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Abstract

Motivated by the demand of ultra reliable and low latency communications, we employ tools from information theory, stochastic processes and queueing theory, in order to provide a comprehensive framework regarding the analysis of a Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) network with bursty traffic, in the finite blocklength regime. Specifically, we re-examine the stability conditions, evaluate the optimal throughput, and identify the optimal trade off between data packet size and latency. The evaluation is performed both numerically and via the proposed approximations that result in closed form expressions. Then, we examine the stability conditions and the performance of the Multiple Access Relay Channel with TDMA scheduling, subject to finite blocklength constraints, by applying a cognitive cooperation protocol that assumes relaying is enabled when sources are idle. Finally, we propose the novel Batch-And-Forward (BAF) strategy, that can significantly enhance the performance of cooperative networks in the finite blocklength regime, as well as reduce the requirement in metadata. The BAF strategy is quite versatile, thus, it can be embedded in existing cooperative protocols, without imposing additional complexity on the overall scheme.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Future wireless services will support a wide range of applications with a high discrepancy of their performance criteria, such as, very low latency (<1ms), very high data rates (>1Gbps), and ultra-high reliability (block error probability < 10^{-8}). According to the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), these services are classified as Enhanced Mobile Broadband, Massive Machine-Type Communications and Ultra-Reliable Low-Latency Communications (URLLC) [1]. The concept of URLLC emerged to support a vast family of applications that require the simultaneous consideration of latency and reliability criteria, and is a key factor for many vertical markets, including, autonomous vehicles, remote healthcare, industrial automation and mission critical communications. The majority of these applications will be supported by current and future wireless communication networks.

Although Shannon’s information theory has evolved over the years to include applications in a wide range of fields related to communications, such as, compression, coding and statistics, it has failed to leave its distinct mark in the field of communication networks [2]. One of the main reasons that led to this result, is the asymptotic nature of information theory which cannot sufficiently address the finite blocklength constraints in communication applications [2], [3]. Fortunately, recent results [4]–[6] provide valuable tools regarding the analysis of communication networks in the finite blocklength regime. These results were applied to address the requirement of low latency from various perspectives, such as, the characterization of finite blocklength rates for various channels [7], [8], the performance evaluation of short length codes [9], and the performance analysis of communication protocols [10]. On topics related to cooperation in multiple access channels, though there is an extensive literature that spans from the performance analysis [11] to protocol design [12], [13], and from relay selection [14] to full-duplex cooperative relaying [15], the vast majority of the existing literature regards asymptotic, in terms of blocklength, analysis. Thus, though these techniques can be employed in the context of finite blocklength, they do not necessarily perform in an optimal manner.

In view of the above limitations, we apply tools from information theory, stochastic processes and queueing theory, in order to provide a comprehensive framework regarding the performance analysis of these networks, in the finite blocklength regime. We apply the emerged framework in order to reexamine the stability of the non cooperative Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) network, subject to finite blocklength constraints. The analysis adopts a packet-based network view of cooperation with bursty
sources. Subsequently, we extend the results to the case of Multiple Access Relay Channel (MARC) with TDMA scheduling. The selected cognitive cooperation protocol [11], which is based on the underlay cognitive radio concept, assumes relaying is enabled when sources are silent (idle). Although the cognitive cooperation protocol improves the performance of the network, this improvement is disproportionate to the additional complexity and resources that it entails. The reason for the insufficient performance is that existing cooperative protocols are not designed to perform optimally in the finite blocklength regime. Towards this direction, we propose a novel strategy that can significantly enhance the performance of networks that employ short codes.

The key contributions of this paper are:

i) We characterize the stability region of the TDMA network subject to finite blocklength constraints. We investigate the concavity properties of the throughput, and evaluate the optimal throughput and the optimal trade-off between data packet size and latency. The evaluation is performed both numerically and via the proposed approximations that result to closed form expressions.

ii) We characterize the stability region and the throughput of the MARC-TDMA network subject to finite blocklength constraints, for a particular cognitive cooperation protocol.

iii) We propose the Batch-And-Forward (BAF) strategy which can improve the performance of the network, in the finite blocklength regime. We embed this strategy in the discussed cognitive cooperation protocol, and show via numerical evaluation that the overall performance is significantly enhanced. Although the performance is evaluated for a particular cooperative protocol, the proposed strategy is quite versatile, thus, it can be embedded in the majority of existing cooperative techniques, without imposing additional complexity.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we briefly review the recent results in finite blocklength analysis. In Section III, we describe the model and the underlying assumptions, prove the stability conditions for the overall queueing system in the finite blocklength regime, and evaluate the overall throughput and the optimal trade-off between data length and channel’s blocklength. In Section IV, we examine the cooperation in the finite blocklength regime, and in Section V, we discuss the proposed BAF strategy and provide numerical evaluation of its performance.
II. Preliminaries on Finite Blocklength Analysis

