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Abstract—We consider the transmission of packets across a lossy end-to-end network path so as to achieve low in-order delivery delay. This can be formulated as a decision problem, namely deciding whether the next packet to send should be an information packet or a coded packet. Importantly, this decision is made based on delayed feedback from the receiver. While an exact solution to this decision problem is combinatorial in the feedback delay, we exploit ideas from queueing theory to derive scheduling policies that, while suboptimal, can be efficiently implemented and offer substantially better performance than state of the art approaches to making use of delayed feedback. We obtain a number of useful analytic bounds that help characterise design trade-offs and our analysis highlights that the use of prediction plays a key role in achieving good performance in the presence of significant feedback delay. Our approach readily generalises to networks of paths and we illustrate this by application to multipath transport scheduler design.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we revisit the transmission of packets across a lossy end-to-end network path so as to achieve low in-order delivery delay. Consideration of end-to-end packet transmission is motivated by improving operation at the transport layer and with this in mind we also assume the availability of feedback from client to server. This feedback is delayed by the path propagation delay and, in contrast to the link layer, this feedback delay may be substantial. For example, on a 50Mbps path with 25ms RTT there are around 100 packets in flight and so the server only learns of the fate of a packet after a further 100 packets have been sent. In other words, the server has to make predictive decisions about what to transmit in those 100 packets, in particular whether they are information or redundant/coded packets. Information theory tells us that we do not need to make use of feedback in order to be capacity achieving in a packet erasure channel. However, it also tells us that feedback can be used to reduce in-order delivery delay, possibly very considerably [11]. More generally, there is a trade-off between rate and delay, and feedback can be used to modify this trade-off, and it is this which is of interest.

While much attention in 5G has been focused on the physical and link layers, it is increasingly being realised that a wider redesign of network protocols is also needed in order to meet 5G requirements. Transport protocols are of particular relevance for end-to-end performance, including end-to-end latency. For example, ETSI have recently set up a working group to study next generation protocols for 5G [2]. The requirement for major upgrades to current transport protocols is also reflected in initiatives such as Google QUIC [3] and the Open Fast Path Alliance [4] as well as by recent work such as [5]. In part, this reflects the fact that low delay is already coming to the fore in network services. For example, Amazon estimates that a 100ms increase in delay reduces its revenue by 1% [6]. Google measured a 0.74% drop in web searches when delay was artificially increased by 400ms [7] while Bing saw a 1.2% reduction in per-user revenue when the service delay was increased by 500ms [8]. But the requirement for low latency also reflects the needs of next generation applications, such as augmented reality and the tactile Internet.

As we will describe in more detail shortly, by use of modern low-delay streaming code constructions, the task at the transport layer can be formulated as one of deciding whether the next packet to send should be an information packet or a coded packet, with this decision being made based on stale/delayed feedback from the receiver. The use of feedback in ARQ has of course been well studied, but primarily in the case of instantaneous feedback i.e. where there is no delay in the server receiving the feedback. When feedback is delayed the problem becomes significantly more challenging, and has received almost no attention in the literature (notable exceptions include [9], [10], [11]). While the decision task can be formulated as a dynamic programming problem, the complexity grows combinatorially with the delay and so quickly becomes unmanageable for even quite small delays. In particular, such solutions are unsuited to the real-time decision-making required within next generation networks.

In this paper we take a different tack and make use of a helpful connection between coding and queuing theory. We use this connection to derive scheduling policies that, while suboptimal, can be efficiently implemented and offer substantially better performance than state of the art alternate solutions to making use of delayed feedback. This approach...
also allows us to obtain a number of useful analytic bounds that help characterise design trade-offs. Our analysis highlights that the use of prediction plays a key role in achieving good performance in the presence of significant feedback delay, and that it is prediction errors that drive the rate-delay trade-off.

Although our main focus is on single paths, our approach readily generalises to networks of paths and we illustrate this by application to multipath transport scheduler design.

II. RELATED WORK

The literature contains several different proposals for coding schemes that make use of feedback. For instance, Sundarajan et al. introduce in [12] a new linear coding scheme that includes feedback. They exploit it so that the encoder learns the packets that have been “seen” by the receivers, thus speeding the decoding process. The authors of [13] propose an extension of LT and Raptor Codes that adds information feedback, with the objective of reducing the coding overhead. Hagedorn et al. present in [14] a generalised LT coding scheme that relies on feedback information. Other interesting approaches include Hybrid ARQ [15], which combines a forward error correction code causal, suppose that each coded packet only protects the first information packet can be reconstructed and all of the buffered until the first coded packet is received. At this point, the first information packet can be reconstructed and all of the information packets have to be transmitted over the system. Coded packet construction for packet erasure channels, referred to as a streaming code (a form of convolutional code). The code is an ideal one in the sense that receipt of any $k$ of the $n$ information packets allows all of the $k$ information packets to be reconstructed. Furthermore, assume that the first information packet is lost. All remaining information packets have to be buffered until the first coded packet is received. At this point, the first information packet can be reconstructed and all of the information packets can be delivered in-order. The in-order delivery delay is therefore proportional to $k$. Alternatively, suppose that the $n-k$ coded packets are distributed uniformly among the information packets, rather than all being placed after the $k$ information packets, see Fig. 1b. To keep the code causal, suppose that each coded packet only protects the preceding information packets in the block. Assume again that the first information packet is lost. This loss can now be recovered on receipt of the first coded packet resulting in a delay that is now proportional to $k/(n-k)$ (i.e., this is much lower than $k$ when $n$ is large).

With the aim of obtaining an improved trade-off between throughput and delay, [11] recently proposed an alternative code construction for packet erasure channels, referred to as a streaming code (a form of convolutional code). The code is constructed by interleaving information packets $u_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$ with coded packets $c_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$. One coded packet is inserted after every $l-1$ information packets and transmitted over the network path, resulting in a code of rate $\frac{l-1}{n}$. Fig. 2 illustrates this code construction. Coded packet $c_i$ is generated by taking random linear combinations of the previously transmitted information packets $\{u_{L_{i-1}}, \ldots, u_{(i-1)l}\}$. With the left-hand edge

---

1Thus, coded packet $c_1$ protects information packets $u_1$ and $u_2$, coded packet $c_2$ protects $u_2$, $u_3$ and $u_4$, and so on. Note that the resulting code construction is not the same as using a short classical block code with $k = 2$ and $n = 3$ as then $c_2$ would only protect $u_3$ and $u_4$. 

---

III. PRELIMINARIES

A. Low Delay Streaming Codes

We model an end-to-end network path as a packet erasure channel (packets carry a unique sequence number and a checksum thus losses can be detected). Most previous works on packet erasure channels have been based on use of block codes, whereby the sequence of information packets to be transmitted is partitioned into blocks of size $k$ and $n-k$ coded packets are appended to these to create a block of size $n$ information plus coded packets, which implies a code with rate $k/n$, see Fig. 1a. As already noted, the requirement for low latency in next generation networks has led to renewed interest in whether alternative code constructions can yield a more favourable trade-off between throughput and in-order delivery delay. To see that this may indeed be the case lets consider, for example, a rate $\frac{k}{n}$ systematic block code and suppose that the code is an ideal one in the sense that receipt of any $k$ of the $n$ information packets allows all of the $k$ information packets to be reconstructed. Furthermore, assume that the first information packet is lost. All remaining information packets have to be buffered until the first coded packet is received. At this point, the first information packet can be reconstructed and all of the information packets can be delivered in-order. The in-order delivery delay is therefore proportional to $k$. Alternatively, suppose that the $n-k$ coded packets are distributed uniformly among the information packets, rather than all being placed after the $k$ information packets, see Fig. 1b. To keep the code causal, suppose that each coded packet only protects the preceding information packets in the block. Assume again that the first information packet is lost. This loss can now be recovered on receipt of the first coded packet resulting in a delay that is now proportional to $k/(n-k)$ (i.e., this is much lower than $k$ when $n$ is large).

