

# On the Energy-Delay Tradeoff and Relay Positioning of Wireless Butterfly Networks

Quoc-Tuan Vien, Huan X. Nguyen, Brian G. Stewart, Jinho Choi, and Wanqing Tu

**Abstract**—This paper considers energy-delay tradeoff (EDT) of data transmission in wireless network coded butterfly networks (WNCBNs) where two sources convey their data to two destinations with the assistance of a relay employing either physical-layer network coding (PNC) or analog network coding (ANC). Hybrid automatic repeat request with incremental redundancy (HARQ-IR) is applied for a reliable communication. Particularly, we first investigate the EDT of both PNC and ANC schemes in WNCBNs to evaluate their energy efficiency. It is found that there is no advantage of using a relay in a high power regime. However, in a low power regime, the PNC scheme is shown to be more energy efficient than both the ANC and direct transmission (DT) schemes if the relay is located far from the sources, while both the PNC and ANC schemes are less energy efficient than the DT scheme when the relay is located near the sources. Additionally, algorithms that optimise relay positioning are developed based on two criteria - minimising total transmission delays and minimising total energy consumption subject to node location and power allocation constraints. This optimisation can be considered as a benchmark for relay positioning in either a low-latency or a low-energy-consumption WNCBN.

**Index Terms**—HARQ-IR, network coding, wireless butterfly network.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, relaying techniques have attracted growing interest in wireless communications [1]–[3]. Relays can be used not only to increase coverage for remote transmissions but also to improve service quality and link capacity for local users [4], [5]. Inspired by the benefits of relays, relay-assisted communications are incorporated in various wireless system models such as cellular [4]–[6], ad hoc [7] and sensor [8] networks. Data transmission from source nodes to destination nodes is realised with the assistance of one or multiple relay nodes using either decode-and-forward (DF) or amplify-and-forward (AF) relaying protocols [3].

Copyright (c) 2013 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. However, permission to use this material for any other purposes must be obtained from the IEEE by sending a request to pubs-permissions@ieee.org.

Q.-T. Vien and H. X. Nguyen are with the School of Science and Technology, Middlesex University, The Burroughs, London NW4 4BT, UK. Email: {q.vien; h.nguyen}@mdx.ac.uk.

B. G. Stewart is with the School of Engineering and Built Environment, Glasgow Caledonian University, Cowcaddens Road, Glasgow G4 0BA, UK. Email: b.stewart@gcu.ac.uk.

J. Choi is with the School of Information and Communications, Gwangju Institute of Science and Technology, Buk-gu, Gwangju, South Korea. Email: jchoi0114@gist.ac.kr.

W. Tu is with the School of Computing Science and Digital Media, The Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen AB10 7GJ, UK. Email: w.tu@rgu.ac.uk.

This work was partly supported by the UK EPSRC Grant EP/J017159/1, British Council Research Link Programme Grant (Project No. 101468), and GIST College's 2013 GUP Research Fund.

Basically, relays transmit packets through a store-and-forward mechanism, and thus do not increase the network throughput. In an attempt to improve throughput, the concept of network coding (NC), which was initially proposed to increase the system throughput in lossless networks [9], [10], has been applied at relays to improve network throughput [11]–[15]. The principle of NC is that the relays perform algebraic linear/logic operations on received packets from multiple transmission source nodes and then forward the combined packets to the destination nodes in the subsequent transmissions. An appropriate NC employment at the relay nodes could save bandwidth for a higher system throughput. Many NC-based protocols have been proposed and investigated for particular relay topologies such as relay-assisted bidirectional channels [16], broadcast channels [17], multicast channels [18], unicast channels [19] and vehicular networks [20], [21]. As a specific model of multicast channels, butterfly networks have been investigated, e.g. [22]–[25], in which NC is applied at the relay node to help two source nodes simultaneously transmit their information to two destination nodes.

In addition to the merit of NC techniques providing throughput improvement, the reliability and energy efficiency of data transmission should also be taken into consideration within communication systems. This is particularly the case in wireless environments where the communication channels often suffer from deep fading and background noise, and where the energy consumption of various communication and networking devices causes an increasing carbon dioxide emission. To cope with the reliability issue, hybrid automatic repeat request (HARQ) protocols were proposed to reliably deliver information over error-prone channels such as the wireless medium [26]. Specifically, HARQ with incremental redundancy (HARQ-IR) has been shown to achieve the ergodic capacity of fading and interference channels [27], [28]. With respect to energy efficiency, energy-delay tradeoff (EDT) tools have been developed in [29] to evaluate the energy efficiency of HARQ-IR protocols for NC-based two-way relay systems. However, for NC-based multi-source multi-destination relay networks [30], [31], the EDT of HARQ-IR protocols has received little attention in the literature.

In this paper, we investigate the energy efficiency for a reliable wireless network coded butterfly network (WNCBN) which consists of two source nodes, one relay node and two destination nodes. The reliability of all communication links is guaranteed by the HARQ-IR protocol. The relay node in a WNCBN carries out either physical-layer network coding (PNC) [12] or analog network coding (ANC) [13] on the

signals received from two source nodes before forwarding to the destination nodes. This work is extended from [32] where we have briefly investigated the energy efficiency for a reliable WNCBN. In this paper, for completeness, we first provide the expression of the EDTs for the HARQ-IR protocols with PNC and ANC schemes in WNCBNs. In order to provide insight into the derived expressions, approximations of the EDTs for various HARQ-IR protocols are derived in high and low power regimes. In the high power regime, the relay in the relay-aided transmission is shown to have no advantage over the direct transmission (DT) scheme<sup>1</sup>. In the low power regime, we show that, with equal power allocation and when the relay node is located far from the source nodes, the PNC scheme is more energy efficient than both the ANC and DT schemes. However, when the relay node is located near the source nodes, it is demonstrated that the DT scheme performs better in terms of energy efficiency than both PNC and ANC schemes.

Another contribution of the paper is that we develop new algorithms to optimise relay positioning (RP) based on the derived EDT for each NC scheme in a WNCBN. The objectives of optimised RP are to find the position for the relay node which can minimise either the total delay or the total energy consumption in the whole system, given the constraints on power allocation and the locations of source and destination nodes. We then achieve the following findings from this positioning design:

- *Minimum total delay:* In the case of equal power allocation at the source nodes, the ANC-based relay should be located nearer to the destination nodes than the PNC-based relay if the power at the source nodes is larger than the power at the relay; otherwise, the ANC-based relay should be located closer to the source nodes than the PNC-based relay. For the scenario of unequal power allocation at the source nodes, the ANC-based relay should be positioned near the lower-power source node, while the PNC-based relay should be located in the region between the lower-power source node and the nearby destination node.
- *Minimum total energy consumption:* In the case of equal power allocation at the source nodes, the ANC-based relay should be close to the destination nodes while the PNC-based relay should stay close to the source nodes if the power at the source nodes is larger than the power at the relay; otherwise, the ANC-based and PNC-based relays should be close to the source and the destination nodes, respectively. For the scenario of unequal power allocation at the source nodes, the ANC-based and the PNC-based relays should be located in the same region as for the minimum total delay.

Interestingly, we observe that the ANC-based relay can be located within a small region to nearly achieve both the minimum total delay and the minimum total energy consumption, while the optimised locations for the PNC-based relay vary depending on the objective functions.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In Section

<sup>1</sup>The DT scheme refers to the model in which two sources simultaneously transmit information to the destinations without using relaying techniques.




Fig. 1. System model of wireless butterfly network.

II, we introduce the system model of WNCBNs and the EDT of the HARQ-IR protocol for a simple single-source single-destination communication system. Section III derives the EDTs of the HARQ-IR protocols in WNCBNs using PNC and ANC schemes. Section IV provides the approximated expressions of the EDTs for various HARQ-IR protocols in high and low power regimes. The optimisation method for relay locations is presented in Section V. Numerical results are presented and discussed in Section VI. Finally, Section VII concludes the paper.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL, HARQ-IR PROTOCOL AND ENERGY-DELAY TRADEOFF

In this section, we introduce the system model of WNCBN and the HARQ-IR protocol for reliable communications as well as the associated energy-delay relation.

### A. System Model of WNCBN

The basic system model of a WNCBN is shown in Fig. 1 where data transmitted from two source nodes  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  to two destination nodes  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  is assisted by one relay node  $R$ . A half-duplex WNCBN system is considered where all nodes can either transmit or receive data, but not simultaneously. In WNCBN, the NC is applied at  $R$  to help  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  simultaneously transmit their data packets  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ , respectively, to  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  in two time slots. In the first time slot,  $S_1$  transmits  $s_1$  to both  $R$  and  $D_1$  while  $S_2$  transmits  $s_2$  to both  $R$  and  $D_2$ . Then,  $R$  performs NC on the mixed signals received from  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  and broadcasts the network coded signals to both  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  in the second time slot. Accordingly,  $D_1$  can extract the signal transmitted from  $S_2$  (i.e.  $s_2$ ) and  $D_2$  can extract the signal transmitted from  $S_1$  (i.e.  $s_1$ ). The data transmission in the first time slot consists of two direct (DR) transmissions ( $S_1 \rightarrow D_1$  and  $S_2 \rightarrow D_2$ ) and a multiple access (MA) transmission ( $\{S_1 S_2\} \rightarrow R$ )<sup>2</sup>, while there is only a broadcast (BC) transmission ( $R \rightarrow \{D_1 D_2\}$ ) in the second time slot. In this work, we focus on energy efficiency for a conventional butterfly network when the relay plays a role of coverage extension, facilitating message delivery of indirect links ( $S_1 \rightarrow D_2$  and  $S_2 \rightarrow D_1$ ), but not to achieve diversity gain (even though it can be achieved with

<sup>2</sup>It is noted that DR and MA transmissions are carried out simultaneously in the first time slot with the same coding scheme due to the broadcast nature of the wireless medium.

appropriate technique). Therefore, we assume there is no direct link between  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  and between  $\mathcal{S}_2$  and  $\mathcal{D}_1$ .

