Delay and Throughput Analysis of a Fixed Relay Concept for Next Generation Wireless Systems[1]

Norbert Esseling[2], Ralf Pabst, Bernhard H. Walke

RWTH Aachen University, Communication Networks, Germany
EMail: pab@comnets.rwth-aachen.de

***Abstract*— This paper presents a concept and performance analysis for a wireless broadband system based on fixed relay stations acting as wireless bridges. The system is intended for dense populated areas as an overlay to cellular radio systems. The proposed extension to a MAC-frame based access protocol like IEEE802.11e, 802.15.3, 802.16a and HIPERLAN2 is outlined. A possible deployment scenario is introduced and, following up on a previous paper about the simulative evaluation, this paper presents the analysis to estimate the traffic performance of the realying solution. It is established that the fixed relaying concept is well suited to substantially contribute to provide high capacity cellular broadband radio coverage in future (NG) cellular wireless broadband systems.**

I. Introduction

Future broadband radio interface technologies and the related high multiplexing bit rates will dramatically increase the traffic capacity of a single Access Point (AP), so that it is deemed very unlikely that this traffic capacity will be entirely used up by the mobile terminals roaming in an APs service area. This observation will be stressed by the fact that future broadband radio interfaces will be characterised by a very limited range due to the very high operating frequencies (>5GHz) expected. Furthermore, future broadband radio systems will suffer from a high signal attenuation due to obstacles, leading either to an excessive amount of APs or to a high probability that substantial parts of the service area are shadowed from its AP. By means of traffic performance analysis, this paper establishes that a system based on fixed mounted relay stations is well suited to overcome the problems mentioned. The paper is organised as follows. The introduction explains the advantages of relaying, presents fundamentals on how the proposed relaying concepts works in general and finally explains how to "misuse" existing standards to enable relaying in the time domain for wireless broadband systems based on a periodic Medium Access Control (MAC) frame, as used in IEEE802.11e, 802.15.3, 802.16a and HIPERLAN2. The latter system is taken to exemplify a detailed solution. This paper focuses on the analytical evaluation of the presented relaying concept. Section II presents the most important parameters and the deployment scenarios used to obtain the performance results. Section III provides the analytical background for the evaluation and presents first results. Section IV answers the question under what circumstances a relay based 2-hop transmission should be preferred to a 1-hop transmission between Mobile Terminal (MT) and AP. Conclusions are drawn in Section VI.

A. Related Work

An overview and literature survey on the concept of fixed relays to enhance coverage and capacity of wireless networks is given in [1]. That article also cites work complimentary to this one, focusing on the enhancements of wide-area cellular networks through relays. Many of these envisage an ad-hoc extension to cellular architectures, while our approach goes towards a fully planned, yet flexible infrastructure mainly enabling increased coverage of wireless broadband networks.

Other work in the area of multi-hop communication has to a large extent been focused in the past on the topic of Mobile Ad-Hoc Networks (MANETs) [2]. An almost infinite number of publications exists in this field.

However, there are paramount differences between MANETs and wireless networks based on the deployment of fixed relays. (I) In the latter case the position of the nodes participating in a communication is known and thus the routing overhead that presents one of the major issues in MANETs is not present here. (II) Fixed relays do not exhibit power limitations because they are expected not to be battery-operated, but they do contribute to a reduction of overall transmission power levels.

Previous work on analytical estimation of the capacity of relay-based networks has mostly approached the issue from the view-point of information theory, thereby deriving theoretical performance bounds. The novel contribution of this paper is that the analysis takes into account a specific protocol approach, including a relaying-enabled Medium Access Control (MAC) and a Selective-Repeat type Automatic Repeat ReQuest (ARQ) Protocol.

B. Characteristics of the Relaying Concept

Relaying is widely acknowledged as a means to improve capacity and coverage in Wireless Broadband Networks, see [1] The properties of our relay concept and the benefits that can be expected are as follows:

Radio Coverage can be improved in scenarios with high shadowing (e.g. bad urban or indoor scenarios). This allows to significantly increase the Quality of Service (QoS) of users in areas heavily shadowed from an AP.