With the aim of obtaining an improved trade-off between rate and delay, [11] recently proposed an alternative code construction for packet erasure channels, referred to as a streaming code (a form of convolutional code). The code is constructed by interleaving information packets $u_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$ with coded packets $c_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$. One coded packet is inserted after every $l-1$ information packets and transmitted over the network path, resulting in a code of rate $\frac{l-1}{n}$. Fig. 2 illustrates this code construction. Coded packet $c_i$ is generated by taking random linear combinations of the previously transmitted information packets $\{u_{L_{i-1}}, \ldots, u_{(i-1)l}\}$. With the left-hand edge
the standing assumption that the field size is sufficiently large so every coded packet increases the rank of the effective generator matrix at time $t$, which is composed only of the coefficients obtained from received packets. If $G_t$ is full rank, Gaussian elimination is used to recover from any packet erasures that may have occurred during transit. We will make the standing assumption that the field size $Q$ is sufficiently large that with probability one each coded packet helps the receiver recover from one information packet erasure i.e. each coded packet row added to generator matrix $G_t$ increases the rank of $G_t$ by one.

In summary, this streaming code construction generates coded packets that are (i) individually streamed between information packets (rather than being transmitted in groups of size $n - r$ packets) and (ii) each coded packet protects all preceding information packets (rather than just the information packets within its block). See [1] for a detailed analysis of the throughput and delay performance of this code, but for a given code rate it is easy to see that this code construction tends to decrease the overall in-order delivery delay at the receiver compared to a block code, as illustrated in the example above.

B. Decision Problem

Our interest in the above streaming code construction is twofold. Firstly, for a given coding rate under a wide range of conditions it offers lower in-order deliver delay compared to standard block codes [1]. Thus it provides a useful starting point for developing methods for low delay transmission across lossy network paths. Secondly, it lends itself to being embedded within a clean decision problem. Namely, one where rather than transmitting coded packets periodically according to a predetermined schedule, at each transmission opportunity the transmitter dynamically decides whether to send an information packet or a coded packet based on feedback from the receiver [1].

Formally, assume a time-slotted system where each slot corresponds to transmission of a packet. We have an arrival process consisting of a sequence of information packets $\{A_k, k = 1, 2, \ldots\}$, where $A_k \in \{0, 1\}$ is the number of new information packets in slot $k$, and define $\bar{a} = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} A_i$ as the average arrival rate. These information packets are buffered at the transmitter and then sent across a lossy path to a receiver. The queue occupancy $Q_k'$ at the transmitter in slot $k$ behaves according to:

$$Q_{k+1}' = [Q_k' + A_k - S_k]^+$$

where $S_k \in \{0, 1\}$ is the number of information packets transmitted in slot $k$ and $Q_1' = 0$. We let $\bar{s} = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} S_i$ denote the average transmit rate.

Define a random variable $X_k$, which takes value 1 when a packet transmitted in slot $k$ is erased and 0 otherwise. We will assume the sequence of random variables $\{X_k\}$ is i.i.d. $X_k \sim X$ with $\text{Prob}(X = 1) = p$, and that when $p = 0$ then $X_k = 0$ for all $k$ (so as $k \to \infty$ the occurrence of a non-zero but finite number of losses is excluded).

Received packets are buffered at the receiver until they can delivered in-order to an application i.e. when an information packet is erased then subsequently arriving information packets are buffered until the lost packet can be recovered. A coded packet sent in slot $k$ is built as the random linear combination of all information packets sent before slot $k$. It is assumed that the field size used is sufficiently large so every coded packet increases the rank of the effective generator matrix at the receiver by one. In each slot $k$ the receiver also sends feedback to the transmitter, informing of the packets already received as of slot $k$. This feedback arrives at the transmitter after delay $d$, in slot $k + d$. It is assumed, for simplicity, that none of these feedback packets are lost.

2 Use of block codes leads to a significantly more complex decision problem. To see this observe that losing more than $n - r$ packets within a block requires transmission of additional coded packets from that block in order to avoid a decoding failure. These are then received interleaved with later blocks. Thus we lose the renewal structure of open-loop block code constructions and the decision-maker needs to (i) keep track of multiple generations of interleaved blocks, each perhaps of a different size, and (ii) decide from which block to send a coded packet as well as deciding whether to send an information or coded packet.
to make progress we make use of the observation that the back delay. This means that optimal decision-making quickly operates with significant delays before feedback is received.

This, together with our observation in Section III-B that the queue occupancy increases whenever an information packet is erased and decreases whenever a coded packet is successfully received. Decoding events occur at slots $k$ where $Q'_k = 0$.

Intuitively, the length of this virtual queue is correlated with the in-order delivery delay at the receiver – as $Q'_k$ grows the number of information packets buffered at the receiver will also tend to grow. The relationship is not one to one, and we explore it further in the next section, but as we will see it is sufficient to form the basis of simple yet effective scheduling policies. Importantly, by taking this approach we are able to obtain bounds on delay and rate which can be used for analysis and design.

B. Relating Delay and Queue Occupancy

We proceed by considering in more detail the relationship between end-to-end in-order delivery delay, the transmitter queue occupancy $Q'_t$ and the receiver virtual queue occupancy $Q'_r$. First, observe that the end-to-end delay can be divided into: (i) the time between being enqueued at the sender and being first transmitted, $D_{qt}$, and (ii) the time between being first transmitted and when the packet is successfully delivered to the application layer, $D_{qr}$. We expect that $D_{qt}$ is related to $Q'_t$ and $D_{qr}$ with $Q'_r$, and indeed this can be seen in Fig. 5. This figure plots the average of the delays, after repeating the experiment 100 times, $D_{qt}$ and $D_{qr}$ per packet versus the queue occupancies $Q'_t$ and $Q'_r$ over a path with erasure rate $p = 0.2$ and with coded packets sent periodically every $p/(1 - p)$ information packets. Also indicated is the 95% confidence interval. The strong correlation between delay and queue occupancy is clearly evident. Further, it can be seen that the impact of the receiver queue occupancy $D_{qr}$ on delay is much larger than that of the transmitter queue $D_{qt}$. This is perhaps to be expected, since a loss causes all subsequent information packets to be delayed at the receiver until the loss is repaired and decoding takes place ($Q'_r$ becomes zero), hence amplifying the effect of a non-zero queue occupancy $Q'_r$ on delay. Although the data in Fig. 5 is for a particular choice of loss and arrival rate it is representative of the behaviour seen for other choices.