For convenience, the main notation used in the paper is listed in Table I.

### B. HARQ-IR Protocol and EDT for Reliable Point-to-Point Communications

In order to investigate the HARQ-IR protocols with PNC and ANC in WNCBNs, let us first introduce briefly a simple HARQ-IR protocol for point-to-point (P2P) communications [27] along with the EDT evaluation for this system model [29].

Over a P2P communication channel  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  employing the HARQ-IR protocol, node  $\mathcal{S}$  encodes a data packet  $\mathbf{d}$  into a sequence of  $N$  coded packets  $\{\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2, \dots, \mathbf{c}_N\}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{S}$  sequentially transmits  $\mathbf{c}_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , to  $\mathcal{D}$  until a positive acknowledgement (ACK) is received. The signal  $\mathbf{y}_k$  received at node  $\mathcal{D}$  when transmitted the  $k$ -th coded packet  $\mathbf{c}_k$  from node  $\mathcal{S}$  can be expressed through

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \sqrt{P}h_k\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{n}_k, \quad (1)$$

where  $P$  is the signal power,  $h_k$  is the channel gain of link  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  for the  $k$ -th packet transmission,  $\mathbf{x}_k$  is the modulated signal of  $\mathbf{c}_k$ , and  $\mathbf{n}_k$  is an independent CSCG noise vector with each entry having zero mean and unit variance.

Let  $\kappa_{\text{P2P}}$  denote the number of transmissions required in the HARQ-IR protocol to transmit a data packet from  $\mathcal{S}$  to  $\mathcal{D}$ .  $\kappa_{\text{P2P}}$  can be expressed by [27]

$$\kappa_{\text{P2P}} = \min \left\{ k \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \log(1 + P|[h_k]_j|^2) > r_{\text{P2P}} \right. \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where  $r_{\text{P2P}}$  denotes the initial rate of a capacity-achieving code in P2P communications. By using the same evaluation tool in [29], the EDT can be characterised by two normalised metrics: energy per bit (EB) [Joules/bit/Hz] and effective delay (ED) [sec/bit/Hz]. Here, the EB and ED are normalised over the transmission data rate  $r_{\text{P2P}}$ . Let  $\delta_{\text{P2P}}$  and  $\epsilon_{\text{P2P}}$  denote ED and EB, respectively, of the HARQ-IR protocol for P2P communications. These metrics are given as

$$\delta_{\text{P2P}} = \frac{\bar{\kappa}_{\text{P2P}}}{r_{\text{P2P}}}, \quad (3)$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{P2P}} = \frac{P\bar{\kappa}_{\text{P2P}}}{r_{\text{P2P}}} = P\delta_{\text{P2P}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\bar{\kappa}_{\text{P2P}}$  denotes the average number of transmissions for reliable P2P communications.

## III. ENERGY-DELAY TRADEOFF IN WNCBNs

Basically, the signal processing at relay  $\mathcal{R}$  can be carried out with either PNC or ANC protocols. In this section, the EDTs of the HARQ-IR protocols with PNC and ANC are derived for the WNCBNs as shown in Fig. 1.

### A. EDT of HARQ-IR protocol with PNC

Using the PNC scheme for HARQ-IR in WNCBNs,  $\mathcal{R}$  performs joint decoding of two signals received from  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  in the MA transmission [33]. Thus, the number of transmissions in the MA transmission can be determined through the MA channel capacity bound [34] as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{\text{PNC,MA}} = \min & \left\{ k \left| \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k \log(1 + [\gamma_{1R}]_j) > r_1 \right\} \right. \right. \\ & \cap \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k \log(1 + [\gamma_{2R}]_j) > r_2 \right\} \\ & \left. \left. \cap \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k \log(1 + [\gamma_{1R}]_j + [\gamma_{2R}]_j) > r_1 + r_2 \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $\gamma_{iR}$  and  $r_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , denote the SNR of the transmission link  $\mathcal{S}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  and the transmission rate at  $\mathcal{S}_i$ , respectively. In parallel with the MA transmission,  $\mathcal{D}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , receives the packet from  $\mathcal{S}_i$  in the DR transmission. The received signal at  $\mathcal{D}_i$  can be written by

$$\mathbf{y}_{ii} = \sqrt{P_i}h_{ii}\mathbf{s}_i + \mathbf{n}_{ii}, \quad (6)$$

where  $P_i$ ,  $h_{ii}$  and  $\mathbf{n}_{ii}$  denote the transmission power, channel coefficient and CSCG noise vector at  $\mathcal{D}_i$  of the transmission link  $\mathcal{S}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i$ , respectively. Similar to the transmission over P2P channels, the number of transmissions required at  $\mathcal{S}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , to transmit  $\mathbf{s}_i$  to  $\mathcal{D}_i$  in the DR transmission can be computed by

$$\kappa_{\text{PNC,DR}_i} = \min \left\{ k \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \log(1 + [\gamma_{ii}]_j) > r_i \right. \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\gamma_{ii}$  denotes the SNR of the transmission link  $\mathcal{S}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i$ . With HARQ-IR protocol, the data packet is retransmitted by  $\mathcal{S}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , until both  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_i$  successfully decode. Thus, the number of transmissions at  $\mathcal{S}_i$  and the total number of transmissions in the first time slot are given by

$$\kappa_{\text{PNC,S}_i} = \max\{\kappa_{\text{PNC,MA}}, \kappa_{\text{PNC,DR}_i}\}, \quad (8)$$

$$\kappa_{\text{PNC,1}} = \max\{\kappa_{\text{PNC,MA}}, \kappa_{\text{PNC,DR}_1}, \kappa_{\text{PNC,DR}_2}\}, \quad (9)$$

respectively. Then,  $\mathcal{R}$  encodes the superimposed packet, and then broadcasts the encoded packet to both  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  in the second time slot. The number of transmissions required at  $\mathcal{R}$  to transmit the mixed packet to  $\mathcal{D}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , in the BC transmission is similarly determined as in P2P communications, i.e.

$$\kappa_{\text{PNC,BC}_i} = \min \left\{ k \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \log(1 + [\gamma_{Ri}]_j) > r_{i'} \right. \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where  $i' = 1$  if  $i = 2$  and  $i' = 2$  if  $i = 1$  (or  $i' = i - (-1)^i$ ). Here,  $\gamma_{Ri}$  denotes the SNR of the transmission link  $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i$ . In order to help both  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  detect the data packets from  $\mathcal{S}_2$  and  $\mathcal{S}_1$ , respectively,  $\mathcal{R}$  retransmits the packet until

TABLE I  
SUMMARY OF MAIN NOTATION

Notation	Meaning
$d_{AB}, \{A, B\} \in \{S_1, S_2, R, D_1, D_2\}$	distance of link $A - B$
$\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_R$	physical angles $\overline{D_1 S_1 S_2}, \overline{S_1 S_2 D_2}, \overline{S_2 D_2 D_1}, \overline{D_2 D_1 S_1}, \overline{D_1 S_1 R}$ , respectively
$P_i, i = 1, 2, P_R$	transmit powers of $S_i, \mathcal{R}$ , respectively
$r_i, i = 1, 2, r_R$	transmission rate at $S_i, \mathcal{R}$ , respectively
$h_{ii}, h_{iR}, h_{Ri}, i = 1, 2$	channel coefficients of links $S_i \rightarrow D_i, S_i \rightarrow \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R} \rightarrow D_i$ , respectively
$\mathbf{n}_{ii}, \mathbf{n}_R, \mathbf{n}_{Ri}, i = 1, 2$	independent circularly symmetric complex Gaussian (CSCG) noise vectors of links $S_i \rightarrow D_i, \{S_1, S_2\} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R} \rightarrow D_i$ , respectively, with each entry having zero mean and unit variance
$\gamma_{ii}, \gamma_{iR}, \gamma_{Ri}, i = 1, 2$	signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of links $S_i \rightarrow D_i, S_i \rightarrow \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R} \rightarrow D_i$ , respectively
$\nu$	pathloss exponent between a pair of transceiver nodes
$\kappa(\cdot)$	number of transmissions required in HARQ-IR protocol to transmit a data packet
$\delta(\cdot)$	effective delay (ED) of HARQ-IR protocol
$\epsilon(\cdot)$	energy per bit (EB) of HARQ-IR protocol
$[a]_i$	$i$ -th realisation of a random variable $a$
$\bar{a}$	mean of a random variable $a$
$\log(\cdot)$	binary logarithm function
$\ln(\cdot)$	natural logarithm function
$E[\cdot]$	statistical expectation function

both  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  successfully detect it. Thus, the number of transmissions in the second time slot is computed by

$$\kappa_{\text{PNC},2} = \max\{\kappa_{\text{PNC},\text{BC}_1}, \kappa_{\text{PNC},\text{BC}_2}\}. \quad (11)$$

Overall, the resulting ED and EB of the HARQ-IR protocol with the PNC are respectively given by

$$\delta_{\text{PNC}} = \frac{\bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC},1} + \bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC},2}}{r_1 + r_2}, \quad (12)$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{PNC}} = \frac{P_1 \bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC},1} + P_2 \bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC},2} + P_R \bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC},2}}{r_1 + r_2}, \quad (13)$$

where  $P_R$  denotes the transmission power at  $\mathcal{R}$ .

### B. EDT of HARQ-IR protocol with ANC

With the ANC protocol, in the MA transmission of the first time slot,  $\mathcal{R}$  receives the data packets from both  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , which can be written by

$$\mathbf{r} = \sqrt{P_1} h_{1R} \mathbf{s}_1 + \sqrt{P_2} h_{2R} \mathbf{s}_2 + \mathbf{n}_R, \quad (14)$$

where  $h_{iR}$  and  $\mathbf{n}_R$  denote the channel coefficient and CSCG noise vector at  $\mathcal{R}$  of the transmission link  $S_i \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ , respectively. At the same time,  $D_i, i = 1, 2$ , receives the data packet from  $S_i$  in the DR transmission. Similarly, the received signal  $\mathbf{y}_{ii}$  at  $D_i$  is given by (6) and the number of transmissions  $\kappa_{\text{ANC},\text{DR}_i}$  is determined as  $\kappa_{\text{PNC},\text{DR}_i}$  in (7).