The extension of the radio range of an AP by means of Fixed Relay Stations (FRSs) allows to operate much larger cells with broadband radio coverage than with a conventional one-hop system, while at the same time **reducing transmission power levels**. In the case of the access points and relay stations, this will contribute to the public acceptance of such systems, while in the case of the mobile terminals it has the potential to increase battery lifetime.

The FRS concept provides the **possibility of installing temporary coverage** in areas where permanent coverage is not needed (e.g. construction sites, conference-/meeting-rooms) or where a **fast initial network roll-out** has to be performed.

The wireless connection of the FRS to the fixed network **substantially reduces infrastructure costs**, which in most cases are the dominant part of the roll-out and operations

[1]This work has partly been funded by both the Federal Ministry of Research and Education (BMBF), Germany in the Multihop/COVERAGE Project and the European Union in the IST project WINNER.

[2]Now with T-Mobile International, Bonn, Germany



(a) Standard-conformant enhancements of the H2 MAC frame (b) Data flow using a sub-frame in 2-Hop mode

Fig. 1. Example: Relaying based on H2 protocol extensions

costs. FRS only need mains supply. In cases where no mains is available, relays could rely on solar power supply.

A **standard-conformant integration of the relays into any MAC frame based system** would allow for a **stepwise enhancement of the coverage region** of an already installed system. Investments in new APs can be saved and any hardware product complying to a wireless MAC frame based standard is possible to be used without modifications.

The proposed relay concept can be recursively used to extend the radio coverage range of a single AP by multi-hop links. In this case, a FRS serves another FRS according to the needs besides serving the Mobile Terminals (MTs) roaming in its local environment. It is worth mentioning that we focus on relaying in layer 2 by means of what is called a bridge in Local Area Networks.

C. Fundamentals

In relay based systems, additional radio resources are needed on the different hops on the route between AP and MT, since multiple transmissions of the data have to take place. We have studied three concepts and present here the results of the first one.

Relaying in the Time-Domain: The same frequency channel is used on both sides of the relay. A certain part of the MAC-frame capacity is dedicated to connect MT and FRS and the rest is used to connect AP and FRS via a time-multiplexing channel. One transceiver only is needed in a FRS, which results in cheap, small and energy-efficient FRSs. The physical layers of the standard air interfaces considered do not require any modifications. Instead the FRS concept is realised throgh the MAC protocol software only.

Relaying in the Frequency-Domain: This concept uses different carrier frequencies on links a FRS is connecting. The two hops can be operated independently of each other at the cost of increased complexity of the hardware and the frequency management.

Hybrid Time-/Frequency-Domain Relaying: In the hybrid concept as investigated in [3], the FRS periodically switches between two frequencies, allowing the AP to continue using its frequency f_1 while the relay serves its terminals on frequency f_2. No additional transceiver is needed, but the hardware complexity is increased since a very fast frequency switching has to be supported.

We will focus on the time domain relaying in this paper. To illustrate the capabilities and properties of relaying in the time domain, results of a model based analysis of the throughput over distance of a MT from the AP and of the achievable capacity for the scenario shown in Fig. 2(b) are presented.

D. Realisation of MAC frame based Relaying - Example: HIPERLAN2

The HIPERLAN2 (H2) system is used here as an example to explain how MAC frame based protocols as 802.11e, 802.16a (HIPERMAN) and the recently adopted 802.15.3 can be applied to realise relaying in the time domain. All the MAC and PHY functions addressed here are existent in all these wireless standards and no changes of the existent specifications are needed for relaying. However, either the Logical Link Control (LLC) or MAC layer now needs a store-and-forward function like that known from a bridge to connect LANs to each other. In the description of a H2 relay we also use the term Forwarding when referring to Relaying. H2 specifies a periodic MAC frame structure, Fig. 1(a). In the Forwarding Mode (FM) both signaling and user data are being forwarded by the FRS. A FRS operating in FM appears like a directly served MT to the AP. **Therefore, this does not preclude the possibility of allowing any MT to act as relay to become a Mobile Relay Station (MRS).** MTs are also referred to as Remote Mobile Terminals (RMTs) if they are served by a FRS.