C. Transmission Policies

Based on the insight provided by the above analysis we consider the following class of transmission policies:

\[
C_k = \arg \min_{C \in \{0, 1\}} F(Q'_t - d, \hat{Q}'_r, Q'_t)C 
\]

\[
\hat{Q}'_r = \hat{\theta}(Q'_t - d) 
\]

\[
S_k = \min\{Q'_k + A_k, 1 - C_k\} 
\]
where function $F(\cdot)$ is a design parameter, which we will discuss in more detail shortly. Observe that selection of $C_k$ uses only information available at the sender at time $k$. Since $S_k = \min\{Q_k^t + A_k, 1 - C_k\}$, an information packet is transmitted when (i) $1 - C_k = 1$, and (ii) the transmission queue contains a packet to be sent. Furthermore, $Q_{k-d}^r$ is only available at the sender after feedback delay $d$. We will focus on the estimator

$$
\hat{Q}_k^r = \hat{\theta}(Q_{k-d}^r) = Q_{k-d}^r + \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j p - C_j (1 - p)) \tag{7}
$$

which simplifies to $\hat{\theta}(Q_{k-d}^r) = Q_{k-d}^r$ when the feedback delay $d = 0$. This estimator makes a $d$-step ahead prediction of the value of $Q_{k-d}^r$ based on $Q_{k-d}^r$ and the average path loss $p$. We will consider the impact of the accuracy of estimator predictions in more detail shortly. Other choices of estimator are of course possible, but (7) has the virtues of simplicity and tractability.

This class of transmission policies includes ARQ and open-loop FEC as special cases. Namely, when $F(Q_{k-d}^r, \hat{Q}_k^r, Q_k^t) = -\hat{Q}_k^r$ and $d = 0$, then $C_k = 1$ when $Q_{k-d}^r > 0$ i.e. a coded packet is sent whenever the receiver reassembly queue is non-empty. Since for code construction considered this coded packet will actually be an information packet, we have ARQ. Similarly, selecting $F(Q_{k-d}^r, Q_k^t, \hat{Q}_k^r) = -(\hat{Q}_k^r - Q_{k-d}^r)$ then as $d \to \infty$ we recover the open-loop FEC in (1), whereby a coded packet is sent every $p/(1-p)$ information packets. To see this, observe that $C_k = 1$ when $\hat{Q}_k^r - Q_{k-d}^r = p(\sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j - C_j (1 - p))/p) > 0$.

Recall from Section [1-3] that the delay is much more strongly affected by the receiver queue occupancy $Q^r$ than by the transmitter queue occupancy $Q^t$. With this in mind, Fig. 6 compares the end-to-end system delay for different transmission policies. First, we take ARQ as a baseline scheme, comparing it with $F(Q_{k-d}^r, \hat{Q}_k^r, Q_k^t) = \rho \cdot Q_k^t - \hat{Q}_k^r$, where $\rho$ is a configuration parameter that modulates the weight given to the transmission queue length. As can be seen, the more weight that is given to $Q_t$ (higher $\rho$), the longer the end-to-end system delay. This suggests that we should favour policies $P$ such that:

$$
C_k \in \arg \min_{C \in \{0,1\}} (\hat{Q}_k^r + \gamma) C \tag{8}
$$

$$
\hat{Q}_k^r = \hat{\theta}(Q_{k-d}^r) \tag{9}
$$

$$
S_k = \min\{Q_k^t + A_k, 1 - C_k\} \tag{10}
$$

where $\gamma \geq 0$ is a design parameter. Observe that this class of policies corresponds to a threshold rule, namely $C_k = 1$ when $\hat{Q}_k^r - \gamma > 0$ and $C_k = 0$ otherwise. As noted above, when $d = 0$ and $\gamma = 1$ this transmission policy reduces to ARQ, while when $d \to \infty$ then it reduces to open-loop FEC. That is, in these two boundary cases this transmission policy reverts to the state of the art.

D. Bounding Virtual Receiver Queue

We have already seen that the end-to-end delay mostly depends on the receiver queue occupancy. The following establishes that for the class of policies $P$ with estimator (7) we can bound the queue length.

**Theorem 1.** Consider transmission policy $P$ using estimator (7). Suppose $Q_{k-d}^r - Q_k^t \leq \delta$, $\delta \geq 0$. When $0 < p < 1$ then $Q_{k-d}^r$ converges almost surely to the interval $0 \leq Q_{k-d}^r \leq \gamma + \delta + 1$.

**Proof.** Since $\hat{Q}_{k+1}^r = Q_{k-d}^r + \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j p - C_j (1 - p))$ then

$$
\hat{Q}_{k+1}^r = \hat{Q}_k^r + (Q_{k-d}^r + 1 - \hat{Q}_k^r) + (S_k - \hat{Q}_k^r) - C_k - (1 - p) \tag{11}
$$

Now $Q_{k-d}^r + 1 - \hat{Q}_k^r = |Q_{k-d}^r + S_k - A_{k-d} - C_{k-d} + (1 - X_{k-d})| \leq Q_{k-d}^r = S_k - A_{k-d} - C_{k-d} + (1 - X_{k-d})$ when $Q_{k-d}^r \geq 1$. Hence.

$$
\hat{Q}_{k+1}^r = \hat{Q}_k^r + (X_{k-d} - p)(S_{k-d}^r + C_{k-d}) + S_k p - C_{k-d} \tag{12}
$$

when $Q_{k-d}^r \geq 1$. Conversely, when $Q_{k-d}^r < 1$ then $Q_{k-d}^r = 0$ since it is non-negative and integer valued. Hence, $Q_{k-d}^r = (S_{k-d}^r - X_{k-d} - C_{k-d} + (1 - X_{k-d})) = S_{k-d}^r - X_{k-d} - C_{k-d} + (1 - X_{k-d})$ and

$$
\hat{Q}_{k+1}^r = \hat{Q}_k^r + (X_{k-d} - p)(S_{k-d} + C_{k-d}) + S_k p - C_{k-d} \tag{13}
$$

We proceed by considering the following two cases.

Case (i): $-\gamma + \hat{Q}_k^r \geq 1$. Since $-\gamma + \hat{Q}_k^r > 0$ then $C_k = 1$, $S_k = 0$. When $Q_{k-d}^r \geq 1$ then (12) applies and since $-\gamma + \hat{Q}_k^r \geq 1$ then $-\gamma + \hat{Q}_{k+1}^r = -\gamma + \hat{Q}_k^r + \Delta_k$ with $\Delta_k :=$
\(X_{k-d} - p(S_{k-d} + C_{k-d}) - (1 - p) \leq 0\). Similarly, when \(Q^r_{k-d} < 1\) then \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_{k+1} = -\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_k + \Delta^2_k\) with \(\Delta^2_k := (X_{k-d} - p)(S_{k-d} + C_{k-d}) - (1 - p) + C_k-d(1 - X_{k-d}) \leq 0\). Therefore,

\[-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_{k+1} \leq -\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_k \tag{14}\]

Observe that \(\Delta^1_k\) is strictly less than zero when \(X_{k-d} = 0\) and \(\Delta^2_k\) is strictly less than zero when \(X_{k-d} = 0\) and \(C_{k-d} = 0\). By assumption \(0 < p = \text{Prob}(X_k = 1) < 1\) and \(X_{k-d}, \forall k\) are independent of \(Q^r_k\). Hence if \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_k \geq 1\) persists then, with probability one, a slot will occur where \(X_{k-d} = 0\) and so \(\Delta^1_k < 0\). Further, when \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_k \geq 1\) and \(Q^r_{k-d} < 1\) then \(\sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (p - C_j) = \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j p - C_j (1 - p)) \geq \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j p - C_j (1 - p)) > 1 + \gamma\). Since \(p < 1\) and \(\sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (p - C_j) > 0\) it follows that \(C_j = 0\) for at least \([d(1 - p)]\) of the slots in the sum. Therefore, regardless of \((S_{k-d} + C_{k-d})\), with positive probability over any \(d\) slots a slot will occur where \(X_{k-d} = 0\), \(C_{k-d} = 0\) and \(\Delta^1_k < 0\).