Prior to broadcasting the received signal to both  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ ,  $\mathcal{R}$  normalises its received signal  $\mathbf{r}$  in (14) by a factor  $\lambda = 1/\sqrt{E[|\mathbf{r}|^2]} = 1/\sqrt{\gamma_{1R} + \gamma_{2R} + 1}$  to have unit average energy. Thus, in the BC transmission, the signals received at  $D_i, i = 1, 2$ , can be written as

$$\mathbf{y}_{Ri} = \sqrt{P_R} h_{Ri} \lambda \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{n}_{Ri}, \quad (15)$$

where  $h_{Ri}$  and  $\mathbf{n}_{Ri}$  denote the channel coefficient and CSCG noise vector at  $D_i$  of the transmission link  $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow D_i$ , respectively. Then,  $D_i, i = 1, 2$ , detects  $\mathbf{s}_{i'}$ ,  $i' = i - (-1)^i$ , by canceling  $\mathbf{s}_i$  which is detected in the DR transmission. The resulting SNR  $\gamma_{i'}$  at  $D_i$  is expressed by

$$\gamma_{i'} = \frac{\gamma_{Ri} \gamma_{i'R}}{\gamma_{Ri} + \gamma_{i'R} + \gamma_{iR} + 1}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\gamma_{iR}$  and  $\gamma_{Ri}$  denote the SNRs of the transmission links  $S_i \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow D_i$ , respectively. In the HARQ-IR protocol with ANC,  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  feedback to  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  over direct links to acknowledge the packets  $\mathbf{s}_1$  and  $\mathbf{s}_2$ , respectively. Since there is no decoding process carried out at  $\mathcal{R}$  in the first time slot,  $\mathcal{R}$  does not perform any feedback for the links  $S_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  and  $S_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ . However,  $\mathcal{R}$  can help  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  forward the acknowledgement of the packets  $\mathbf{s}_2$  and  $\mathbf{s}_1$  to  $S_2$  and  $S_1$ , respectively. Therefore, the number of transmissions required at  $S_i, i = 1, 2$ , to transmit  $\mathbf{s}_i$  to  $D_{i'}$  is determined by

$$\kappa_{\text{ANC}_i} = \min \left\{ k \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \log(1 + [\gamma_i]_j) > r_i \right. \right\}. \quad (17)$$

The total number of transmissions at  $S_i, i = 1, 2$ , is accordingly given by

$$\kappa_{\text{ANC},S_i} = \max\{\kappa_{\text{ANC}_i}, \kappa_{\text{ANC},\text{DR}_i}\}. \quad (18)$$

It is noted that, with the ANC protocol, the retransmission of the lost packets at  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  is carried out by  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ .  $\mathcal{R}$  only amplifies and forwards to  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  the data received from  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ . This means that the number of transmissions at  $\mathcal{R}$  to assist  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  is also given by  $\kappa_{\text{ANC}_1}$  and  $\kappa_{\text{ANC}_2}$ , respectively, and,  $\mathcal{R}$  uses half power for each task. Therefore, the resulting ED and EB of the HARQ-IR protocol with the ANC scheme are respectively obtained as

$$\delta_{\text{ANC}} = \frac{\max\{\bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC},S_1}, \bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC},S_2}\} + \max\{\bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC}_1}, \bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC}_2}\}}{r_1 + r_2}, \quad (19)$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{ANC}} = \frac{P_1 \bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC},S_1} + P_2 \bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC},S_2} + \frac{P_R}{2} \bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC}_1} + \frac{P_R}{2} \bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC}_2}}{r_1 + r_2}. \quad (20)$$

## IV. ANALYSIS OF EDTs IN WNCBNS

In this section, we derive the approximations of the EDTs for various HARQ-IR protocols in WNCBNS in high and low power regimes. For comparison, both relay-aided transmission (i.e. PNC and ANC) and non-relay-aided transmission (i.e. DT) are considered. Our comparison with DT scheme is relative but can be justified because of the following: Both

relay-aided transmission (i.e. PNC and ANC schemes) and non-relay-aided transmission (i.e. DT scheme) require the same number of time slots to transmit data packets  $\mathbf{s}_1$  and  $\mathbf{s}_2$  from  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$ , respectively, to both  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ . Specifically, in the DT scheme, in the  $i$ -th,  $i = 1, 2$ , time slot  $\mathcal{S}_i$  transmits  $\mathbf{s}_i$  to  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  over  $\mathcal{S}_i\text{-}\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_i\text{-}\mathcal{D}_2$  links, respectively. In the PNC and ANC schemes, the data transmission in the first time slot consists of two direct (DR) transmissions ( $\mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_2$ ) and a multiple access (MA) transmission ( $\{\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2\} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ ), while there is only a broadcast (BC) transmission ( $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \{\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2\}$ ) in the second time slot. This means that all the PNC, ANC and DT schemes require 2 time slots for the data transmission, which proves a relatively fair comparison between these schemes.

Let  $P$  denote the total power constraint of all transmitting nodes, i.e.  $P = P_1 + P_2 + P_R$ . Also, let us denote  $\rho_1, \rho_2$  and  $(1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2)$  as the fractions of power allocated to  $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$  and  $\mathcal{R}$ , respectively<sup>3</sup>. Accordingly,  $P_1 = \rho_1 P$ ,  $P_2 = \rho_2 P$  and  $P_R = (1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2)P$ . All channel links are assumed to suffer from quasi-static Rayleigh block fading with  $E[|h_{11}|^2] = 1/d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu$ ,  $E[|h_{22}|^2] = 1/d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu$ ,  $E[|h_{iR}|^2] = 1/d_{S_i R}^\nu$  and  $E[|h_{Rj}|^2] = 1/d_{RD_j}^\nu$ ,  $i = 1, 2, j = 1, 2$ .

Using the HARQ-IR protocol with DT scheme in WNCBN, the ED and EB can be simply derived as

$$\delta_{\text{DT}} = \frac{\bar{\kappa}_{\text{DT},1} + \bar{\kappa}_{\text{DT},2}}{r_1 + r_2}, \quad (21)$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{DT}} = \frac{P_1 \bar{\kappa}_{\text{DT},1} + P_2 \bar{\kappa}_{\text{DT},2}}{r_1 + r_2}. \quad (22)$$

Here,  $\bar{\kappa}_{\text{DT},i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , denotes the total number of transmissions required at  $\mathcal{S}_i$  to transmit  $\mathbf{s}_i$  to both  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , which is given by

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{DT},i} = \max \left\{ \min \left\{ k \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \log(1 + [\gamma_{ii}]_j) > r_i \right. \right\}, \min \left\{ k \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \log(1 + [\gamma_{ii'}]_j) > r_i \right. \right\} \right\}, \quad (23)$$

where  $i' = i - (-1)^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\gamma_{ii'}$  denotes the SNR of the transmission link  $\mathcal{S}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{i'}$ .

In the high power regime, all HARQ-IR protocols for both relay-aided and non-relay-aided transmissions in the WNCBN require 2 time slots in total to transmit successfully 2 data packets  $\mathbf{s}_1$  and  $\mathbf{s}_2$  from  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  to  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ . This means that all the PNC, ANC and DT schemes achieve the same EDT performance with  $\{\delta_{\text{PNC}}, \delta_{\text{ANC}}, \delta_{\text{DT}}\} \rightarrow \frac{2}{r_1 + r_2}$  and  $\{\epsilon_{\text{PNC}}, \epsilon_{\text{ANC}}, \epsilon_{\text{DT}}\} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $P \rightarrow \infty$ . Also, as shown in Lemma 1 below, there is no advantageous scheme in the high power regime.

**Lemma 1.** If  $P$  approaches infinity, then  $\epsilon_{\text{PNC}}/\epsilon_{\text{DT}} \rightarrow 1$ ,  $\epsilon_{\text{ANC}}/\epsilon_{\text{DT}} \rightarrow 1$  and  $\epsilon_{\text{PNC}}/\epsilon_{\text{ANC}} \rightarrow 1$ .

*Proof:* From (12), (13), (19), (20), (21) and (22), the proof can be straightforwardly obtained. ■

<sup>3</sup>Note that, in the DT scheme,  $P_R = 0$  and  $\rho_1 + \rho_2 = 1$ .

In the low power regime, the transmission power at all transmitting nodes is assumed to be equally allocated as  $P_1 = P_2 = P_R = P/3$  in PNC and ANC schemes and  $P_1 = P_2 = P/2$  in the DT scheme<sup>4</sup>. Also, for simplicity, the data transmission from  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  to  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  is assumed to be carried out at the same data rate, i.e.  $r_1 = r_2 = R$ .