The capacity of the MAC frame (see Fig. 1(a), upper part) is assigned dynamically in a two-stage process [4]. Transmit capacity for terminals directly associated to the AP (FRSs and MTs) is allocated by the AP. A FRS appears to the AP like a MT but sets up a Sub Frame (SF) structure, which is embedded into the H2 MAC frame structure of the serving AP (see Fig. 1(a), bottom). The SF structure has available only the capacity assigned by the AP to the FRS. This capacity is dynamically allocated by the FRS to its RMTs according to the rules of the H2 MAC protocol. Using this scheme, the FRS needs one transceiver only.

The SF is generated and controlled by the FRS (shown in Fig. 1(b)) and it is structured the same as the MAC frame used at the AP. It enables communication with legacy H2 terminals without any modifications. It implements the same physical channels as the standard H2 (F-BCH, F-FCH, F-ACH, F-DL, F-UL and F-RCH), which carry now the prefix “F-” to indicate that thy are set up by the FRS. A RMT may also set up a SF to recursively apply this relaying concept in order to cascade multiple relays.

Fig. 1(a) shows the functions introduced to the H2 MAC frame to enable relaying in the time domain. The capacity assigned in the MAC frame to the FRS to be used there to establish a SF is placed in the UL frame part of the AP. When the FRS is transmitting downlink, the data is addressed properly to its RMT and the AP will discard this data accordingly. The same applies for data transmitted from the RMT to the FRS. The capacity to exchange the



(a) Exemplary AP deployments and co-channel placement without relays (b) Relay-based cell with four relays in the Manhattan scenario (c) City-wide coverage with relay-based cells for cluster size $N = 2$

Fig. 2. One- and Two-Hop deployment concepts for dense urban environments

data between AP and FRS has to be reserved as usual in both UL and DL directions on request by the FRS. For more details, see [4]. A very similar operation is possible by using the Hybrid Coordinator Access in IEEE802.11e.

The next sections present an analytical performance evaluation of a relay-based system in a Manhattan-type environment. The analytical results have validated simulative results presented in [5] and [6].

II. Scenario and Assumptions about Environment

All assumptions made on scenario details can be found in [5] and [6] and will not be repeated in full detail here.

A. Scenario

The dense urban environment with a high degree of shadowing has been identified as a scenario especially suited for deploying a relay based wireless broadband network. The Manhattan grid scenario defined by [7] has been taken for the following investigations, see Fig. 2(b). The most important parameters of the scenario are the block size of 200m and the street width of 30m. An exemplary deployment scenario without relays is shown in Fig. 2(a), each of the APs covers the range of two building blocks and one street crossing, resulting in 430m range.

The variant shown here is has the APs placed on street crossings, thereby covering horizontal and vertical streets. In this scenario without using relays, at least 8 frequencies are needed to ensure that co-channel cells are separated sufficiently far by cells using a different frequency. Other variants used in the comparison are the AP placement according to [7] and the (very similar) placement of APs between buildings at equal x- and y-coordinates (referred to as “Same Height”).

The scenario shown requires that a cellular coverage in the Manhattan scenario would have to rely on LOS, leading to a high number of APs.

Besides covering the scenario area with a single hop system, we study the impact of covering the the same area with a system based on relaying. The basic building block, which consists of an AP and 4 FRSs is shown in Fig. 2(b). It has the potential to cover a much larger area than one single-hop AP. Fig. 2(c) shows the cellular deployment of these building blocks for various cluster sizes. Owing to the high attenuation caused by the buildings, only those co-channel interferers have to be taken into account that are marked in the figure in black and the reuse distance is indicated by the black arrows.

For the cluster sizes $N = 2/3/4$ we obtain reuse distances $D = 1380m/2070m/2760m$.

B. Air Interface

All of the MAC frame based air interfaces mentioned above will operate in the 5GHz licence-exempt bands (300MHz in the US, 550MHz in Europe, 100MHz in Japan). We assume for the following studies that the physical layer (PHY) uses an OFDM based transmission with 20MHz carrier bandwidth subdivided into orthogonal subcarriers. The modem is assumed conformant to the IEEE802.11a standard. As indicated in Section I, the 5GHz frequency range is characterised by high attenuation and very low diffraction, leading to low radio range, which is one of the key problems adressed by the proposed relaying concept.