Case (ii) \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_k \leq 1\). We now have two subcases to consider:

(a) When \(0 \leq -\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_k \leq 1\), then \(C_k = 1\) and \(S_k = 0\). By update (12) \(Q^r_{k+1} = \hat{Q}^r_k + (X_{k-d} - p)(S_{k-d} + C_{k-d}) - (1 - p) \leq \hat{Q}^r_k + 1 + p\) and by update (13) \(\hat{Q}^r_k + (X_{k-d} - p)(S_{k-d} + C_{k-d}) - (1 - p) + C_{k-d}(1 - X_{k-d}) \leq \hat{Q}^r_k\). Hence, \(\hat{Q}^r_{k+1} \leq \hat{Q}^r_k\) and, therefore, \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_{k+1} \leq 1\).

(b) When \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_k < 0\) then \(S_k = 0\) and \(C_k = 0\). By update (12) \(Q^r_{k+1} = \hat{Q}^r_k + (X_{k-d} - p)(S_{k-d} + C_{k-d}) + pS_k \leq \hat{Q}^r_k + p\) and by update (13) \(\hat{Q}^r_k + (X_{k-d} - p)(S_{k-d} + C_{k-d}) + pS_k + C_{k-d}(1 - X_{k-d}) \leq \hat{Q}^r_k + 1\). Therefore, \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_{k+1} \leq 1\).

We have that \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_{k+1}\) never increases and strictly decreases with positive probability when \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_k > 1\). And when \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_k \leq 1\) then \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_{k+1}\) never goes above 1. Hence, we can conclude that \(\hat{Q}^r_k\) converges almost surely and that it is indeed upper bounded by \(\hat{Q}^r_k \leq 1\). Since \(\hat{Q}^r_k - Q^r_k \leq \delta\) it follows that \(-\gamma + \hat{Q}^r_k \leq \delta + 1\), and the stated interval now follows from the fact that \(\hat{Q}^r_k \geq 0\). \(\square\)

Importantly, observe that the bound in Theorem \([\text{I}\] is in terms of the instantaneous queue length \(Q^r_k\) and applies to every sample path. It is therefore much stronger than a bound on the average queue length. Further, we can relatively easily derive good estimates for \(\delta\) and so obtain a fairly tight bound in Theorem \([\text{I}\]. For example, since

\[Q^r_k = \left[Q^r_{k-1} + (S_{k-1}X_{k-1} - C_k(1 - X_{k-1}))\right]^+ \tag{15}\]

\[\geq Q^r_{k-1} + (S_{k-1}X_{k-1} - C_k(1 - X_{k-1})) \tag{16}\]

\[\geq Q^r_{k-d} + \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j X_j - C_j(1 - X_j)) \tag{17}\]

Fig. 7: Comparison between the maximum experimental value of \(Q^r\) after running the system for \(10^6\) slots with the Chernoff bound in Lemma \([\text{I}\] and the loss bound \(Q^r_k - Q^r_k \leq \delta p\), for different feedback delays. Configuration parameters, \(a = 0.4, p = 0.6, \gamma = 1\)

then

\[\hat{Q}^r_k = Q^r_{k-d} + \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j p - C_j(1 - p)) \tag{18}\]

\[\leq Q^r_k + \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j p - C_j(1 - p)) - (S_j X_j - C_j(1 - X_j)) \tag{19}\]

and so, by rearranging the terms:

\[\hat{Q}^r_k - Q^r_k \leq \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j (p - X_j) + C_j (p - X_j)) \tag{20}\]

Since \(x_j \in \{0, 1\}\) and \(S_j + C_j = 1\) we can upper bound the RHS of (20) by \(dp\). However, when the \(X_j\) are i.i.d. we can use Chernoff’s inequality \([\text{I}\] to obtain a much tighter bound, summarised in the following Corollary:

**Corollary 1.** \(Q^r\) converges to zero \(0 \leq Q^r_k \leq \gamma + tdp + 1\) with probability \(1 - \exp^{-\frac{t}{dp}}\), \(t > 0\).

This upper bound is illustrated in Fig. \([\text{II}\] for a probability of 99\%. Also shown is the bound \(Q^r_k - Q^r_k \leq \delta p\) and the maximum value of \(Q^r\) observed in experiments over \(10^6\) slots. It can be seen that the bound in Corollary \([\text{II}\] is quite tight to the experimental data, and much better that the \(\hat{Q}^r_k - Q^r_k \leq \delta p\) bound for delays larger than about 10 slots.

From Theorem \([\text{I}\] and Corollary \([\text{II}\] it can be seen that the maximum queue length \(Q^r_k\) and so delay, tends to increase with design parameter \(\gamma\). Hence, to minimise delay we should choose parameter \(\gamma\) small. Corollary \([\text{II}\] tells us that the maximum queue length also tends to increase with the feedback delay \(d\) and with loss rate \(p\), although no more than linearly in both.

**E. Impact of Imperfect Prediction: Rate Sub-Optimality**

Transmission policies \(P\) use estimator \(\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)\) to make a \(d\)-step ahead prediction of \(Q^r_k\). As discussed in more detail later, use of prediction lowers delay. However, inevitably, this estimator will make mistakes when predicting \(Q^r_k\) due to the uncertainty in the fate of the packets “in flight”, i.e. those transmitted but
not yet acknowledged. When $\hat{Q}_k \geq \gamma$ and $Q_k^c = 0$ then the
scheduler will send extra coded packets that are not useful
(since $Q_k^c = 0$ there are no outstanding losses at the receiver). Prediction
effects therefore translate into a loss in capacity, since these extra coded packets replace information packets
that would have otherwise have been sent.

1) Capacity Achieving Transmission Policies: The following
theorem bounds the capacity loss induced by prediction errors:

**Theorem 2.** Suppose $|\hat{Q}_k - Q_k^c| \leq \delta$, $\delta > 0$ and $E[S_k|\hat{Q}_k^c] \geq
\epsilon > 0$ when $Q_k^c \leq \gamma$. Then $E[S_k] \geq (1-p) - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \delta + (1+\delta)(1-p)\right)/\gamma$ as $k \to \infty$, where $\hat{s}_k := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{S}_i$ and
$S_k \leq \hat{S}_k = 1 - C_k$.

Theorem 2 says that as parameter $\gamma \to \infty$ the transmission
slots $E[S_k]$ available for sending information packets tends
to the path capacity $1-p$. That is, the transmission policy
is capacity achieving as $\gamma \to \infty$. The requirement that
$E[S_k|\hat{Q}_k^c] \geq \epsilon > 0$ when $Q_k^c \leq \gamma$ excludes transient arrival
processes (for instance when packets arrive for a period of time
and then no further arrivals happen) and is satisfied when, for
example, the packet arrival process is ergodic and independent
of the receiver queue.