The capacity of a memoryless channel, characterized by the conditional distribution \( P_{Y|X}(y|x) \), is given by Shannon’s celebrated single letter expression

\[
C = \max_{P_X(x)} I(X;Y) = \max E [i(x;y)],
\]

(1)

where \( X \) is the channel input symbol, \( Y \) is the channel output symbol, \( E \) is the expectation with respect to the joint distribution \( P_{X,Y}(x,y) \), \( I(X;Y) \) is the mutual information between the random variable \( X \) and the random variable \( Y \), and \( i(x;y) \triangleq \left\{ \log \frac{P_{Y|X}(y|x)}{P_Y(y)} \right\} \) is the information density.

Shannon’s capacity, has a natural operational definition that associates the rate of information and the reliability, that is, the highest coding rate, in which there exist an encoder-decoder pair that achieve arbitrary small probability of error. The error probability itself is shown to vanish asymptotically with the length of the code, as long as the transmission rate is below capacity. Given \( R^*(n,\varepsilon) \), which denotes the optimal rate for fixed blocklength \( n \), and block error probability, \( \varepsilon \), Shannon’s capacity is defined as follow.

\[
C = \lim_{n \to \infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} R^*(n,\varepsilon).
\]

(2)

Despite the tremendous theoretical importance of Shannon’s capacity, the prerequisite of infinite length codes severely limits its practical importance. This limitation becomes even more critical for communication applications where low latency is imperative. The above problem can be addressed via the optimal fixed blocklength rate, \( R^*(n,\varepsilon) \), which eliminates the necessity of infinitely large codes imposed directly by the definition of capacity. While, in general, \( R^*(n,\varepsilon) \) is an NP-hard problem \[3\], \[16\], the recent work of Polyanskiy, Poor and Vedru \[4\], among others, refines Strassen’s normal approximation of \( R^*(n,\varepsilon) \) \[17\], and provides an attractive tight approximation for it. In particular, they proved that for a class of channel models with positive capacity, \( C \), \( R^*(n,\varepsilon) \) is given by

\[
R^*(n,\varepsilon) = C - \sqrt{\frac{V}{n}} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right),
\]

(3)

where \( C \) is the ergodic capacity, \( V \) is the channel’s dispersion, which is by definition the minimum variance of information density over all capacity achieving input distributions \[4\], \( Q^{-1}(\cdot) \) is the inverse of the Gaussian Q-function and \( O(\log n/n) \) comprises of the higher order terms. Providing closed form expressions for the channel’s dispersion, it is perhaps the most challenging task regarding the evaluation of
the finite blocklength rate. Over the past few years, this challenge was successfully addressed for various channels (see [3] and references within). In particular, for the Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN) channel, the channel’s capacity and dispersion are given by

\[ C = \frac{1}{2} \log_2(1 + \text{SNR}), \]  

\[ V = \frac{\text{SNR}}{2} \frac{\text{SNR} + 2}{(\text{SNR} + 1)^2} (\log_2 e)^2, \]

respectively, where \( \text{SNR} \) denotes the signal to noise ratio, while the finite blocklength rate subject to equal-power constraint is approximated by

\[ R^*(n, \varepsilon) \approx C - \sqrt{\frac{V}{n}} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon). \]

Substituting \( R^*(n, \varepsilon) = \frac{k}{n} \), where \( k \) denotes the size of the data packet, and solving with respect to the block error probability \( \varepsilon \), we obtain

\[ \varepsilon(k,n) \approx Q\left(\frac{nC - k}{\sqrt{nV}}\right). \]

The probability of successful transmission for a code of blocklength \( n \), \( P_c(k,n) \), is the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of the normal distribution, and it is expressed as

\[ P_c(k,n) = 1 - \varepsilon(k,n) \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{nC - k}{\sqrt{nV}}} e^{-\frac{z^2}{2}} dz. \]