III. Analytical Background

This section presents the analysis corresponding to the results displayed in Figs. 3– 7(b). Most of these figures also include performance evaluation results obtained by stochastic-event driven simulation, which have been published in [5] and [6]. The mathematical symbols used in this section are explained in the following:
PL_{Path}: resulting Pathloss (attenuation)
PL_{FS}: free-space component
k_{wi}: number of transmitted walls of category i
PL_{wi}: attenuation of wall type i
b_{wi}: correction factor
L_{Ges}: Number of OFDM symbols per MAC Frame
L_{Org_1Hop}: Number of symbols for organization channels
L_{Neg_Ack}: Symbols for negative acknowledgement
$n_{Neg_Ack_Phy_x}$: Number of acknowledgements needed
$L_{Data_Phy_x}$: Symbols for a data packet in PHY mode x
p_{BCH}: Error probability on boadcast channel
p_{FCH}: Error probability on frame description channel
$p_{Data_Phy_x}$: Error prob. for a data packet in PHY mode x
p_{F-BCH}: Error probability on FRS boadcast channel
p_{F-FCH}: Error probability on FRS frame description channel
p_{1Hop}: Error probability on first hop
p_{2Hop}: Error probability on second hop

A. Link-Level Performance

The basis for the calculation of the transmission errors is the ratio of Carrier to Interference and Noise power ($C/(I + N)$). The extensive Link-level investigations performed in [8] provide a PDU error-probability related



(a) E2E-Thoughput Downlink, 1-Hop



(b) E2E-Throughput Downlink, 2-Hop "Main Road" (with gain antenna)

Fig. 3. End-to-End-Throughput along the "Main Road" without (left) and with relays (right) (Lines: analysis, Markers: simulation)



Fig. 4. PDU-Error Probability for varying $C/(I+N)$ and PHY-mode, based on [8]

to the average $C/(I+N)$ (taking into account co-channel interference) during reception of the PHY-PDU. This relation is shown in Fig. 4.

B. Propagation and Interference

The COST259 Multi-Wall model has been taken as propagation model. This model [9] is an indoor propagation model for the 5GHz frequency range, which takes into account the transmission through walls obstructing the LOS between transmitter and receiver. Unlike in the COST231 model [10], the attenuation non-linearly increases with the number of transmitted walls. The pathloss is:

$$PL_{Path} = PL_{FS} + \sum_{i=1}^{l} k_{wi}^{\left[\frac{k_{wi}+1,5}{k_{wi}+1} - b_{wi}\right]} PL_{wi} \quad (1)$$

Wall attenuations have been chosen according to the suggestions in [11].

The Signal to Noise plus Interference Ratio $C/(I+N)$ can then be calculated like this

$$\frac{C}{I+N} = \frac{P_{Rx}}{P_N + \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{I_i}} \quad (2)$$

with $P_N = -95\,\mathrm{dBm}$ being the reiceiver noise floor for the 20 MHz channel, P_{Rx} the received signal power (including the path loss) and P_{I_i} the received interference Power from each interferer i. With the assumption about the scenario geometry and a fixed transmission Power of all stations of 23 dBm, it is possible to calculate $C/(I+N)$ values for all positions in a given scenario.

C. Throughput

The values L_{Ges}, L_{Org_1Hop}, L_{Org_2Hop} define the capacity that can be made available in one MAC frame. In combination with the knowledge about the re-transmission behaviour of the Automatic Repeat Request (ARQ) Protcol (influenced by the PDU error probabilities as gained using the calculated $C/(I+N)$ -values in Fig. 4), this leads to the formulas for the throughput as presented in the following:

1) 1-Hop System: The resulting throughput for 1-Hop End-to-End connections with ARQ is described by the following equation:

$$D_{ARQ_1Hop_Phy_x} = \frac{(1-\nu_{1Hop}) \cdot (L_{Ges} - L_{Org_1Hop})}{(L_{Neg_Ack} \cdot n_{Neg_Ack_Phy_x} + L_{Data_Phy_x} \cdot n_{ARQ_Phy_x})} \cdot \frac{48 \cdot 8bit}{2ms} \quad (3)$$

where ν_{1Hop} is the capacity loss due to erroneous detection of the broadcast channel (BCH) and/or the frame channel (FCH), given through:

$$\nu_{1Hop} = 1 \cdot p_{BCH} + 1 \cdot (1 - p_{BCH}) \cdot p_{FCH} \quad (4)$$

the number of necessary negative acknowledgements necessary for the successful transmission of a packet ranges from 3 to 24. In the case of multiple re-transmissions, the average number of necessary negative acknowledgements is then given through

