic approach to network coding," in *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, Jun. 2002, vol. 1, pp. 122–130.
- [5] P. Chou, Y. Wu, and K. Jain, "Practical network coding," in *Proc. 41st Allerton Conf. Commun., Control Comput.*, Monticello, IL, Oct. 2003.
- [6] C. Chekuri, C. Fragouli, and E. Soljanin, "On average throughput and alphabet size in network coding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 6, pp. 2410–2424, Jun. 2005.
- [7] C. Gkantsidis and P. Rodriguez, "Network coding for large scale content distribution," in *Proc. 24th IEEE INFOCOM*, Aug. 2005, pp. 2235–2245.
- [8] Y. Wu, P. A. Chou, and S.-Y. Kung, "Information exchange in wireless networks with network coding and physical-layer broadcast," in *Proc. 39th Annu. CISS*, Mar. 2005.
- [9] S. Katti, H. Rahul, W. Hu, D. Katabi, M. Medard, and J. Crowcroft, "Xors in the air: Practical wireless network coding," *ACM SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 243–254, Oct. 2006.
- [10] Y. Wu, P. A. Chou, and S.-Y. Kung, "Minimum-energy multicast in mobile ad hoc networks using network coding," in *Proc. IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop*, Oct. 2004, pp. 304–309.
- [11] S. Deb, M. Effros, T. Ho, D. R. Karger, R. Koetter, D. S. Lun, M. Medard, and N. Ratnakar, "Network coding for wireless applications: A brief tutorial," in *Proc. Int. Workshop Wireless Ad-hoc Sensor Netw.*, May 2005.
- [12] J. Liu, D. Goeckel, and D. Towsley, "The throughput order of ad hoc networks employing network coding and broadcasting," in *Proc. MILCOM*, 2006, pp. 1–7.
- [13] D. Nguyen, T. Nguyen, and B. Bose, "Wireless broadcast using network coding," in *Proc. NetCod Workshop*, Jan. 2007.
- [14] D. Nguyen, "Wireless broadcast with network coding," Oregon State Univ., Corvallis, OR, Tech. Rep. OSU-TR-2006-06, Jun. 2006.
- [15] T. Cover, "Broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. IT-18, no. 1, pp. 2–14, Jan. 1972.
- [16] D. S. Lun, M. Medard, and R. Koetter, "Efficient operation of wireless packet networks using network coding," in *Proc. Int. Workshop Convergent Technol.*, Jun. 2005.
- [17] M. Cagalj, J. Hubaux, and C. Enz, "Minimum-energy broadcast in all-wireless networks: NP-completeness and distribution issues," in *Proc. ACM/IEEE MOBIKOM*, Sep. 2002, pp. 172–182.
- [18] W. Liang, "Constructing minimum-energy broadcast trees in wireless ad hoc networks," in *Proc. 3rd ACM Int. Symp. MobiHoc*, Lausanne, Switzerland, Jun. 2002, pp. 112–122.
- [19] A. Ahluwalia, E. Modiano, and L. Shu, "On the complexity and distributed construction of energy-efficient broadcast trees in wireless ad hoc networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 2136–2147, Sep. 2005.
- [20] Z. Li and B. Li, "On increasing end-to-end throughput in wireless ad hoc networks," in *Proc. Conf. QShine*, 2005, p. 33.
- [21] Z. Li and B. Li, "Network coding: The case for multiple unicast sessions," in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Commun.*, 2004, pp. 11–19.
- [22] D. Lun, M. Medard, R. Koetter, and M. Effros, "On coding for reliable communication over packet networks," in *Proc. 42nd Annu. Allerton Conf. Commun., Control, Comput.*, Monticello, IL, Oct. 2004.
- [23] S. Katti, D. Katabi, W. Hu, H. Rahul, and M. Medard, "The importance of being opportunistic: Practical network coding for wireless environments," in *Proc. 43rd Annu. Allerton Conf. Commun.*, Sep. 2005, pp. 756–765.
- [24] C. Fragouli, J. L. Boudec, and J. Widmer, "Network coding: An instant primer," *ACM SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 63–68, Jan. 2006.
- [25] A. Eryilmaz, A. Ozdaglar, and M. Medard, "On delay performance gains from network coding," in *Proc. 40th Annu. Conf. Inf. Sci. Syst.*, Mar. 2006, pp. 864–870.
- [26] T. Ho, M. Medard, J. Shi, M. Effros, and D. R. Karger, "On randomized network coding," in *Proc. 41st Annu. Allerton Conf. Commun., Control, Comput.*, Oct. 2003, pp. 11–20.
- [27] T. Ho, M. Medard, D. R. Karger, M. Effros, J. Shi, and B. Leong, "A random linear network coding approach to multicast," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 4413–4430, Oct. 2004.
- [28] M. Ghaderi and D. Towsley, "Reliability benefit of network coding," *Comput. Sci. Dept., Univ. Mass., Amherst, MA, Tech. Rep. 07-08*, Feb. 2007.
- [29] Q. Dong, J. Wu, W. Hu, and J. Crowcroft, "Practical network coding in wireless networks," in *Proc. 13th Annu. ACM Int. Conf. Mobile Comput. Netw.*, 2007, pp. 306–309.
- [30] A. Willig, M. Kubisch, C. Hoene, and A. Wolisz, "Measurements of a wireless link in an industrial environment using an IEEE 802.11—Compliant physical layer," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 49, no. 6, pp. 1265–1282, Dec. 2002.