To prove Theorem 2 we make use of the following technical lemma.

**Lemma 1.** Suppose $E[S_k|\hat{Q}_k^c] \geq \epsilon > 0$ when $\hat{Q}_k^c \leq \gamma$. Then
$\gamma - (1-p) \leq E[\hat{Q}_{k+1}] \leq \gamma + p$.

**Proof.** Recall (12),

$$\hat{Q}_{k+1} = \hat{Q}_k + (X_{k-d} - p)(S_{k-d} + C_{k-d}) + S_k p - C_k(1-p)$$

(21)

when $Q_k^c \geq 1$ and (13),

$$\hat{Q}_{k+1} = \hat{Q}_k + (X_{k-d} - p)(S_{k-d} + C_{k-d}) + S_k p - C_k(1-p) + C_{k-d}(1-X_{k-d})$$

(22)

when $Q_k^c < 1$. Since $C_{k-d}(1-X_{k-d}) \geq 0$ it follows that:

$$\hat{Q}_{k+1} \geq \hat{Q}_k + (X_{k-d} - p)(S_{k-d} + C_{k-d}) + S_k p - C_k(1-p)$$

(23)

for all values of $Q_k^c$ and taking expectations with respect to the
packet arrival and loss processes,

$$E[\hat{Q}_{k+1}|\hat{Q}_k^c] \geq \hat{Q}_k + E[S_k|\hat{Q}_k^c] p - E[C_k|\hat{Q}_k^c](1-p)$$

(24)

where we have used the fact that $X_{k-d}$ is independent of $S_{k-d}
and $C_{k-d}$. We proceed by considering the following two cases.

Case (i): $-\gamma + \hat{Q}_k^c \leq 0$. Then $C_k = 0$, and $S_k \in \{0, 1\}$:

$$-\gamma + E[\hat{Q}_{k+1}|\hat{Q}_k^c] \geq -\gamma + \hat{Q}_k^c + E[S_k|\hat{Q}_k^c] p$$

(25)

Since $E[S_k|\hat{Q}_k^c] \geq \epsilon > 0$, then it follows that $-\gamma + E[\hat{Q}_{k+1}|\hat{Q}_k^c] \leq E[S_k|\hat{Q}_k^c] p \leq p$.

Case (ii): $-\gamma + \hat{Q}_k^c > 0$. Then $C_k = 1$, $S_k = 0$, and:

$$-\gamma + E[\hat{Q}_{k+1}|\hat{Q}_k^c] \geq -\gamma + \hat{Q}_k^c - (1-p)$$

(26)

and $-\gamma + E[\hat{Q}_{k+1}|\hat{Q}_k^c] \geq -\gamma + E[\hat{Q}_{k+1}|\hat{Q}_k^c] > -(1-p)$.

Hence, when $-\gamma + E[\hat{Q}_{k+1}|\hat{Q}_k^c]$ is outside the interval
$[-(1-p), p]$ then it is strictly attracted to this interval, and
once it is within it, it stays there. The latter holds regardless of
the values of $Q_k^c$ and so we have that $-(1-p) \leq -\gamma + E[\hat{Q}_{k+1}] \leq p$ as claimed.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** We have that

$$\begin{align*}
(Q_{k+1})^2 &= (|Q_k^c + S_k - (1-X_k)|^+)^2 \\
&\leq (|Q_k^c + \hat{S}_k - (1-X_k)|^+)^2 \\
&= (Q_k^c)^2 + 2(\hat{S}_k - (1-X_k))Q_k^c \\
&\quad + (\hat{S}_k - (1-X_k))^2)
\end{align*}$$

(27)

(28)

(29)

Applying this recursively we have, $(Q_{k+1})^2 \leq (Q_k^c)^2 +
2\sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{S}_i - (1-X_i))Q_i^c + \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{S}_i - (1-X_i))^2$. That
is,

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{S}_i - (1-X_i))Q_i^c \geq -\eta - \frac{1}{2}$$

(30)

since $0 \leq (\hat{S}_i - (1-X_i))^2 \leq 1$, where $\eta := \frac{1}{\lambda_k}(Q_k^c)$. Adding
and subtracting $\gamma\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{S}_i - (1-p))\right)$ to the LHS yields:

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k ((-\gamma + Q_i^c)\hat{S}_i - (1-X_i)(Q_i^c - \gamma))$$

$$+ \gamma(\hat{s}_k - (1-p)) \right) \geq -\eta - \frac{1}{2}$$

(31)

where $\tau_k := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k X_i$.

The scheduler selects $\hat{S}_i \in \arg\min_{S \in \{0, 1\}}(-\gamma + \hat{Q}_i)S$.

When $\hat{Q}_i \geq \gamma$ then $\hat{S}_i = 0$ and otherwise $\hat{S}_i = 1$. Hence,
$(-\gamma + \hat{Q}_i)\hat{S}_i \leq 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ and so $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (-\gamma + \hat{Q}_i)\hat{S}_i \leq 0$. Since $|\hat{Q}_i - Q_i^c| \leq \delta$ and $\hat{S}_i \in \{0, 1\}$ then
$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (-\gamma + \hat{Q}_i)\hat{S}_i \geq -\delta$. Combining this with (31) and
taking expectation over the loss and arrival processes yields

$$\gamma E[S_i] - (1-p) \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (1-p)(E[Q_i^c] - \gamma) - \eta - \frac{1}{2} - \delta$$

(32)

where we have used the fact that $X_i$ is independent of $Q_i^c$.

By Lemma 1 and the fact that $|\hat{Q}_i - Q_i^c| \leq \delta$ we have that
$E[Q_i^c] - \gamma \geq 1 - \delta$. Combining this with (32) yields

$$\gamma E[S_i] - (1-p) \geq -(1+\delta)(1-p) - \eta - \delta - \frac{1}{2}$$

(33)

and the claimed result now follows by rearranging and using the
fact that $\eta \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

2) Estimating Rate Sub-Optimality For Small $\gamma$: Lemma 2

**Lemma 2** tells us that for $\gamma$ large enough our scheduler is capacity
achieving, even where the feedback delay, $d$, is greater than zero.

However, this is not as comforting as it might seem at first sight since Theorem 1 also tells us that large $\gamma$ can lead to a large receiver queue and so large decoding delays. By taking a different analysis approach, however, we can
obtain fairly good estimates of the capacity loss induced by prediction errors when $\gamma$ is small. These estimates indicate that the capacity loss is moderate.

Recall that under transmission policy $P$, when $Q_k > \gamma$ then a coded packet is transmitted. However, if $Q_k = 0$ then this coded packet is not useful, since there is no outstanding receiver queue i.e. no outstanding packet loss that bound benefit from the coded packet. Defining random variable $R_k$ which takes value 1 when $Q_k > \gamma$ and $Q_k = 0$ and 0 otherwise then $\bar{r} = \frac{1}{K} \lim_{K \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{K} R_k$ is the transmission rate for redundant coded packets. We would like to estimate $\bar{r}$.