The recent work in [5], refined the approximation given in (6), by providing the third order term in the normal approximation for the AWGN channel, that resulted in the following expressions

\[ R^*(n, \varepsilon) \approx C - \sqrt{\frac{V}{n}} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + \frac{\log_2(n)}{2n}, \]

\[ P_c(k,n) \approx 1 - Q\left(\frac{nC - k + 0.5 \log_3 n}{\sqrt{nV}}\right). \]

III. Stability for the Non Cooperative Scheme on the Finite Blocklength Regime

In this section, we characterize the stability region and evaluate the performance of the non cooperative TDMA scheme depicted in Fig. [1] in the finite blocklength regime. Moreover, we evaluate the optimal throughput and the trade off between data size and blocklenght, both numerically and via the proposed approximations.
A. Model description

We consider a model with two source terminals, A and B, with infinite buffer memories, and a single destination node D. At each time slot, data packets of length $k_i$, $i \in \{A, B\}$, arrive at the source terminal $i \in \{A, B\}$, according to a Bernoulli distribution with probability $p_i$. The expected value of arrivals at each time slot is $\lambda_i = p_i$, $\forall i \in \{A, B\}$. The terminals then encode the data packet into a codeword of length $n$, and access the channel through a TDMA scheduling with probability $\omega_i$, where $0 \leq \omega_i \leq 1$, and $\omega_A + \omega_B = 1$ [18]. We assume that at each time slot, $n$ channel uses are employed and solely allocated to source terminal $i$, with probability $\omega_i$. The channel is an AWGN channel with zero mean and variance $\sigma^2$. The destination, after receiving and decoding the codeword, sends Acknowledgement/ Negative-Acknowledgement (ACK/NACK) back to the respective source terminal, to inform it about the status of the transmission. In the case of a correct transmission, the respective source terminal discards the data packet from its buffer memory. In the opposite case, the data packet remains in the buffer memory and waits for the next available time slot for retransmission.

The probability of an erroneous transmission for a packet, generated by terminal $i$ at a given time slot, is denoted by $P_e(k_i, n)$. The service (departure) process is Bernoulli distributed with probability $q_i = \omega_i (1 - P_e(k_i, n))$. Since both the arrivals and departures are Bernoulli distributed, the time of an arrival and the time of a departure to occur, measured in slots, is characterized by a geometric distribution. The system at each terminal $i \in \{A, B\}$ can be described by a discrete time Markov process with states $\{S_i, i \geq 0\}$, which denote the number of packets in the system. The associated Discrete Time Markov
Fig. 2: Discrete Time Markov Chain for queue $i, i \in \{A,B\}$, where $\overline{p}_i = 1 - p_i$ and $\overline{q}_i = 1 - q_i$.

Chain (DTMC) of the Geo/Geo/1 queue \cite{19}, of each terminal is depicted in Fig. 2.

B. Stability analysis

Our first objective is to study the maximum rate that can be supported by the network. Towards this direction, we prove that network stability is possible, if and only if, the overall rate of the system is less than the throughput. We assume that the size of the data packets that arrive at the two source terminals is identical, that is, $k_A = k_B = k$, and we denote the probability of a successful transmission by $P_c(k,n)$.

**Theorem 1.** Let $X(k,n) \triangleq \frac{k}{n} (\lambda_A + \lambda_B)$ denote the rate of the non cooperative scheme, and $u^{NC}(k,n) \triangleq \frac{k}{n} P_c(k,n)$ denote the overall throughput of the non cooperative scheme \cite{4}. Then, the network is stable, if and only if, the following conditions hold

\begin{align}
    \lambda_i &< \omega_i P_c(k,n), \quad \forall i \in \{A,B\}, \quad (11) \\
    X(k,n) &= (\lambda_A + \lambda_B) \frac{k}{n} < \frac{k}{n} P_c(k,n) = u^{NC}(k,n). \quad (12)
\end{align}

**Proof.** See Appendix A.

Next, we employ Theorem 1 to recast the classical problem of maximizing the overall rate of the network by imposing a latency constraint. That is, given a channel and a fixed latency $n$ (blocklength), we ask what is the optimal size of the data packets that maximizes the rate. We will consider the case where the size of the data arriving at the two terminals is identical, that is, $k_A = k_B = k$, investigate the impact of
the latency, \( n \), on the throughput, and provide numerical evaluation and closed-form approximations for the throughput. As proved in Theorem 1, the overall rate that guarantees stability can be arbitrary close to the throughput of the system. Thus, to maximize rate we need to identify the optimal value of \( k \) that maximizes \( u^{NC}(k, n) \). The resulted optimization problem is given by

\[
u^{NC,*}(k, n) = \max_k \frac{k}{n} P_c(k, n).
\] (13)

Before we proceed to the solution of the above optimization problem, we investigate the convexity properties of the objective function \( u^{NC}(k, n) \). Towards this direction, we state the necessary definition of log-concavity and a lemma which highlights an important property of log-concave functions.