Firstly, let us derive the EDT of the HARQ-IR protocol in the WNCBN with the DT scheme. We have the following finding:

**Lemma 2.** If  $P$  approaches 0, then the ED and EB of the HARQ-IR protocol with the DT scheme are approximated by  $\delta_{\text{DT},0}$  and  $\epsilon_{\text{DT},0}$ , respectively, where

$$\delta_{\text{DT},0} = \frac{\ln 2}{P} (\max\{d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu, d_{S_1 D_2}^\nu\} + \max\{d_{S_2 D_1}^\nu, d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu\}), \quad (24)$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{DT},0} = \frac{\ln 2}{2} (\max\{d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu, d_{S_1 D_2}^\nu\} + \max\{d_{S_2 D_1}^\nu, d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu\}). \quad (25)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix A. ■

Investigating the EDT of the HARQ-IR protocols with PNC and ANC schemes in the low power regime, we have the following findings:

**Lemma 3.** If  $P$  approaches 0, then the ED and EB of the HARQ-IR protocol with the PNC scheme are approximated by  $\delta_{\text{PNC},0}$  and  $\epsilon_{\text{PNC},0}$ , respectively, where

$$\delta_{\text{PNC},0} = \frac{3 \ln 2}{2P} (\max\{d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu, d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu\} + \max\{d_{RD_1}^\nu, d_{RD_2}^\nu\}), \quad (26)$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{PNC},0} = \frac{\ln 2}{2} (d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu + d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu + \max\{d_{RD_1}^\nu, d_{RD_2}^\nu\}). \quad (27)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix B. ■

**Lemma 4.** If  $P$  approaches 0, then the ED and EB of the HARQ-IR protocol with the ANC scheme are approximated by  $\delta_{\text{ANC},0}$  and  $\epsilon_{\text{ANC},0}$ , respectively, where

$$\delta_{\text{ANC},0} = \frac{9 \ln 2}{P^2} \max\{d_{S_1 R}^\nu d_{RD_2}^\nu, d_{S_2 R}^\nu d_{RD_1}^\nu\}, \quad (28)$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{ANC},0} = \frac{9 \ln 2}{4P} (d_{S_1 R}^\nu d_{RD_2}^\nu + d_{S_2 R}^\nu d_{RD_1}^\nu). \quad (29)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix C. ■

From the above lemmas, we have the following observations in the low power regime:

(O1) *Energy inefficiency with ANC:* It can be seen in (29) that  $\epsilon_{\text{ANC},0}$  increases as  $P$  decreases. This means that the ANC scheme is not energy efficient when compared to the DT and PNC schemes for the HARQ-IR protocol in WNCBN.

(O2) *Higher energy efficiency with PNC when relay node is located far from source nodes:* In fact, when  $\mathcal{R}$  is far from  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$ , we have  $\{d_{RD_1}^\nu, d_{RD_2}^\nu\} \ll \{d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu, d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu\}$ . Thus,  $d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu + d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu + \max\{d_{RD_1}^\nu, d_{RD_2}^\nu\} \approx d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu + d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu$ . Accordingly, from (25) and (27), it can be shown that  $\epsilon_{\text{PNC},0} < \epsilon_{\text{DT},0}$ , which means the HARQ-IR protocol with the PNC

<sup>4</sup>It is noted that the equal power allocation is not optimal in general. However, as  $P \rightarrow 0$ , it is reasonable to assume the equal power allocation at all transmitting nodes.

scheme is more energy efficient than the HARQ-IR protocol with the DT scheme.

(O3) *Higher energy efficiency with DT over PNC when relay node is located nearby source nodes*: In this scenario, we can approximate  $\{d_{RD_1}^V, d_{RD_2}^V\} \approx \{d_{S_1D_1}^V, d_{S_2D_2}^V\}$ . Thus, from (25) and (27), we have  $\epsilon_{\text{PNC},0} > \epsilon_{\text{DT},0}$ . This means that the DT scheme is more energy efficient than the PNC scheme for the HARQ-IR protocol in WNCBN. In other words, there is no advantage of employing the relay when the relay is in the neighbourhood of the sources.

## V. RELAY POSITIONING IN WNCBNS

In WNCBNS, the data transmissions from two source nodes to two destination nodes are carried out via a relay node operating under either PNC or ANC protocols. Taking into account the EDT performance, the location of the relay may have a considerable impact on the energy efficiency in the WNCBNS. However, optimising RP in terms of delay and energy consumption has attracted little attention in previous work, e.g. [22]–[25]. In this paper, based on the derived EDT for HARQ-IR protocols with PNC and ANC in previous sections, we propose algorithms for solving the RP optimisation problem subject to location and power constraints in WNCBNS<sup>5</sup>.

The problem relates to how to position the relay node in order to minimise either the total delay or the total energy consumption of all the multicast transmissions from two source nodes to two destination nodes. As shown in Fig. 1, the relay location can be determined through the distance between  $S_1$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  (i.e.  $d_{S_1R}$ ), and the angle  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}_1S_1\mathcal{R}}$  (i.e.  $\alpha_R$ ). Based on  $d_{S_1R}$  and  $\alpha_R$ , we can easily evaluate the distance from  $\mathcal{R}$  to  $S_2$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  as

$$d_{S_2R} = \sqrt{d_{S_1S_2}^2 + d_{S_1R}^2 - 2d_{S_1S_2}d_{S_1R}\cos(\alpha_1 - \alpha_R)}, \quad (30)$$

$$d_{RD_1} = \sqrt{d_{S_1D_1}^2 + d_{S_1R}^2 - 2d_{S_1D_1}d_{S_1R}\cos\alpha_R}, \quad (31)$$

$$d_{RD_2} = \sqrt{d_{S_2D_2}^2 + d_{S_2R}^2 - 2d_{S_2D_2}d_{S_2R}\cos\beta_R}. \quad (32)$$

Here,  $\beta_R$  denotes the angle  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}_2S_2\mathcal{R}}$ , which can be computed by

$$\beta_R = \alpha_2 - \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{d_{S_1R}}{d_{S_2R}}\sin(\alpha_1 - \alpha_R)\right). \quad (33)$$

Let  $\{d_{S_1R,\delta_{\text{PNC}}}^*, \alpha_{S_1R,\delta_{\text{PNC}}}^*\}$ ,  $\{d_{S_1R,\delta_{\text{ANC}}}^*, \alpha_{S_1R,\delta_{\text{ANC}}}^*\}$ ,  $\{d_{S_1R,\epsilon_{\text{PNC}}}^*, \alpha_{S_1R,\epsilon_{\text{PNC}}}^*\}$  and  $\{d_{S_1R,\epsilon_{\text{ANC}}}^*, \alpha_{S_1R,\epsilon_{\text{ANC}}}^*\}$  denote the optimised positioning parameters for the relay location using PNC and ANC protocols subject to minimising  $\delta_{\text{PNC}}$ ,  $\delta_{\text{ANC}}$ ,  $\epsilon_{\text{PNC}}$  and  $\epsilon_{\text{ANC}}$ , respectively. The RP optimisation problem is therefore expressed as

$$\{d_{S_1R,\delta_{\text{PNC}}}^*, \alpha_{S_1R,\delta_{\text{PNC}}}^*\} = \arg \min_{d_{S_1R}, \alpha_R} \delta_{\text{PNC}}, \quad (34)$$

$$\{d_{S_1R,\delta_{\text{ANC}}}^*, \alpha_{S_1R,\delta_{\text{ANC}}}^*\} = \arg \min_{d_{S_1R}, \alpha_R} \delta_{\text{ANC}}, \quad (35)$$

<sup>5</sup>In this work, with fixed location of the source and destination nodes, we determine the best relay location with respect to different HARQ-IR protocols. This is useful for the system where the mobile users play the role as the relay nodes and thus the user having the best relay location would be selected for the relay communications.

$$\{d_{S_1R,\epsilon_{\text{PNC}}}^*, \alpha_{S_1R,\epsilon_{\text{PNC}}}^*\} = \arg \min_{d_{S_1R}, \alpha_R} \epsilon_{\text{PNC}}, \quad (36)$$

$$\{d_{S_1R,\epsilon_{\text{ANC}}}^*, \alpha_{S_1R,\epsilon_{\text{ANC}}}^*\} = \arg \min_{d_{S_1R}, \alpha_R} \epsilon_{\text{ANC}}, \quad (37)$$

where  $\delta_{\text{PNC}}$ ,  $\delta_{\text{ANC}}$ ,  $\epsilon_{\text{PNC}}$  and  $\epsilon_{\text{ANC}}$  are generally given by (12), (19), (13) and (20), respectively<sup>6</sup>. Given the fixed location of the source and destination nodes (see Fig. 1),  $d_{S_1R}$  and  $\alpha_R$  are bounded by the following ranges:

$$0 < d_{S_1R} < \max \left\{ \sqrt{d_{S_1D_1}^2 + d_{S_1S_2}^2 - 2d_{S_1D_1}d_{S_1S_2}\cos\alpha_1}, \sqrt{d_{S_1D_1}^2 + d_{D_1D_2}^2 - 2d_{S_1D_1}d_{D_1D_2}\cos\alpha_4} \right\}, \quad (38)$$

$$0 < \alpha_R < \alpha_1. \quad (39)$$

We have the following observations:

(O4) *ANC-based relay can be nearly located at the same location for minimising both the delay and energy*: In fact, given a compact set  $\mathbb{S}$ , it is noted that  $\arg \min_{x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{S}} \max\{f(x_1), f(x_2)\} \approx \arg \min_{x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{S}} f(x_1) + f(x_2)$ . Thus, from (19) and (20), we can approximate  $\arg \min_{d_{S_1R}, \alpha_R} \delta_{\text{ANC}} \approx \arg \min_{d_{S_1R}, \alpha_R} \epsilon_{\text{ANC}}$ , which means  $\{d_{S_1R,\delta_{\text{ANC}}}^*, \alpha_{S_1R,\delta_{\text{ANC}}}^*\} \approx \{d_{S_1R,\epsilon_{\text{ANC}}}^*, \alpha_{S_1R,\epsilon_{\text{ANC}}}^*\}$ .