To proceed we make the following simplifying assumptions: (i) feedback is only received every $d$ slots, (ii) either an information packet or a coded packet is transmitted in every slot, (iii) $\gamma = 0$, and (iv) $Q_k = 0$ for $k = id + 1, i = 0, 1, \ldots$. Assumption (i) means that we have less knowledge of the decoder status and so expect the number of redundant packets transmitted to be larger i.e. we expect our estimate of $\bar{r}$ to be larger than the true value.

By assumption (i), at slots $k = id + 1, i = 0, 1, \ldots$ we perform update

$$\hat{Q}_k = Q_k + \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j p - C_j (1-p))$$

(34)

and

$$\hat{Q}_k = Q_k + dp - \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} C_j \leq \hat{Q}_k + dp$$

(35)

where in step (a) we have used assumption (ii) that $S_j + C_j = 1$. By assumptions (iii) and (iv), over the next $d$ slots $\{k, \ldots, k+d\}$ then at most $[dp]$ coded packets will be sent (fewer packets may be sent depending on the sample path $S_j, j \in \{k-d, \ldots, k\}$ and when the threshold $\gamma > 0$). Letting $U_k = \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} S_j X_j$ denote the number of erasure information packets then the number of redundant coded packets transmitted over slots $\{k+1, \ldots, k+d\}$ is upper bounded by $\max\{0, [dp] - U_k\}$. Letting $a_k = \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} S_j$ denote the number of information packets sent over slots $\{k-d, \ldots, k\}$ then $U_k$ is distributed as $P(U_k = u) = B(da_k, p, u)$, where $B$ is the Binomial distribution. Approximating $da_k$ by $[da]$ then an estimate of the number of redundant coded packets transmitted over interval $\{k+1, \ldots, k+d\}$, normalised by the interval duration $d$, is

$$\hat{r} = \frac{[dp]}{d} B ([d \cdot a], p, u)$$

(36)

Despite the assumptions made in deriving (36), empirical tests indicate that the estimator is nevertheless quite accurate. For example, Fig. 8 compares estimate $\hat{r}$ with the measured average number of redundant packets transmitted $\bar{r}$ as the feedback delay and loss rate $p$ is varied. It can be seen that $\hat{r}$ is essentially an upper bound on $\bar{r}$, and while it becomes less accurate as the loss rate $p$ increases it stays reasonably close to the true value. Observe also that in Fig. 8 the mean rate $a = 0.6$ of packet arrivals is significantly less than the path capacity $1-p = 0.9$ and so assumption (ii) (persistent queue backlog at the transmitter) is violated, nevertheless the estimate $\hat{r}$ remains accurate.

These results in Fig. 8 indicate that the capacity loss due to the transmission of redundant packets generally stays below 5%. However, observe also that when the delay $d$ is less than the reciprocal of the loss rate $1/p$ then no redundant packets are sent i.e. $\hat{r} = 0$. This behaviour is accurately captured by $\hat{r}$ (since $[dp] = 1$ when $d < 1/p$ in (36)). Hence, on links with lower loss larger feedback delays can be tolerated without incurring redundant packet transmissions e.g. for $p = 0.01$ (a typical path loss rate in the Internet) feedback delays of up to 100 slots yield $\hat{r} = 0$.

**F. Performance Evaluation**

We conclude this section by comparing the performance of the transmission policies introduced here with state of the art alternatives, namely (i) ARQ, (ii) random linear block codes and (iii) the low delay code construction from [11]. Note that the latter two are open-loop approaches, i.e. do not make use of feedback to trigger transmission of extra packets. Fig. 9 plots the measured end-to-end delay Vs. the feedback delay for these schemes. As expected, for the block code and
γ = 1

95% confidence intervals. Various coding approaches. Configuration parameters are a = 0.7, p = 0.2, k = 50 and γ = 1, block size 50. The data is for 10^4 slots repeated 100 times and the figure also shows the 95% confidence intervals.

Fig. 9: End-to-end delay vs feedback delay (d) for ARQ and various coding approaches. Configuration parameters are a = 0.7, p = 0.2, k = 50, γ = 1, block size 50. The data is for 10^4 slots repeated 100 times and the figure also shows the 95% confidence intervals.

Low delay coding schemes the end-to-end delay is constant, and does not vary with the feedback delay, also the end-to-end delay with the low delay code construction is around half of that for the block code (which is consistent with the results reported in [1]). It can be seen that with ARQ the end-to-end delay increases linearly with the feedback delay d, and for delays greater than 40 slots the end-to-end delay with ARQ is larger than with any of the other approaches. However, for lower feedback delays the end-to-end delay with ARQ is lower than for the two open-loop coding schemes. The class of transmission policies introduced here provides a balance between ARQ and the low delay code construction. Namely, when the feedback delay is low its end-to-end delay performance is similar to that of ARQ (which is known to be delay optimal when the feedback delay is zero) and as the feedback delay becomes large its end-to-end performance is similar to that of the low delay code construction. For intermediate values of feedback delay, the proposed class of transmission policies offers lower end-to-end delay than any of the competing approaches.

As noted above, the use of prediction introduces a trade-off between delay and rate, since prediction errors lead to transmission of redundant coded packets. In comparison ARQ, which is purely reactive and involves no prediction, is capacity achieving but at the cost of increased end-to-end delay compared to when prediction is used (see Fig. 9). The trade-off between delay and rate seems like a fundamental once since predictions allow lower delay to be achieved, but prediction errors are inevitable when losses are stochastic. Fig. 10 explores this trade-off in more detail. For a fixed packet loss rate p this figure plots the achieved transmission rate $\bar{s}$ of information packets as the arrival rate $\bar{a}$ approaches capacity, namely $\bar{a} = 1 - p - \epsilon$ where $\epsilon$ is indicated on the x-axis of the plot. It can be seen that when $\epsilon \gg 0$, the achieved transmission rate equals the arrival rate for all four schemes. However, as the arrival rate approaches capacity ($\epsilon \to 0$) the achieved transmission rate falls below the arrival rate for all schemes apart from ARQ. Since we use a fixed block size, the block code is not capacity achieving and this behaviour is to be expected. Similarly, the low delay code construction incurs an overhead at the end of a connection. Interestingly, observe that the achieved transmission rate with the transmission policy introduced here is higher than either of these schemes, that is the loss in capacity due to redundant coded transmissions is lower.

V. Generalising to Networks of Links

Assuming, for simplicity, that the arrival queue $Q_k$ is persistently backlogged then transmission policy $P$ is,

$$C_k \in \arg \min_{C \in \{0,1\}} (-\hat{Q}_k + \gamma)C$$ (37)

$$Q_{k+1}^r = [Q_k^r + S_k \cdot X_k - C_k(1 - X_k)]^+$$ (38)

$$\hat{Q}_k^r = Q_{k-d}^r + \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} (S_j p - C_j(1-p))$$ (39)

$$S_k = 1 - C_k$$ (40)

This is a natural threshold-based policy, namely a coded packet is sent whenever the virtual receiver queue is larger than $\gamma$, combined with use of predictor $\hat{Q}_k^r$ to mitigate the impact of the feedback delay $d$. In this section we show that it can also be viewed as an approximate dual-subgradient update for an associated convex optimisation problem. As well as being of interest in its own right, this connection allows the rich body of results on convex optimisation to be brought to bear on analysis and design and also leads to the immediate generalisation of policy $P$ to networks of lossy links.