**Definition 1.** A function \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R} \) is log-concave if \( f(x) > 0 \) for all \( x \in \text{Domain } f \) and \( \log f \) is concave.

**Lemma 1.** Log-concavity is closed under multiplication, that is, if \( f \) and \( g \) are log-concave, the pointwise product is also log-concave [20, Section 3.5].

We now state the theorem regarding the log-concavity of the objective function \( u^{NC}(k, n) \).

**Theorem 2.** For any fixed \( n > 1 \), \( u^{NC}(k, n) \) is log-concave function of \( k \).

**Proof.** See Appendix B.

By virtue of Theorem 2, \( u^{NC}(k, n) \) is unimodal, that is, there are no local maxima that are non-global ones. This property eliminates the risk for the optimization algorithm getting trapped into a local maxima that is no global. Moreover, log-concavity allows transforming the original optimization problem into a convex optimization problem, that inherits all useful properties and tools of convex optimization.

Unfortunately, no closed form solutions can emerge from the optimization problem (13), since no explicit expression is known for \( P_c(k, n) \). To overcome this problem, we capitalize the properties of the objective function, \( u^{NC}(k, n) \), and provide numerical evaluation of the optimal value of \( k \) via exhaustive search. Additionally, we propose first order and second order approximations of \( P_c(k, n) \). These are applied in order to evaluate closed form approximations of the optimal data packet size, \( k^* \), and the optimal throughput, \( u^{NC,*}(k, n) \), with a view to identify the optimal trade off between the optimal size of the data packet, \( k \),
and the blocklength $n$.

**Remark 1.** In our analysis, we do not address the issue of control signals (metadata), which are necessary, inter alia, for the error detecting schemes required for the ACK/NACK protocol. Thus, the results of this work should be interpreted in the light of this consideration. This is translated as a genie aided destination [21], [22], that can identify possible errors, and requests, or does not request, data retransmission.

**C. Numerical evaluation of throughput**

The optimal solution of optimization problem (13) can be found via exhaustive search over all possible values of $k \geq 1$. This approach is computationally efficient due to the log-concavity of $u^\text{NC}(k,n)$, which results to a unique global maxima. The exhaustive search algorithm simply compares the objective function, $u^\text{NC}(k,n)$, for successive values of $k$, and terminates the search when $u^\text{NC}(k = i+1,n) < u^\text{NC}(k = i,n)$, $i \in [1,\infty)$. Then, the optimal solution is given by, $k^* = i$. By substituting the value of $k^*$ in (13), we obtain the value of the throughput.

The analytical evaluation of the throughput involves the AWGN Q-function, and since it cannot be integrated in closed form, tight approximations should be employed in order to evaluate closed form expressions for the throughput and for the trade off between the size of the data, $k$, and the channel’s blocklength, $n$. Despite the significant work on approximations of the Gaussian Q-function (see [23] and references within), these cannot be employed to provide closed form expressions of the throughput, due to their complex structure. Towards this direction, we propose linear and quadratic approximations on the probability of successful transmission, that result in closed form expressions.

**Remark 2.** It has been observed, via numerical evaluation of the throughput, that the approximation given in (10), though tighter than (8) for relatively large blocklength, $n > 10^3$, may produce inconsistent results for very small blocklengths, $n < 10^2$ (the approximated rates are greater than channel’s capacity). This observation holds especially for small values of SNR (SNR < 1). Thus, we employ the pessimistic expression (8) rather than (10). Nevertheless, the proposed methodology and results can be straightforwardly extended to any possible expression of $P_c(k,n)$. 
D. Linear approximation

Linear approximation, though not the tightest, is attractive since it provides simple expressions that can be physically interpreted. Recent works on topics related to finite blocklength analysis employ such approximations, for the finite blocklength analysis of the incremental redundancy Hybrid ARQ (HARQ) \[24\] and for full-duplex and half-duplex relaying for short packet communications \[25\]. Let, the linear approximation of the probability of successful transmission be denoted by \( \hat{P}_{c}(k,n) \), and the resulting approximations of the throughput and of the data packet size be denoted by \( \hat{u}_{NC}(k,n) \) and \( \hat{k} \), respectively.