$$n_{Neg_Ack_Phy_x} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{k \cdot (1 - p_{Data_Phy_x}) \cdot p_{Data_Phy_x}^{k}}{\max(3\,;\, 24 \cdot p_{Data_Phy_x}^{k})} \quad (5)$$

while $n_{ARQ_Phy_x}$ denotes the number of necessary packet transmissions and can be approximated by:

$$n_{ARQ_Phy_x} \approx \frac{1}{(1 - p_{Data_Phy_x})} \quad (6)$$

2) 2-Hop System: The total throughput for 2-Hop End-to-End connections with ARQ is defined in analogy to (3) and is described by the following equation:

$$D_{ARQ_2Hop_Phy_x} = \frac{(1-\nu_{2Hop}) \cdot (L_{Ges} - L_{Org_2Hop})}{2 \cdot (L_{Neg_Ack} \cdot n_{Neg_Ack_Phy_x} + L_{Data_Phy_x} \cdot n_{ARQ_Phy_x})} \cdot \frac{48 \cdot 8bit}{2ms} \quad (7)$$

The factor $\frac{1}{2}$ is introduced because the end-to-end throughput and not the overall system throughput is described in the expression. The simplifying assumption was



(a) Overview



(b) for specific $C/(I+N)$ -values on first hop

Fig. 5. Maximum ARQ-E2E-THroughput vs. $C/(I+N)$ -values on the respective hops

made that both the first and the second hop are ecountering similar conditions.

In the 2-Hop case, the capacity loss ν_{2Hop} due to erroneous detection of the broadcast channel (BCH) and/or the frame channel (FCH) becomes more complex, because we now have to take into account the BCH and FCH phases of the FRS, denoted as F-BCH and F-FCH. It is given through the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{2Hop} &= 1 \cdot p_{BCH} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 - p_{BCH}) \cdot p_{FCH} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 - p_{BCH}) \cdot p_{FCH} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 - p_{BCH}) \cdot (1 - p_{FCH}) \cdot p_{F-BCH} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 - p_{BCH}) \cdot (1 - p_{FCH}) \\ &\quad \cdot (1 - p_{F-BCH}) \cdot p_{F-FCH} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Where all p_{x-y} depend on the $C/(I+N)$ and the used PHY mode on the respective hop.

The influence of the different hops on the end-to-end throughput is investigated in the following. Fig. 5(a) shows the throughput as a function of the $C/(I+N)$ -values on the respective hop. Fig. 5(b) shows selected sections through the surface from Fig. 5(a). The $C/(I+N)$ value on the first hop is used as a parameter. The relation between the channel quality on the first hop and the end-to-end throughput is obvious. With a $C/(I+N)$ of 32 dB on the first hop, the transmission capacity is only limited by the second hop.

D. End-to-end Delay

This subsection presents the analysis of the influence of the ARQ protocol on the end-to-end delay. The results of the 2-Hop case are compared with the reference results for the 1-Hop case.

The analysis presented is based on a number of assumptions:

- We regard a selective-repeat ARQ
- The delay is dominated by re-transmissions
- The delay is determined as multiples of 1 MAC frame

First, we have to determine the probability for a Protocol Data Unit (PDU) to be successfully transmitted via a 1-Hop link after exactly j retransmissions. As a function of the packet error probability p, the result is:

$$P_{=}(j) = (1-p) \cdot p^j \quad (9)$$

As a consequence, the probability of up to j retransmissions is given by the sum:

$$P_{\leq}(j) = \sum_{l=0}^{j} (1-p) \cdot p^j \quad (10)$$

For the 1-Hop end-to-end relation we immediately find:

$$P_{=1Hop-E2E}(j) = P_{=1Hop}(j) \quad (11)$$

For the 2-Hop link, the probability for the number of retransmissions is composed from all possible combinations of the sum of the retransmissions on the respective hops. The end-to-end probability thus becomes:

$$P_{=2Hop-E2E}(j) = \sum_{l=0}^{j} P_{=1Hop}(j) \cdot P_{=2Hop}(j-l) \quad (12)$$

1) ARQ Delay for Small Data Rates: In the case of connections with small data rates (small data rates are assumed to consume an average of less than one PDU per MAC frame) the packets can be assumed to be independent.