A. Using Policy $P$ Within Convex Optimisation

Consider the convex optimisation $C$,

$$\min_{s \in [0,1]} -s$$ (41)

$$s \leq 1 - p$$ (42)

where it will be helpful to think of $s$ as the average rate of transmission of information packets. Letting $c = 1 - s$ (which can think of as the average rate of transmission of coded packets) the constraint $s \leq 1 - p$ ensures that $sp \leq c(1-p)$, so enough coded packets are sent to recover from packet losses. Trivially, this optimisation has the solution $s = 1 - p$, but this is not where our interest lies. Rather, our interest is in the relationship between this optimisation and policy $P$. 
Optimisation $C$ is convex and provided $0 \leq p < 1$ then the interior of the feasible set is non-empty i.e. the Slater condition is satisfied and so strong duality holds. The Lagrangian is $L(s, \lambda) := -s + \lambda(s - (1 - p))$ and the standard dual subgradient update for solving the optimisation is:

$$s_k \in \arg\min_{s \in [0,1]} L(s, \lambda_k) \equiv \arg\min_{s \in (0,1)} (-1 + \lambda_k)s$$

$$\lambda_{k+1} = [\lambda_k + \frac{1}{\gamma}(s_k - (1 - p))]^+$$

(43)

(44)

where step size $1/\gamma > 0$ and equality (a) follows by dropping the terms in $L(s, \lambda)$ that do not depend on $s$ (and so do not affect the $s$ that minimises $L(s, \lambda)$) and noting that the solution must lie at an extreme point i.e. 0 or 1. Defining $q_k = \gamma \lambda_k$ then this dual subgradient update can be rewritten equivalently as:

$$c_k \in \arg\min_{c \in [0,1]} (-q_k + \gamma)c$$

$$q_{k+1} = [q_k + s_k p - c_k(1 - p)]^+$$

$$s_k = 1 - c_k$$

(45)

(46)

(47)

The similarity of this update with transmission policy $P$ is immediately apparent, including the fact that $s_k$ and $c_k$ are $\{0, 1\}$ valued. However, it can be seen that there are also number of important differences: (i) the average loss rate $p$ is used rather than the loss rate process $\{X_k\}$, (ii) scaled multiplier $q_k$ is a real-valued quantity whereas packet queue $Q_k$ is integer valued, (iii) feedback delay $d$ is ignored. Nevertheless, despite these differences, recent results on approximate convex optimisation in [18] can be used to establish a strong connection between the update generated by policy $P$ and the optimal solution to optimisation $C$.

We proceed as follows. Letting $\epsilon_k = (\hat{Q}_k - Q_k)/\gamma$ and $\delta_k = (S_k \cdot X_k - C_k(1 - X_k)) - (S_k p - C_k(1 - p)) = X_k - p$ then we can write transmission policy $P$ equivalently as:

$$C_k \in \arg\min_{C \in [0,1]} (-\hat{Q}_k + \gamma)C$$

$$Q_{k+1}^c = [Q_k^c + S_k p - C_k(1 - p) + \delta_k]$$

$$\hat{Q}_k = Q_k^c + \gamma \epsilon_k$$

$$S_k = 1 - C_k$$

(48)

(49)

(50)

(51)

We recall the following, which corresponds to [18] Theorem 1.

**Theorem 3.** Consider the convex optimisation:

$$\min_{x \in X} f(x) \quad s.t. \quad g(x) + \delta \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m$$

where $f : X \rightarrow R$, $g : X \rightarrow R^m$ are convex functions, $X$ is a bounded convex subset of $R^n$ and $\delta \in R^m$. Let dual function $h(\lambda, \delta) := \inf_{x \in X} f(x) + \lambda^T g(x) + \delta$ and consider the update

$$\lambda_{k+1} = [\lambda_k + \alpha \partial h(\mu_k, \delta_k)]^+$$

(52)

where $\mu_k = \lambda_k + \epsilon_k$ with $\lambda_1 \in R^+$ and $\{\epsilon_k\}$ a sequence of points from $R^+$ such that $\mu_k \geq 0$ for all $k$. Suppose the Slater condition is satisfied and that $\delta_k$ is an ergodic stochastic process with expected value $\delta$ and $E(\|\delta_k - \delta\|_2^2) = \sigma^2$ for some finite $\sigma^2$. Further, suppose that $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \|\epsilon_i\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for all $k$ and some $\epsilon \geq 0$. Then,

(i) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |E(f(\bar{x}_k) - f^*(\delta))| \leq \frac{\alpha M}{2} + 2\epsilon \sigma_g$

(ii) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E(g(\bar{x}_k) + \delta) \leq 0$

(iii) $E\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i\right) < \infty \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots$

where $\bar{x}_k = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k x_i$ and $M = \sigma^2 + \sigma^2$.

Applying this to optimisation $C$ and identifying [48]-[51] with perturbed update [52] we obtain the following:

**Lemma 2.** Suppose loss process $\{X_k\}$ is ergodic. Then under policy $P$ we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |E[\hat{S}_k] - (1 - p)| \leq \frac{1+\delta}{\gamma}$, where $\hat{S}_k := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k S_i$, and $E\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k Q_i\right) < \infty$ for all $k$.

**Proof.** To apply Theorem 3 we need to show for $\epsilon_k = (\hat{Q}_k - Q_k)/\gamma$ and $\delta_k = X_k - p$ that (i) $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon_i \leq \epsilon$ and (ii) $\delta_k$ has finite variance $\sigma^2$. Observing that $\gamma |\hat{Q}_k - Q_k| \leq \gamma |\hat{Q}_k - Q_k|\gamma^2$ then (i) follows immediately with $\epsilon = d/\gamma$. Since $X_k \in \{0, 1\}$ then $|\delta_k| \leq 1$ and it follows immediately that $\delta_k$ has finite variance $\sigma^2 \leq 1$.

Observe that the bound on $E[\hat{S}_k]$ in Lemma 2 is not especially useful when $\gamma$ is small, nor the bound on $E\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k Q_i\right)$. It is for this reason that it was necessary to derive the much tighter bounds in the previous section that are specialised to the policy $P$. Nevertheless, the approach used to derive Lemma 2 is of considerable interest because it can be used to show that transmission policy $P$ can be embedded as a building block within solution updates for general convex optimisation problems and not only will behave sensibly, but can be analysed via Theorem 3 and related results from the area of approximate convex optimisation. We illustrate this in more detail in the next section.

**B. Example: Multipath Transmission**

Suppose we have $n$ paths available between our source and destination nodes, and $m$ flows. Each flow is divided into $n$ subflows, one corresponding to each of the possible paths. Let $s_f$ denote the rate at which information packets from flow $f$ are sent, $p_{f,i}$ denote the packet loss rate experienced by the subflow of flow $f$ over path $i$ and $r_{f,i}$ denote the fraction of the capacity of path $i$ allocated to flow $f$. Formulate the utility fair optimisation,

$$\min_{0 \leq s_f \leq \sum_{i=1}^n r_{f,i} x_i \in U} - \sum_{f=1}^n s_f$$

$$s_f \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - p_{f,i}\right) r_{f,i}$$

(53)

(54)

where $r_i = [r_{1,i}, \ldots, r_{m,i}]^T$ is the vector allocating the capacity of link $i$ amongst the flows and $U = \{r_i : \sum_{i=1}^n r_{f,i} \leq 1, r_{i,f} \geq 0\}$ is the unit simplex. Letting $s_f = \sum_{i=1}^n s_{f,i}$ and $c_{f,i} = r_{f,i} - s_{f,i}$, the constraint $s_f \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - p_{f,i}) r_{f,i}$
ensures that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{f,i} s_{f,i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 - p_{f,i}) c_{f,i}$, i.e. that enough coded packets are sent to recover from packet loss.