(O5) *Perspective transformation for a general setting of the node positions in an irregular quadrilateral*: We can realise a spatial transformation to map the nodes in a quadrilateral to the nodes in a rectangle [35]. Then, we find the optimal relay position in the rectangular region (namely virtual relay positions) for minimising either delay or energy. The real relay position for the irregular quadrilateral node setting can be found by an inverse mapping. Specifically, a perspective transformation or projective non-affine mapping with bilinear interpolation can be used to map a quadrilateral to a rectangle as follows: Given four 2-dimensional points  $A, B, C$  and  $D$  of a quadrilateral located at  $(x_A, y_A)$ ,  $(x_B, y_B)$ ,  $(x_C, y_C)$  and  $(x_D, y_D)$ , and four 2-dimensional points  $A', B', C'$  and  $D'$  of a rectangle located at  $(x_{A'}, y_{A'})$ ,  $(x_{B'}, y_{B'})$ ,  $(x_{C'}, y_{C'})$  and  $(x_{D'}, y_{D'})$ . We can map  $\{A, B, C, D\}$  to  $\{A', B', C', D'\}$  by finding an  $4 \times 4$  mapping matrix  $\mathbf{M}$  [35]:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_A & y_A & x_A y_A \\ 1 & x_B & y_B & x_B y_B \\ 1 & x_C & y_C & x_C y_C \\ 1 & x_D & y_D & x_D y_D \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_{A'} & y_{A'} & x_{A'} y_{A'} \\ 1 & x_{B'} & y_{B'} & x_{B'} y_{B'} \\ 1 & x_{C'} & y_{C'} & x_{C'} y_{C'} \\ 1 & x_{D'} & y_{D'} & x_{D'} y_{D'} \end{pmatrix}$$

According to observation (O5), for simplicity, let us investigate a specific scenario where  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 = \pi/2$ ,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2}$  and  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2}$ . The search range of the relay position given by (38) and (39) can be rewritten as

$$0 < d_{S_1R} < \sqrt{d_{S_1D_1}^2 + d_{S_1S_2}^2}, \quad (40)$$

$$0 < \alpha_R < \frac{\pi}{2}. \quad (41)$$

With the total power constraint  $P$  and different power allocation at  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , there are three typical cases based on

<sup>6</sup>It is noted that, in the low power regime,  $\delta_{\text{PNC}} \approx \delta_{\text{PNC},0}$ ,  $\delta_{\text{ANC}} \approx \delta_{\text{ANC},0}$ ,  $\epsilon_{\text{PNC}} \approx \epsilon_{\text{PNC},0}$  and  $\epsilon_{\text{ANC}} \approx \epsilon_{\text{ANC},0}$ , which are determined by (26), (28), (27) and (29), respectively.

the relationship between  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  which are described as follows:

A.  $P_1 = P_2$ :

Due to the equal power allocation at  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$ ,  $\mathcal{R}$  is located on the median line between the pair nodes  $\{\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{D}_1\}$  and  $\{\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{D}_2\}$ . Let us denote  $d_R = \sqrt{d_{S_1 R}^2 - d_{S_1 S_2}^2}/4$ . The RP optimisation in (34), (35), (36) and (37) can be determined through

$$d_{R, \delta_x}^* = \arg \min_{0 < d_R < d_{S_1 D_1}} \delta_x, \quad (42)$$

$$d_{R, \epsilon_x}^* = \arg \min_{0 < d_R < d_{S_1 D_1}} \epsilon_x, \quad (43)$$

where  $X \in \{\text{PNC}, \text{ANC}\}$ . Then, we can determine  $\{d_{S_1 R, \delta_x}^*, \alpha_{R, \delta_x}^*\}$  and  $\{d_{S_1 R, \epsilon_x}^*, \alpha_{R, \epsilon_x}^*\}$  as

$$d_{S_1 R, \delta_x}^* = \sqrt{d_{R, \delta_x}^{*2} + \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}^2}{4}}, \alpha_{R, \delta_x}^* = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{2d_{R, \delta_x}^*} \right), \quad (44)$$

$$d_{S_1 R, \epsilon_x}^* = \sqrt{d_{R, \epsilon_x}^{*2} + \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}^2}{4}}, \alpha_{R, \epsilon_x}^* = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{2d_{R, \epsilon_x}^*} \right). \quad (45)$$

It can be observed that the optimised positioning search algorithms using (42), (43), (44) and (45) require a lower complexity processing than an exhaustive search of all available relay positions in the whole region encompassing the four source and destination nodes with the constraints of (40) and (41).

B.  $P_1 > P_2$ :

In this scenario,  $\mathcal{R}$  is located in the neighbourhood region of the pair node  $\{\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{D}_2\}$ . Thus, the search range for the optimised relay location in (40) and (41) can be limited by two regions defined as follows:

$$\text{Region (I): } \begin{cases} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{2d_{S_1 D_1}} \right) < \alpha_R < \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{d_{S_1 D_1}} \right), \\ \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{2 \sin \alpha_R} < d_{S_1 R} < \frac{d_{S_1 D_1}}{\cos \alpha_R}. \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

$$\text{Region (II): } \begin{cases} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{d_{S_1 D_1}} \right) < \alpha_R < \frac{\pi}{2}, \\ \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{2 \sin \alpha_R} < d_{S_1 R} < \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{\sin \alpha_R}. \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

With various relay positions in regions (I) and (II), we can then determine the optimised relay location  $\{d_{S_1 R, \delta_x}^*, \alpha_{R, \delta_x}^*\}$  and  $\{d_{S_1 R, \epsilon_x}^*, \alpha_{R, \epsilon_x}^*\}$ ,  $X \in \{\text{PNC}, \text{ANC}\}$ , subject to minimising either  $\delta_x$  or  $\epsilon_x$  as in (34), (35), (36) and (37). Regarding the search range in the context  $P_1 > P_2$ , it can be observed that the search regions (I) and (II) are narrower than the region determined by (40) and (41), and thus the complexity of the search for the optimised relay location is reduced.




Fig. 2. EDT of various HARQ-IR protocols in WNCBN with  $R = 5$  bps,  $d_{S_1 D_1} = d_{S_2 D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1 S_2} = d_{D_1 D_2} = 1/\sqrt{3}$ ,  $\alpha_R = \pi/6$ ,  $d_{S_1 R} = d_{S_2 R} = d_{R D_1} = d_{R D_2} = d_{S_1 D_1}/2/\cos \alpha_R$ .

C.  $P_1 < P_2$ :

Similarly, in this scenario,  $\mathcal{R}$  is located near the two nodes  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_1$ . The search range for the optimised relay location in (40) and (41) can thus be limited by two regions defined as follows:

$$\text{Region (III): } \begin{cases} 0 < \alpha_R < \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{2d_{S_1 D_1}} \right), \\ 0 < d_{S_1 R} < \frac{d_{S_1 D_1}}{\cos \alpha_R}. \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

$$\text{Region (IV): } \begin{cases} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{2d_{S_1 D_1}} \right) < \alpha_R < \frac{\pi}{2}, \\ 0 < d_{S_1 R} < \frac{d_{S_1 S_2}}{2 \sin \alpha_R}. \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

Then, we can then determine the optimised relay location  $\{d_{S_1 R, \delta_x}^*, \alpha_{R, \delta_x}^*\}$  and  $\{d_{S_1 R, \epsilon_x}^*, \alpha_{R, \epsilon_x}^*\}$ ,  $X \in \{\text{PNC}, \text{ANC}\}$ , in regions (III) and (IV) so as to minimise either  $\delta_x$  or  $\epsilon_x$ . Additionally, it can be observed that the search regions (III) and (IV) for the scenario  $P_1 < P_2$  are also narrower than the region determined by (40) and (41), and again a low-complexity search algorithm is achieved.

## VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present numerical results of the EDT and relay location optimisation in a WNCBN using various HARQ-IR protocols when all channels experience quasi-static Rayleigh block fading. A symmetric network structure is considered with  $d_{S_1 D_1} = d_{S_2 D_2}$ ,  $d_{S_1 S_2} = d_{D_1 D_2}$  and  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 = \pi/2$ . The data transmission from  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  to  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  is carried out at the same data rate (i.e.  $r_1 = r_2 = R$ ) via either HARQ-IR with DT or PNC or ANC schemes. The pathloss exponent between a pair of transceiver nodes is assumed to be  $\nu = 3$ .

Let us first investigate the EDT in the WNCBN with HARQ-IR protocols with DT, PNC and ANC. As shown in Fig. 2, the EDT curves are plotted for the three HARQ-IR protocols. The data rate at  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  is 5 bits per second (bps). The relay  $\mathcal{R}$  is assumed to be located at the centre of the network, where the distances and angles are set as  $d_{S_1 D_1} = d_{S_2 D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1 S_2} = d_{D_1 D_2} = 1/\sqrt{3}$ ,  $\alpha_R = \pi/6$ ,






Fig. 3. EDT of various HARQ-IR protocols in the low power regime with  $R = 5$  bps,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/\sqrt{3}$ ,  $\alpha_R = \pi/6$ ,  $d_{S_1R} = d_{S_2R} = d_{RD_1} = d_{RD_2} = d_{S_1D_1}/2/\cos\alpha_R$ .

$d_{S_1R} = d_{S_2R} = d_{RD_1} = d_{RD_2} = d_{S_1D_1}/2/\cos\alpha_R$ . The transmission powers at  $\mathcal{S}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_2$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are assumed to be equally allocated. It can be seen that the PNC scheme is more energy efficient than both the ANC and DT schemes. In fact, using the HARQ-IR protocol with PNC,  $\mathcal{R}$  can help  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  retransmit the corrupted combined packets to both  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ . Using the HARQ-IR protocol with the ANC scheme,  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  are required to retransmit the corrupted packets to  $\mathcal{R}$ , then  $\mathcal{R}$  combines the received packets and broadcasts the new combined packets to both  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ . Using the DT scheme, there is no relay to assist  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  retransmit the corrupted combined packets to both  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ . Due to the long distances from  $\mathcal{S}_1$  to  $\mathcal{D}_2$  and from  $\mathcal{S}_2$  to  $\mathcal{D}_1$ , the DT scheme is shown to be less energy efficient than the PNC scheme. However, the EDT of the DT scheme is better than that of the ANC scheme since a re-combination process is required at  $\mathcal{R}$  in the ANC scheme, which means more energy consumption at  $\mathcal{R}$ . This confirms the statements in observations (O1) and (O2) regarding a lower energy efficiency of the ANC scheme and a higher energy efficiency of the PNC scheme over the DT scheme when the relay node is located far from the source nodes.