1-Hop System: In the one-hop case, the probability p_{1Hop} for erroneous transmission of a PDU which has to be used in (10) is:

$$\begin{aligned} &p_{1Hop} = \\ &1 - [(1 - p_{BCH}) \cdot (1 - p_{FCH}) \cdot (1 - p_{1Hop_Data_Phy_x})] \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

From this, the distribution function of the 1-Hop end-to-end delay can be derived when the delay caused by j retransmissions is known.

2-Hop System: In the one-hop case, the probability p_{2Hop} for erroneous transmission of a PDU which has to be used in (10) is:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{2Hop} = 1 - [&(1 - p_{BCH}) \cdot (1 - p_{FCH}) \cdot (1 - p_{F-BCH}) \\ &\cdot (1 - p_{F-FCH}) \cdot (1 - p_{2Hop_Data_Phy_x})] \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

From this, the distribution function of the 2-Hop end-to-end delay can be derived when the delay caused by j 2-Hop-retransmissions is known.

2) ARQ Delay for High Data Rates: In the previous model the independence of the single PDUs was assumed. This assumption is only fair for small data rates, where the average number of PDUs per MAC frame is considerably lower than one. For connections with higher data rates, multiple PDUs are transmitted per MAC frame. Thus the forwarding of a PDU depends on all previous PDUs unsuccessfully transmitted in the same frame. It has to wait for the sequence to be "repaired." In the following, we assume that we have an arriving traffic of n PDUs per MAC-Frame. $PDU_{i,x}$ belongs to MAc frame i and has position x with $x \in [1 \ldots n]$. The variables u with $u \in [1 \ldots n]$ and m with $m \in [1 \ldots \infty]$ serve to describe the relation between $PDU_{i,x}$ and $PDU_{i-m,u}$ in frame $i-m$ at position u. Here we have to distinguish 3 cases



(a) 1-Hop-Downlink

(b) 2-Hop-Downlink

Fig. 6. End-to-end-delay for connections with different data rates, depending on a fixed packet error probability $p = 0,2$ (Analysis: lins; Simulation: markers)

that contribute to the distribution function $P_n(k)$ for the number of MAC frames k that a PDU has to wait for its delivery. $P_n(k)$ depends on the number of PDU arrivals per MAC frame n.

Case 1: $PDU_{i,x}$ needs k frames. All previous PDUs in the same and all previous frames have been received correctly. The probability that $PDU_{i,x}$ is delayed by k frames then becomes:

$$P_{Case1(x,k)} = P_{=}(k) \cdot P_{\leq}(k)^{(x-1)} \cdot \prod_{m=0}^{\infty} P_{\leq}(k+m)^n \quad (15)$$

Case 2: $PDU_{i,x}$ needs $k-1$ frames, one of the previous $PDU_{i,y}$ ($y \in [1 \ldots x-1]$) from the same frame i needs k transmissions. Here, all $PDU_{i-m,u}$ ($m \in [1 \ldots \infty]$) from previous frames are received at the latest together with $PDU_{i,y}$. The probability that $PDU_{i,x}$ is delayed by k frames then becomes:

$$P_{Case2(x,k)} = P_{\leq}(k-1) \cdot \prod_{m=0}^{\infty} P_{\leq}(k+m)^n \cdot P_{\leq}(k) \cdot \sum_{y=1}^{x-1} P_{\leq}(k)^{(y-1)} \cdot P_{\leq}(k-1)^{x-1-y} \quad (16)$$

Case 3: At least one $PDU_{i-m,u}$ ($m \in [1 \ldots \infty]$) from a previous frame needs k transmissions. Now the PDUs of the currently regarded frame ($PDU_{i,x}$ and $PDU_{i,y}$ with $y \in [1 \ldots x-1]$) require a maximum of $k-1$ transmissions. The probability that $PDU_{i,x}$ is delayed by k frames then becomes:

$$P_{Case3(x,k)} = P_{\leq}(k-1)^x \cdot \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left[\begin{array}{l} \prod_{s=1}^{m-1} P_{\leq}(k-1+s)^n \cdot \\ \prod_{t=1}^{\infty} P_{\leq}(k+m+t)^n \cdot P_{=}(k+m) \cdot \\ \sum_{u=1}^{n} P_{\leq}(k+m)^{u-1} \cdot P_{\leq}(k-1+m)^{n-u} \end{array} \right] \quad (17)$$