The Lagrangian is $L(s, r, \lambda) = -\sum_{f=1}^{m} s_{f} + \sum_{f} \lambda_{f}(s_{f} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 - p_{f,i}) r_{f,i})$ and the Frank-Wolfe variant of the dual subgradient update is

$$r_{i,k+1} \in \arg \min_{r_{i} \in U} \sum_{f=1}^{m} (-Q_{f,k}(1 - p_{f,i})) r_{f,i} \quad (55)$$

$$s_{f,k+1} \in \arg \min_{s \in \{0, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{f,i}\}} (-1/\alpha + Q_{f,k}) s \quad (56)$$

$$Q_{f,k+1} = [Q_{f,k} + s_{f,k} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 - p_{f,i}) r_{f,i}]^{+} \quad (57)$$

where $f = 1, \ldots, m$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $Q_{f,k} = \lambda_{f,k}/\alpha$. Since $s_{f,k+1}$ and $r_{f,k+1}$ are the solutions of linear programmes their values lie at an extreme point and so the updates can be equivalently replaced by $r_{i,k+1} = \arg \min_{r_{i} \in E} \sum_{f=1}^{m} (-Q_{f,k}(1 - p_{f,i})) r_{f,i}$ and $s_{f,k+1} = \arg \min_{s \in \{0, \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{f,i}\}} (-1/\alpha + Q_{f,k}) s$ where $E$ is the set of extreme points of unit simplex $U$, i.e. consisting of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ with all elements zero apart from one non-zero element having value 1.

Replacing $Q_{f,k}$ with an approximate scaled multiplier $Q_{f,k}^{r}$ yields the update

$$R_{i,k+1} \in \arg \min_{R_{i} \in E} \sum_{f=1}^{m} (-Q_{f,k}^{r}(1 - p_{f,i})) R_{f,i} \quad (58)$$

$$\hat{S}_{f,k+1} \in \arg \min_{S_{f} \in \{0, \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_{f,i}\}} (-1/\alpha + Q_{f,k}^{r}) S \quad (59)$$

$$Q_{f,k+1}^{r} = [Q_{f,k}^{r} + \hat{S}_{f,k} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 - X_{f,i}) R_{f,i}]^{+} \quad (60)$$

We can map this update onto the following physical setup. $\hat{S}_{f,k}$ is the number of information packets from flow $f$ to be transmitted in slot $k$. Note that $\hat{S}_{f,k+1}$ might take a value greater than 1 if multiple link transmit slots are available to flow $f$. Selecting $R_{f,i,k}$ = 1 corresponds to allocating transmission slot $k$ on link $i$ to a packet from flow $f$. When $S_{f,k} = 0$ (no information packet is to be sent) then a coded packet is sent, $C_{f,i,k} = 1$, otherwise $\hat{S}_{f,k} = 1$. $Q_{f,k+1}^{r}$ is the occupancy of the receive queue for flow $f$, increasing on loss of an information packet and decreasing on reception of a coded packet when we define $X_{f,i,k} = 1$ when there is a packet erasure for flow $f$ on path $i$ in slot $k$.

$\hat{S}_{f,k+1}$ is selected according to a threshold rule, namely non-zero when $Q_{f,k}^{r} < 1/\alpha$ and a transmission slot is available (i.e. when $\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_{f,i} > 0$). Element $f$ of $R_{i,k+1}$ takes value 1 (corresponding to transmitting a packet from flow $f$ on link $i$ in slot $k + 1$) when the backlog $Q_{f,k}^{r}(1 - p_{f,i})$ for flow $f$ is largest amongst the flows.

In Fig. 11 we can see the performance of this multipath scheme for a scenario with 3 information flows and 3 paths, $m = n = 3$. Flows sharing the same path see the same loss probability and we vary the packet loss rate from 0.0 to 0.4 over the first path, keeping the other two with a fixed erasure probability of 0.1. We used a delay of 10 slots, but experiments run with other delays yielded the same performance. Fig. 11a shows the individual rates for every flow as the loss rate in the first path is varied, from which it can be seen that the capacity is equally shared. Fig. 11b also shows aggregate rate, which is obtained by summing the individual flow throughputs. It can be seen that the rate of the proposed multipath scheduler is close to the system capacity. Fig. 12 plots the measured end-to-end delay as the feedback delay is varied.

We now compare the application end-to-end delay of our proposed scheme, with that exhibited by a legacy solution when the feedback delay increases. In this case, we use again the prediction of the queue at each flow: $Q_{r,k,f}^{c} = Q_{k-d,f}^{c} + \sum_{j=k-d}^{k-1} \{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (S_{k,j,f} p_{f,i} - C_{k,f,i}(1 - p_{f,i}))\}$, as was done for the single link scenario. We still use three links and three different paths ($m = n = 3$), but now fix the packet loss rate to 0.2 over all links (recall that all flows are equally affected by such erasures). We also assume an arrival rate of $a = \frac{3}{2}$, again for the three flows. As a baseline for comparison we also show data for a traditional ARQ scheme where the scheduler uses a Round-Robin approach to distribute flow transmissions across the paths. It can be seen that the behavior is mostly the same as that observed over a single path and, in particular, that as the feedback delay increases, the proposed scheme clearly outperforms ARQ, yielding much lower delays.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have proposed a joint coding/scheduling scheme to be used over packet erasure paths. We have posed
Fig. 12: Application (e2e) delay vs. feedback delay (\(D_f\)) for an ARQ scheme and our proposal. Configuration parameters are arrival rate \(\alpha = 0.7\), loss rate \(p = 0.2\) for all paths and \(\alpha = 1\). The results are averaged after running the experiment during \(10^5\) slots and the figure also shows the 95% confidence intervals.

an optimization problem, which is solved by means of discrete decisions, and the source node can decide: to send a native packet, to transmit a coded packet, or to do nothing. We have shown that this discrete decision method yields an optimum behavior, ensuring in addition system stability. We have assessed the validity of the model, by means of an extensive simulation-based analysis, in which we have considered the impact of having delayed feedback.

Knowing the status of the decoder after some delay has been usually overlooked when studying the performance of coding solutions. For ideal feedback channels it is well known that ARQ yields the best performance. However, under realistic situations, the obtained results have shown that the joint coder/scheduler clearly outperforms legacy solutions. The proposed approach shows the same throughput as the one seen for the ARQ case, while it does not increase the end-to-end delay.

We have also proposed some practical bounds for the corresponding queue lengths, which were afterwards used to analyze the overhead caused by the transmission of unneeded (dummy) packets. The simulation results show that they are indeed rather tight, and that the proposed predictor for the queue occupancy behaves quite accurately. Hence, they can be exploited to take better coding/scheduling decisions in different setups. Last, we have also studied the proposed model over a multi-path communication scenario, where it again outperforms a legacy solution.
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