Fig. 3 shows the EDT curves for the three HARQ-IR protocols in the low power regime. The data rates and position of all nodes are set as in Fig. 2. Also, the transmission powers at  $\mathcal{S}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_2$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are assumed to be equally allocated. In Fig. 3, both simulation and analytical results are shown. Similarly, in the low power regime, it is observed that the PNC scheme achieves a higher energy efficiency while a lower energy efficiency with the ANC scheme over the DT scheme. Additionally, the simulation results are shown to be approximated by the analytical approximation results in Section IV. This also confirms the statements in observations (O1) and (O2) regarding the higher energy efficiency with the PNC scheme and the lower energy efficiency with the ANC scheme in the low power regime.

The impact of data rate on the EDT performance is shown in Fig. 4, where the data rates at  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  are assumed to be equal and vary in the ranges  $\{1, 5, 10\}$  bps. The position of all




Fig. 4. Comparison of EDTs of various HARQ-IR protocols in WNCBN with various data rates and  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/\sqrt{3}$ ,  $\alpha_R = \pi/6$ ,  $d_{S_1R} = d_{S_2R} = d_{RD_1} = d_{RD_2} = d_{S_1D_1}/2/\cos\alpha_R$ .




Fig. 5. EDTs of various HARQ-IR protocols in WNCBN for the scenario when relay near sources with  $R = 5$  bps,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/2$ ,  $\alpha_R = \pi/10$ ,  $d_{S_1R} = 1/8$ .

nodes is set as in Fig. 2 and the transmission powers at  $\mathcal{S}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_2$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are again assumed to be equally allocated. Similarly, we can observe that the best performance is achieved with the PNC scheme at all data rates and in addition the ANC scheme is always less energy efficient than both the PNC and DT schemes. This comparison of energy efficiency again verifies the statements in observations (O1) and (O2) at all data rates. Also, it can be seen in Fig. 4 that an improved EDT is achieved for all HARQ-IR protocols as the data rate increases.

Taking into account the practical scenario where the relay is not always located at the centre of the network, Figs. 5 and 6 plot the EDT curves of various HARQ-IR protocols in the WNCBN with respect to different relay positions. Specifically, Fig. 5 corresponds to the scenario when the relay is near the sources ( $\alpha_R = \pi/10$ ,  $d_{S_1R} = 1/8$ ) and Fig. 6 is related to the scenario when the relay is near the destinations ( $\alpha_R = \pi/10$ ,  $d_{S_1R} = 7/8$ ). The distances between the sources and destinations are fixed as  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$






Fig. 6. EDTs of various HARQ-IR protocols in WNCBN for the scenario when relay near destinations with  $R = 5$  bps,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/2$ ,  $\alpha_R = \pi/10$ ,  $d_{S_1R} = 7/8$ .




Fig. 7. Comparison of EDTs of various HARQ-IR protocols in WNCBN with  $R = 5$  bps,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/2$  and various relay positions.

and  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/2$ . The transmission powers at  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are also assumed to be equally allocated and the data rate is assumed to be 5 bps. As shown in Fig. 5, the DT scheme is shown to be the most energy efficient scheme compared to both the PNC and ANC schemes when the relay is in the neighbourhood of the sources. This confirms the statement in observation (O3) in relation to the higher energy efficiency of the DT scheme when the relay is located nearby the sources. In fact, it can be intuitively observed that the relay plays the same role as the sources if the relay is located near the sources, which means the use of the relay in the PNC and ANC schemes is not as energy efficient compared to the DT scheme, though the relay can be used in this case to increase the transmit diversity order. For the scenario when the relay is near the destinations (see Fig. 6), the relay is shown to be energy efficient with the PNC scheme while with the ANC scheme it is seen to be less energy efficient. This again verifies the statements in observations (O1) and (O2), which

are similar to the scenario when the relay is located at the centre of the network.

The impact of relay positions on the EDT performance is summarised in Fig. 7 where three typical relay positions are taken into consideration, including the scenarios when the relay is located either near the sources or near the destinations or at the centre of the network. The data rate is set as 5 bps and the transmission powers at all nodes are equally allocated. For the first two scenarios, the EDT curves are similar to those in Figs. 5 and 6 with similar settings of the node positions. For the third scenario, the relay position is determined by  $\alpha_R = \arctan(d_{S_1S_2}/d_{S_1D_1})$  and  $d_{S_1R} = \sqrt{d_{S_1D_1}^2 + d_{S_1S_2}^2}/2$ . It can be seen in Fig. 7 that the most energy efficient scheme is the PNC scheme with respect to the scenario when the relay is located at the centre of the network. Further, applying the ANC scheme to the scenario when the relay is near the sources results in the worst EDT performance.

Investigating the optimisation of RP for minimum ED in WNCBNs, Figs. 8 and 9 sequentially plot the optimised relay locations as a function of power allocation when HARQ-IR protocols are employed with PNC and ANC for various scenarios of power allocations at the source nodes. The EDT corresponding to the optimised relay locations is also included to compare the energy efficiency of the two HARQ-IR protocols. Fig. 8 considers the scenario of equal power allocation (i.e.  $P_1 = P_2$ ) while Fig. 9 investigates the scenario of unequal power allocation<sup>7</sup>  $P_1 = nP_2$ ,  $n > 1$ . The bisection search method is applied to find the optimal relay position in the search region. We assume that  $R = 5$  bps,  $P_{\text{total}} = P_1 + P_2 + P_R = 5$  W,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$  and  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/2$ . The optimised relay locations in Figs. 8 and 9 are determined through  $d_{S_1R}$  and  $\alpha_R$  using the proposed algorithms in Section IV for different power allocations. It can be seen in Figs. 8(c) and 9(c) that the PNC scheme is more energy efficient than the ANC scheme, though the EDT curves have different shapes as  $n$  varies due to the impact of relay position (see Fig. 7). This again validates the effectiveness of the PNC scheme over the ANC scheme for all power allocations. Additionally, it can be observed in Fig. 8 for the scenario  $P_1 = P_2$  that, as  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  increase, the optimized location of both the ANC-based and PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  move from the region near  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  to the region near  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ . However, when  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are small, the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  is closer to  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  than the PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$ . For the case  $P_1 = nP_2$  in Fig. 9, as  $n$  increases, the optimized location of the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  is closer to  $S_2$ , while that of the PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  is farther away from  $D_2$ .

Considering the total energy consumption in the optimisation of RP, Figs. 10 and 11 sequentially plot the optimised relay locations as a function of power allocation at the source nodes using HARQ-IR protocols with PNC and ANC. Also, the EDT corresponding to the optimised relay locations for minimum EB is included to compare the energy efficiency of the two HARQ-IR protocols. The power allocations at the two

<sup>7</sup>Note that the RP for the scenario  $P_2 = nP_1$  can be similarly observed to be symmetric with that for the scenario  $P_1 = nP_2$ , and thus is omitted for brevity.




Fig. 8. Optimisation of relay location subject to minimising ED with  $R = 5$  bps,  $P_{\text{total}} = 5$  W,  $P_1 = P_2$ ,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/2$ : (a)  $d_{S_1R}$ , (b)  $\alpha_R$  and (c) EDT.

source nodes are similarly assumed as in Figs. 8 and 9. We also assume that  $R = 5$  bps,  $P_{\text{total}} = P_1 + P_2 + P_R = 5$  W,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$  and  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/2$ . Using the proposed algorithms in Section IV for different power allocations, the optimised relay locations for minimum EB are determined. Again, Figs. 10(c) and 11(c) confirm the higher energy efficiency of the PNC scheme over the ANC scheme, though the EDT curves also have different shapes due to the impact of relay position. Additionally, in Fig. 10 for the scenario  $P_1 = P_2$ , it can be observed that, as  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  increase, the optimized location of the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  moves




Fig. 9. Optimisation of relay location subject to minimising ED with  $R = 5$  bps,  $P_{\text{total}} = 5$  W,  $P_1 = nP_2$ ,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/2$ : (a)  $d_{S_1R}$ , (b)  $\alpha_R$  and (c) EDT.

from the region near  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  to the region near  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , while that of the PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  moves in the reverse direction. For the case  $P_1 = nP_2$  in Fig. 11, similar to Fig. 9, it is shown that, as  $n$  increases, the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  should be closer to  $\mathcal{S}_2$ , while that of the PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  should be farther away from  $\mathcal{D}_2$ .

Regarding the optimised relay locations, for clarity, Figs. 12 and 13 illustrate detailed examples of relay locations for either minimum ED or EB for three specific scenarios of power allocations, including  $P_1 = P_2$  and  $P_1 = 2P_2$ . Let us first consider the RP objective of minimum ED. It can be observed




Fig. 10. Optimisation of relay location subject to minimising EB with  $R = 5$  bps,  $P_{\text{total}} = 5$  W,  $P_1 = P_2$ ,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/2$ : (a)  $d_{S_1R}$ , (b)  $\alpha_R$  and (c) EDT.

in Fig. 12(a) that the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  should be located nearer to  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  than the PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  if  $P_1 = P_2 \gg P_R$ . In the case  $P_1 = P_2 \ll P_R$ , the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  should remain much closer to  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  compared to the PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$ . Considering the scenario when  $P_1 > P_2$ , as shown in Fig. 12(b), the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  should be positioned near  $\mathcal{S}_2$ , while the PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  should be located in the region between  $\mathcal{S}_2$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ .

Investigating the optimising of RP for minimum EB, Fig. 13(a) shows that if  $P_1 = P_2 \gg P_R$  then the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  should be located in the neighbour of  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  while the PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  should stay near  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$ . When  $P_1 = P_2 \ll P_R$ , the ANC-based relay should stay near  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  while the PNC-based relay should be located near  $\mathcal{D}_1$




Fig. 11. Optimisation of relay location subject to minimising EB with  $R = 5$  bps,  $P_{\text{total}} = 5$  W,  $P_1 = nP_2$ ,  $d_{S_1D_1} = d_{S_2D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1S_2} = d_{D_1D_2} = 1/2$ : (a)  $d_{S_1R}$ , (b)  $\alpha_R$  and (c) EDT.

and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ . For the scenarios when  $P_1 > P_2$ , it can be observed in Fig. 13(b) that the optimised locations of the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  and PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  are similarly determined as in Figs. 12(b). Furthermore, the optimised locations for the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  are shown to be nearly similar for both objectives of minimum ED and minimum EB, while the optimised locations for the PNC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  are different with respect to the objective functions. These nearly similar locations of the ANC-based  $\mathcal{R}$  verify the statement in observation (O4).

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have investigated the EDT of data transmissions in a WNCBN which consists of two source nodes, a relay node and two destination nodes. HARQ-IR protocols with




Fig. 12. Optimized relay location subject to minimising ED with  $R = 5$  bps,  $P_{\text{total}} = 5$  W,  $d_{S_1 D_1} = d_{S_2 D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1 S_2} = d_{D_1 D_2} = 1/2$  (the number beside the node represents the value of  $P_1$ ): (a)  $P_1 = P_2$  and (b)  $P_1 = 2P_2$ .




Fig. 13. Optimized relay location subject to minimising EB with  $R = 5$  bps,  $P_{\text{total}} = 5$  W,  $d_{S_1 D_1} = d_{S_2 D_2} = 1$ ,  $d_{S_1 S_2} = d_{D_1 D_2} = 1/2$  (the number beside the node represents the value of  $P_1$ ): (a)  $P_1 = P_2$  and (b)  $P_1 = 2P_2$ .

either PNC or ANC schemes have been considered for reliable data transmissions. The EDT has been derived for HARQ-IR protocols with PNC and ANC in WNCBNs by taking into account the effects of both relay location and power allocation. Additionally, we have derived the approximations of the EDTs for both non-relay-aided and relay-aided transmissions in high and low power regimes. In the high power regime, the use of the relay in both PNC and ANC schemes has been shown to have no advantage over the non-relay-aided DT scheme. In the low power regime, we have shown that the PNC scheme is more energy efficient than both the ANC and DT schemes when the relay node is located either at the centre of the network or close to the destination nodes, while the DT scheme outperforms both the PNC and ANC schemes when the relay node is in the neighbourhood of the source nodes.

However, in the relaying schemes, the relay together with the source nodes can increase the diversity gain. Furthermore, based on the derived EDTs, algorithms for reducing the search region have been developed to find the optimal relay locations for the HARQ-IR protocols with PNC and ANC to minimise either the total delay or the total energy consumption in WNCBNs. Finally, numerical results have been provided to evaluate the energy efficiency of various HARQ-IR protocols, validate the EDT analysis and determine the optimised relay locations for the minimum delay and the minimum energy consumption in WNCBNs. For future work, we will investigate the energy efficiency of different HARQ-IR protocols with respect to the whole power consumption at nodes. Also, the analytical solution for the relay positioning problem with different HARQ-IR protocols will be investigated.

#### APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 2

It is noted that when  $x$  is sufficiently small,

$$\log(1 + ax) \approx \frac{ax}{\ln 2} + O(x^2). \quad (50)$$

Thus, when  $P \rightarrow 0$ , applying the approximation in (50), we have

$$\log(1 + [\gamma_{ii}]_j) \approx \frac{|[h_{ii}]_j|^2 P}{2 \ln 2}, \quad \log(1 + [\gamma_{i' i'}]_j) \approx \frac{|[h_{i' i'}]_j|^2 P}{2 \ln 2},$$

where  $i' = i - (-1)^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $E\{|h_{11}|^2\} = 1/d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu$ ,  $E\{|h_{22}|^2\} = 1/d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu$ ,  $E\{|h_{12}|^2\} = 1/d_{S_1 D_2}^\nu$ ,  $E\{|h_{21}|^2\} = 1/d_{S_2 D_1}^\nu$  and  $r_1 = r_2 = R$ , we obtain

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{DT},1} \approx \frac{2R \ln 2}{P} \max\{d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu, d_{S_1 D_2}^\nu\}, \quad (51)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{DT},2} \approx \frac{2R \ln 2}{P} \max\{d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu, d_{S_2 D_1}^\nu\}. \quad (52)$$

Substituting (51) and (52) into (21) and (22) with  $r_1 = r_2 = R$  and  $P_1 = P_2 = P/2$ , we obtain (24) and (25), respectively. The lemma is proved.

#### APPENDIX B PROOF OF LEMMA 3

In order to evaluate the EDT of the HARQ-IR protocol with PNC scheme in the low power regime, let us consider (12) and (13).

When  $P \rightarrow 0$ , applying the approximation in (50) to  $\kappa_{\text{PNC,MA}}$ ,  $\kappa_{\text{PNC,DR}_i}$  and  $\kappa_{\text{PNC,BC}_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , given by (5), (7) and (10) with  $r_i = R$  and  $P_i = P_R = P/3$ , we have

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC,MA}} \approx \frac{6R \ln 2}{P} \frac{d_{S_1 R}^\nu d_{S_2 R}^\nu}{d_{S_1 R}^\nu + d_{S_2 R}^\nu}, \quad (53)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC,DR}_1} \approx \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} d_{S_1 D_1}^\nu, \quad (54)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC,DR}_2} \approx \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} d_{S_2 D_2}^\nu, \quad (55)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC,BC}_i} \approx \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} d_{R_i}^\nu. \quad (56)$$

It is noted that  $d_{S_1R}$  and  $d_{3R}$  should be both less than  $d_{S_1D_1}$  and  $d_{S_2D_2}$ . Thus,

$$\frac{d_{S_1R}^{\nu} d_{S_2R}^{\nu}}{d_{S_1R}^{\nu} + d_{S_2R}^{\nu}} < \frac{d_{S_1D_1}^{\nu}}{2}, \quad \frac{d_{S_1R}^{\nu} d_{S_2R}^{\nu}}{d_{S_1R}^{\nu} + d_{S_2R}^{\nu}} < \frac{d_{S_2D_2}^{\nu}}{2}.$$

Accordingly, substituting (53), (54), (55) and (56) into (8), (9) and (11), we obtain

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC},S_1} \approx \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} d_{S_1D_1}^{\nu}, \quad (57)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC},S_2} \approx \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} d_{S_2D_2}^{\nu}, \quad (58)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC},1} \approx \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} \max\{d_{S_1D_1}^{\nu}, d_{S_2D_2}^{\nu}\}, \quad (59)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{PNC},2} \approx \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} \max\{d_{RD_1}^{\nu}, d_{RD_2}^{\nu}\}. \quad (60)$$

Then, substituting (57), (58), (59) and (60) into (12) and (13) with  $r_1 = r_2 = R$  results in (26) and (27). The lemma is proved.

#### APPENDIX C PROOF OF LEMMA 4

Let us consider (19) and (20). When  $P \rightarrow 0$ , applying the approximation in (50) to  $\kappa_{\text{ANC},i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , given by (17) with  $r_i = R$  and  $P_i = P_R = P/3$ , we have

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC},i} \approx \frac{9R \ln 2}{P^2} d_{S_iR}^{\nu} d_{RD_i'}^{\nu}, \quad (61)$$

where  $i' = 2$  if  $i = 1$  and  $i' = 1$  if  $i = 2$ . Substituting (54), (55) and (61) into (18), we have

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC},S_1} \approx \max\left\{\frac{9R \ln 2}{P^2} d_{S_1R}^{\nu} d_{RD_2}^{\nu}, \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} d_{S_1D_1}^{\nu}\right\}, \quad (62)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC},S_2} \approx \max\left\{\frac{9R \ln 2}{P^2} d_{S_2R}^{\nu} d_{RD_1}^{\nu}, \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} d_{S_2D_2}^{\nu}\right\}. \quad (63)$$

Since  $P \rightarrow 0$ , it can be shown that

$$\frac{9R \ln 2}{P^2} d_{S_1R}^{\nu} d_{RD_2}^{\nu} > \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} d_{S_1D_1}^{\nu},$$

$$\frac{9R \ln 2}{P^2} d_{S_2R}^{\nu} d_{RD_1}^{\nu} > \frac{3R \ln 2}{P} d_{S_2D_2}^{\nu}.$$

Thus, (62) and (63) can be rewritten as

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC},S_1} \approx \frac{9R \ln 2}{P^2} d_{S_1R}^{\nu} d_{RD_2}^{\nu}, \quad (64)$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_{\text{ANC},S_2} \approx \frac{9R \ln 2}{P^2} d_{S_2R}^{\nu} d_{RD_1}^{\nu}. \quad (65)$$