- [31] C. H. Nam, S. C. Liew, and C. P. Fu, "An experimental study of ARQ protocol in 802.11b wireless LAN," in *Proc. WPMC*, Oct. 2002.
- [32] D. Nguyen, T. Nguyen, and X. Yang, "Multimedia wireless transmission with network coding," in *Proc. Packet Video*, Nov. 2007, pp. 326–335.
- [33] T. Tran, T. Nguyen, and B. Bose, "A joint network-channel coding technique for single-hop wireless networks," in *Proc. NetCod*, Jan. 2008, pp. 1–6.



Dong Nguyen received the B.S. degree in electrical engineering from Hanoi University of Technology, Hanoi, Vietnam, in 2000 and the M.S. degree in computer science from Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea, in 2005. He is currently working toward the Ph.D. degree with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Oregon State University, Corvallis.

His research interests include network coding, multimedia streaming, and wireless networks.



Tuan Tran received the B.S. and M.S. degrees in electronics and telecommunications from Hanoi University of Technology (HUT), Hanoi, Vietnam, in 2000 and 2004, respectively, and the M.S. degree in navigation and related applications from the Politecnico University of Turin, Turin, Italy, in 2006. He is currently working toward the Ph.D. degree in electrical and computer engineering with Oregon State University, Corvallis.

From 2001 to 2004, he was with HUT as a Lecturer. In 2006, he visited the Istituto Superiore Mario Boella, Turin, as a Summer Intern. His research interests include network and channel coding for wireline and wireless networks.



Thinkh Nguyen received the B.S. degree from the University of Washington, Seattle, in 1995 and the Ph.D. degree from the University of California, Berkeley, in 2003.

He has many years of experience working as an Engineer for a variety of high-tech companies. He is currently an Assistant Professor with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Oregon State University, Corvallis. His research interests include multimedia networking and processing, wireless networks, and network coding.

Dr. Nguyen has served in many technical program committees. He is an Associate Editor of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON CIRCUITS AND SYSTEMS FOR VIDEO TECHNOLOGY, the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON MULTIMEDIA, and *Peer-to-Peer Networking and Applications*.



Bella Bose (S'78–M'79–SM'94–F'95) received the B.E. degree in electrical engineering from Madras University, Madras, India, in 1973, the M.E. degree in electrical engineering from the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India, in 1975, and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in computer science and engineering from Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX, in 1979 and 1980, respectively.

Since 1980, he has been with Oregon State University, Corvallis, where he is currently a Professor and the Associate Director with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. His current research interests include error control codes, fault-tolerant computing, parallel processing, and computer networks.

Dr. Bose is a Fellow of the Association for Computing Machinery.