The resulting combined error probability for a delay of $i+k$ frames, averaged over the n PDUs arriving during a frame then becomes

$$P_n(k) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{x=1}^{n} P_{Case1(x,k)}(x,k) + P_{Case2(x,k)}(x,k) + P_{Case3(x,k)}(x,k) \quad (18)$$

In addition to the probabilities given in (15),(16) and (17) we need knowledge about the delay caused by j retransmissions on the 1-Hop and 2-Hop connections to be able to draw the delay distribution functions for 1-Hop and 2-Hop traffic. As a result of limiting the delay precision to multiples of one MAC frame, this is trivial and will not be shown here.

Fig. 6 shows the End-to-End delay for a fixed PDU error probability pf $p = 0,2$. A varying traffic offer of 192 kbit/s, 768 kbit/s, 1536 kbit/s and 3072 kbit/s, corresponding to $n = 1, 4, 8, 16$ PDUs per frame with constant inter-arrival time for the 54 Mbit/s-PHY-modes was investigated. The curve labelled "low" denotes the theoretical lower bound for very low data rates (e.g. $n < 1/10$), where capacity for acknowledgements is assumed present and used in every frame.

IV. ARQ-Throughput 1-Hop vs. 2-Hop

The question arises under what circumstances relaying would be beneficial, i.e. when a 2-hop communication is preferential to one hop. Fig. 7(a) compares the end-to-end throughput achieved with 1-hop and 2-hop transmission for the two scenarios depicted in the upper right corner of the figure under Line of Sight (LOS) radio propagation. Since the systems in question have delay-sensitive high-bandwidth applications as one of their main targets, an additional condition imposed here is that an upper bound of 10 ms end-to-end delay restriction has to be met in both the one- and the two-hop case.

It is assumed that the FRS is placed at half the distance between the AP and the (R)MT. It turns out that from a distance of 240 m onwards, the 2-hop communication delivers a somewhat higher throughput than 1-hop, as marked by the light shaded area. It can also be noted that the range of the 1-Hop transmissionisd limited to about 380 m, while the 2-Hop transmission reaches 500 m, still keeping 10 ms delay constraints. Under the somewhat weaker constraint of 10 ms delay per hop, the coverage of the 2-hop solution even reaches 750 m, visualized by the darker shaded area.

Relay based 2-hop communication provides another considerable benefit already mentioned in Section I-B: it is able to eliminate the shadowing caused by buildings and other obstacles that obstruct the radio path from an AP. An example of this is given by the scenario in Fig. 7(b), together with the throughput gain (light-shaded: 10ms end-to-end delay constraint, dark-shaded: 10ms per-hop delay constraint) resulting from relaying. In this scenario, the AP and the (R)MT are shadowed from each other by two walls that form a rectangular corner, e.g. a street corner. The COST259 propagation model (see Section III-B) was used and the walls were assumed to have an



(a) LOS condition

(b) Around an obstacle

Fig. 7. Analytical comparison of the maximum achievable End-to-End Throughput over Distance for a 1- and 2-Hop Connection with ARQ under 10ms maximum End-to-End-delay restriction

attenuation of $11,8dB$ each. The shaded area highlights that the 2-hop communication gains over one hop, starting at a distance of about 50 m only. The two examples establish that relaying is of advantage for both, increasing the throughput close to the cell border of an AP (under LOS conditions) and for bringing radio coverage (and throughput) to otherwise shadowed areas.

The trend towards increasing transmission rates resulting from further developed radio modems tends to provide an over capacity in the cell area served by an AP, especially in the first months/years after deploying a system. Relays substantially increase the size of the service area thereby increasing the probability that the capacity of an AP will be used effectively.

V. Validation of Results

A. Reference Scenario without Relays

In Fig. 3(a) the DL End-to-End throughput is plotted over the distance of the MT from the AP when servicing the scenario by APs only according to Fig. 2(a). At distances of 115m and 345m (where the street crossings are located), some additional interference is visible. The figure also shows that the simulation results match the analytical prediction very well, except from said crossing areas.