Substituting (61), (64) and (65) into (19) and (20) with  $r_1 = r_2 = R$  and  $P_1 = P_2 = P_R = P/3$ , we obtain (28) and (29). The lemma is proved.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] A. Sendonaris, E. Erkip, and B. Aazhang, "User cooperation diversity - Part I. System description," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 51, no. 11, pp. 1927–1938, Nov. 2003.
- [2] —, "User cooperation diversity - Part II. Implementation aspects and performance analysis," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 51, no. 11, pp. 1939–1948, Nov. 2003.
- [3] J. Laneman, D. Tse, and G. Wornell, "Cooperative diversity in wireless networks: Efficient protocols and outage behavior," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3062–3080, Dec. 2004.
- [4] K. Loa, C.-C. Wu, S.-T. Sheu, Y. Yuan, M. Chion, D. Huo, and L. Xu, "IMT-advanced relay standards [WiMAX/LTE update]," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 40–48, Aug. 2010.
- [5] Y. Yang, H. Hu, J. Xu, and G. Mao, "Relay technologies for WiMax and LTE-advanced mobile systems," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 47, no. 10, pp. 100–105, Oct. 2009.
- [6] Z. Sheng, K. Leung, and Z. Ding, "Cooperative wireless networks: From radio to network protocol designs," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 64–69, May 2011.
- [7] S. Sharma, Y. Shi, Y. Hou, and S. Kompella, "An optimal algorithm for relay node assignment in cooperative ad hoc networks," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 879–892, Jun. 2011.
- [8] M. Elhawy and Z. Haas, "Energy-efficient protocol for cooperative networks," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 561–574, Apr. 2011.
- [9] R. Ahlswede, N. Cai, S.-Y. Li, and R. Yeung, "Network information flow," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 1204–1216, Jul. 2000.
- [10] R. Koetter and M. Medard, "An algebraic approach to network coding," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 782–795, Oct. 2003.
- [11] S. Katti, D. Katabi, W. Hu, H. Rahul, and M. Medard, "The importance of being opportunistic: Practical network coding for wireless environments," in *Proc. Allerton'05*, Montecillo, Illinois, USA, Sep. 2005.
- [12] S. Zhang, S. C. Liew, and P. P. Lam, "Hot topic: Physical-layer network coding," in *Proc. ACM MobiCom'06*, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Sep. 2006, pp. 358–365.
- [13] S. Katti, S. Gollakota, and D. Katabi, "Embracing wireless interference: Analog network coding," in *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM'07*, Kyoto, Japan, Aug. 2007, pp. 397–408.
- [14] S. Katti, H. Rahul, W. Hu, D. Katabi, M. Medard, and J. Crowcroft, "XORs in the air: Practical wireless network coding," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 497–510, Jun. 2008.
- [15] R. Louie, Y. Li, and B. Vucetic, "Practical physical layer network coding for two-way relay channels: Performance analysis and comparison," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 764–777, Feb. 2010.
- [16] J. M. Park, S.-L. Kim, and J. Choi, "Hierarchically modulated network coding for asymmetric two-way relay systems," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 2179–2184, Jun. 2010.
- [17] D. Nguyen, T. Tran, T. Nguyen, and B. Bose, "Wireless broadcast using network coding," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 914–925, Feb. 2009.
- [18] P. Fan, C. Zhi, C. Wei, and K. Ben Letaief, "Reliable relay assisted wireless multicast using network coding," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 749–762, Jun. 2009.
- [19] Y. Liu, W. Chen, J. Ji, and J. Zhang, "Network-coded cooperation for multi-unicast with non-ideal source-relay channels," in *Proc. IEEE ICC 2010*, Cape Town, South Africa, May 2010, pp. 1–5.
- [20] F. Ye, S. Roy, and H. Wang, "Efficient Data Dissemination in Vehicular Ad Hoc Networks," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 769–779, May 2012.
- [21] Q. Yan, M. Li, Z. Yang, W. Lou, and H. Zhai, "Throughput Analysis of Cooperative Mobile Content Distribution in Vehicular Network using Symbol Level Network Coding," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 484–492, Feb. 2012.
- [22] A. Zhan, C. He, and L. Jiang, "A channel statistic based power allocation in a butterfly wireless network with network coding," in *Proc. IEEE ICC 2010*, Cape Town, South Africa, May 2010, pp. 1–5.
- [23] Y. Qin and L.-L. Yang, "Delay comparison of automatic repeat request assisted butterfly networks," in *Proc. ISWCS 2010*, York, United Kingdom, Sep. 2010, pp. 686–690.
- [24] J. Hu, P. Fan, K. Xiong, S. Yi, and M. Lei, "Cooperation-based opportunistic network coding in wireless butterfly networks," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM 2011*, Houston, TX, USA, Dec. 2011, pp. 1–5.
- [25] A. Burr and J. Sykora, "Extended mappings for wireless network coded butterfly network," in *Proc. EW 2011*, Vienna, Austria, Apr. 2011, pp. 1–7.




- [26] S. B. Wicker, *Error Control Systems for Digital Communication and Storage*. Prentice-Hall, 1995.
- [27] G. Caire and D. Tuninetti, "The throughput of hybrid-ARQ protocols for the Gaussian collision channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 1971–1988, Jul. 2001.
- [28] J. Choi, "On large deviations of HARQ with incremental redundancy over fading channels," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 913–916, Jun. 2012.
- [29] J. Choi and D. To, "Energy efficiency of HARQ-IR for two-way relay systems with network coding," in *Proc. EW 2012*, Poznan, Poland, Apr. 2012.
- [30] Y. Liu and A. Petropulu, "Cooperative beamforming in multi-source multi-destination relay systems with SINR constraints," in *Proc. IEEE ICASSP 2010*, Dallas, Texas, USA, Mar. 2010, pp. 2870–2873.
- [31] Q.-T. Vien, B. G. Stewart, H. Tianfield, H. X. Nguyen, and J. Choi, "An efficient network coded ARQ for multisource multideestination relay networks over mixed flat fading channels," *Elsevier AEU Int. J. Electron. Commun.*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 282–288, Apr. 2013.
- [32] Q.-T. Vien, B. G. Stewart, J. Choi, and H. X. Nguyen, "On the energy efficiency of HARQ-IR protocols for wireless network-coded butterfly networks," in *Proc. IEEE WCNC 2013*, Shanghai, China, Apr. 2013, pp. 2559–2564.
- [33] S. Zhang and S.-C. Liew, "Channel coding and decoding in a relay system operated with physical-layer network coding," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 788–796, Jun. 2009.
- [34] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. NJ: John Wiley, 2006.
- [35] G. Wolberg, *Digital Image Warping*, 1st ed. Los Alamitos, CA, USA: Wiley-IEEE Computer Society Press, 1990.



**Quoc-Tuan Vien** (M'12) received his B.Sc. degree from Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology, Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam, in 2005; his M.Sc. degree from Kyung Hee University, Suwon, Korea, in 2009; and his Ph.D. degree from Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, U.K., in 2012, all in radio engineering.

From 2005 to 2007, he was with Fujikura Fiber Optics Vietnam Company, Binh Duong, Vietnam, as a Production-System Engineer. From 2010 to 2012, he worked as a Research and Teaching Assistant

with the School of Engineering and Built Environment, Glasgow Caledonian University. In Spring 2013, he worked as Postdoctoral Research Assistant with the School of Science and Technology, Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, U.K. He is currently a Lecturer in Computing & Communications Engineering with the School of Science and Technology, Middlesex University, London, U.K. His research interests include MIMO systems and techniques, network coding, relay networks, and cognitive radio networks. Dr. Vien is a Member of the IEEE and the IET.



**Huan X. Nguyen** (M'06) received his B.Sc. from Hanoi University of Technology, Hanoi, Vietnam in 2000 and his Ph.D. from the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia in 2007.

During 2000–2003, he was with Vietnam Television where he focused on designing a terrestrial digital television network. In 2007, he joined the Institute of Advanced Telecommunications, Swansea University, Swansea, UK as a Research Officer. From 2008 to 2010, he was a Lecturer at the School of Engineering and Computing, Glasgow Caledonian


University, Glasgow, UK. He is currently a Senior Lecturer at School of Engineering and Information Sciences, Middlesex University, London, UK. His research interests include MIMO techniques, multi-carrier systems, and relay communications.



**Brian G. Stewart** (M'08) received a B.Sc. (Hons) degree in 1981 and a Ph.D. in 1985, both from the University of Glasgow, Scotland, UK. He also received a BD (Hons) degree in 1994 from the University of Aberdeen, Scotland, UK.

In 1985 he was appointed a lecturer in the School of Electronic and Electrical Engineering at the now Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, UK. In 1998 he joined Glasgow Caledonian University, Scotland, UK and is currently a Professor in the School of Engineering and Built Environment. He has more

than 25 years of teaching and research experience. His research interests lie in the fields of Communication Systems and High Voltage Partial Discharge. He has held numerous government and industrial research grants and has published numerous research papers in journals and international conferences. He also holds a number of patents in the fields of communication systems and high voltage instrumentation. Professor Stewart is a Member of the IEEE, a Chartered Engineer and a Member of the IET.



**Jinho Choi** (Senior Member of IEEE) was born in Seoul, Korea. He received B.E. (magna cum laude) degree in electronics engineering in 1989 from Sogang University, Seoul, and the M.S.E. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), Daejeon, in 1991 and 1994, respectively. He is now with School of Information and Communications, Gwangju Institute of Science and Technology (GIST), Korea, as a professor. Prior to joining GIST, he was with the College of Engineering,

Swansea University, United Kingdom, as a Professor/Chair in Wireless Communications. His research interests include wireless communications and array/statistical signal processing. He authored two books published by Cambridge University Press in 2006 and 2010. Prof. Choi received the 1999 Best Paper Award for Signal Processing from EURASIP, 2009 Best Paper Award from WPMC (Conference), and is Senior Member of IEEE. Currently, he is an Associate Editor of IEEE Communications Letters and an Editor of Journal of Communications and Networks (JCN) since 2005 and served as an Associate Editor of IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology from 2005 to 2007 and ETRI journal.



**Wanqing Tu** received a PhD in Computer Science from the City University of Hong Kong in 2006. She is a Reader at the School of Computing Science and Digital Media at the Robert Gordon University (RGU), Aberdeen, UK. Prior to joining RGU, she was a Senior Lecturer at Nottingham Trent University (2012–2013) and Glyndwr University (2008–2012), UK. Her research interests lie in next-generation multimedia networking, wireless multihop networks, mobile computing, cognitive radio networks, overlay networks, and parallel and

distributed systems. Dr. Tu received a Research Exchange Award from the Royal Academy of Engineering, UK, in 2013, and an IRCSET Embark Initiative Postdoctoral Research Fellowship, Ireland, in 2006. She won a Best Paper Award from ICCNMC'05. She was an Executive Committee Member of The IET Multimedia Communications Network (2011–2013). She is a member of IEEE.