Fig. 6(a) shows the end-to-end-delay for connections with different data rates, depending on a fixed packet error probability $p = 0,2$ (Analysis: lins; Simulation: markers). Here again, the simulation results validate the analytical prediction quite well.

B. Simulation Results with Fixed Relay Stations

Simulations with fixed relays as introduced in Section II-A have been performed for the cluster sizes $N = 2/3/4$, cf. Fig. 2(c). Fig. 3(b) shows two sets of curves in one graph: The TP versus the distance of a MT from the AP (marked with 1. hop) and the TP avilable for MTs being served by a FRS (marked with 2. hop), which is equipped with a 11.8 dB receive antenna gain. The FRS is located at a distance of 230m from the AP on the "Main Road" (cf. the small scenario included in the figure and Fig. 2(b)). This explains the peak of the "2. Hop" TP curve visible at that distance.

Each set of curves has the cluster size N as a parameter. As expected, the curves with $N = 2$ show the lowest TP values. A max. TP of approx. 9-12 Mbit/s (depending on N) can be made available even at the cell border of the second hop, representing an increase in peak throughput of about 60 %-90 %. The same is true for the "side alley" (not shown), an area which has no direct coverage of the first hop at all and which would require an additional AP in a single hop scenario.

VI. Conclusions

Modern wireless broadband air interfaces are based on MAC frames, the only exemptions being IEEE802.11a/b/g but 802.11e uses a MAC frame, too. MAC framed air interfaces have been established in this paper to be useful for relaying in the time domain by just using the functions available from the existing standards. Deployment concepts using fixed relay stations have been shown to be of high benefit to substantially reduce the cost of interfacing APs to the fixed network (owing to a substantial reduction of APs needed). Relays have been proven to substantially extend the radio coverage of an AP, especially in highly obstructed service areas. Gain antennas at FRSs have been established to substantially contribute to increase the throughput at cell areas far away from an AP.

References

[1] R. Pabst, B. Walke, D. C. Schultz, and et al, "Relay-based deployment concepts for wireless and mobile broadband radio," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, pp. 80–89, Sep 2004.
[2] IETF, http://www.ietf.org/html.charters/manet-charter.html.
[3] J. Habetha, R. Dutar, and J. Wiegert, "Performance Evaluation of HiperLAN/2 Multihop Ad Hoc Networks," in *Proc. European Wireless*, vol. 0, Florenz, feb 2002, pp. 25–31.
[4] N. Esseling, H. Vandra, and B. Walke, "A Forwarding Concept for HiperLAN/2," in *Proc. European Wireless 2000, Dresden, Germany*, Sept. 2000, pp. 13–17.
[5] N. Esseling, B. Walke, and R. Pabst, "Performance Evaluation of a Fixed Relay Concept for Next Generation Wireless Systems," in *Proc. of 15th IEEE International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio 2004*. Barcelona, Spain: IEEE, September 2004.
[6] N. Esseling, B. Walke, and R. Pabst, Eds., *Fixed Relays For Next Generation Wireless Systems*. New York, USA: Springer Science+Buisness Media, Inc., 2004, ch. 5, pp. 71–91.
[7] 3GPP, "Selection Proc. for the Choice of Radio Transm. Techn. of the UMTS, (UMTS 30.03)," ETSI, Sophia Antipolis, France, Report TR 101 112, V3.2.0, Apr. 1998.
[8] J. Khun-Jush, P. Schramm, U. Wachsmann, and F. Wenger, "Structure and Performance of the HiperLAN/2 Physical Layer," in *Proc. of the VTC Fall-1999*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Sep. 1999, pp. 2667–2671.
[9] L. M. Correia(Editor), *Wireless Flexible Personalised Communications, COST 259: European Co-operation in Mobile Radio Research*. Wiley, Mar. 2001.
[10] E. Damosso and L. M. C. (Editoren), "COST 231 Final Report - Digital Mobile Radio: Evolution Towards Future Generation Systems," COST Secretariat, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium, , Aug. 1999.
[11] BRAIN, "D 3.1: Technical requirements and identifi cation of necessary enhancements for HIPERLAN Type 2," IST-1999-10050 BRAIN WP3 - Air Interface," Deliverable, Sept. 2000.