The proposed linear approximation is given by

\[
\hat{P}_{c}(k,n) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \chi \geq \delta_{1}, \\
\frac{1}{2\delta_{1}} \chi + \delta_{0} & \text{if } -\delta_{1} \leq \chi < \delta_{1}, \\
0 & \text{if } \chi < -\delta_{1},
\end{cases}
\]

(14)

where

\[
\chi = \frac{nC - k}{\sqrt{nV}}. 
\]

(15)

The parameters \( \{\delta_{0}, \delta_{1}\} \in \mathbb{R} \), are evaluated by minimizing the integral of the absolute error, that is

\[
\{\delta_{0}^{*}, \delta_{1}^{*}\} = \arg \min_{\delta_{0}, \delta_{1}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \hat{P}_{c}(k,n) - P_{c}(k,n) \right| d\chi,
\]

(16)

which results to \( \delta_{0} = 0.5 \) and \( \delta_{1} = 1.545 \). Then, by employing the above approximation, the optimization problem is given by

\[
\hat{u}_{NC}(k,n) = \max_{k} \frac{k}{n} \hat{P}_{c}(k,n) = \max_{k} \left\{ \frac{k}{n} \left( \frac{1}{2\delta_{1}} \chi + \delta_{0} \right) \right\} \text{ if } -\delta_{1} \leq \chi < \delta_{1}. \]

(17)

We first perform the optimization in the region \( -\delta_{1} \leq \chi < \delta_{1} \). By substituting \( \chi \) and the value of \( \delta_{1} \), we rewrite the predefined region as a function of \( k \), that is

\[
nC - 1.545\sqrt{nV} < k \leq nC + 1.545\sqrt{nV}. \]

(18)

The optimization problem is solved by differentiating the objective function, \( \hat{u}_{NC}(k,n) \), with respect to \( k \), and verifying that the second derivative is negative. The optimal value of \( k \) is then given by

\[
\hat{k}^{*} = 0.5 \left( Cn + 1.545\sqrt{nV} \right). 
\]

(19)
The analytical calculations are omitted due to space limitations. Since the value of $k$ must lay in the region defined by (18), then the optimal value of $k$ is valid only if

$$nC - 1.545\sqrt{nV} < \hat{k}^* \leq nC + 1.545\sqrt{nV}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

By substituting (19) in (20) and solving with respect to the blocklength $n$, we obtain the region of $n$ for which the optimal solution given by (19) holds, which yields $0 \leq n < 13.905V/C^2$. For the region $\chi \geq \delta_1$, or equivalently for $k \leq nC - 1.545\sqrt{nV}$, the maximization of $k/n$ with respect to $k$, occurs on the boundary, that is, $k = nC - 1.545\sqrt{nV}$, and this solution holds for $n \geq 13.905V/C^2$. Summarizing the above results, the optimal size of the data packet that resulted from the linear approximation of $P_c(k,n)$, is given by

$$\hat{k}^* = \begin{cases} 
 nC - 1.545\sqrt{nV} & \text{if } n \geq \frac{13.905V}{C^2}, \\
 0.5(Cn + 1.545\sqrt{nV}) & \text{if } 0 < n < \frac{13.905V}{C^2}.
\end{cases} \hspace{1cm} (21)$$

The above equation provides the optimal trade-off between data size and channel’s blocklength (latency). Note, that since the data size is integer, the optimal solution given in (21) should be rounded to the nearest integer. Since we are interested in an approximation of the throughput and not its exact calculation, the effect of the selected rounding function (i.e., round, ceil or floor) is negligible. The approximation of the throughput is then obtained by substituting the rounded value of (21) in (17).

**E. Quadratic approximation**

Next, we propose an approximation of $P_c(k,n)$, that, in general, gives tighter results compared to the linear approximation. This approximation is quadratic in a defined region of $\chi$ and linear in the rest of the region. Let, the quadratic approximation of the probability of successful transmission be denoted by $\tilde{P}_c(k,n)$, and the resulting approximations of the throughput and of the data packet size be denoted by
\( \tilde{u}^{NC}(k,n) \) and \( \tilde{k} \), respectively. Then, the proposed approximation is given by

\[
\tilde{P}_c(k,n) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \chi \geq \theta_1, \\
\theta_2 \chi (2\theta_1 - \chi) + \theta_0 & \text{if } 0 \leq \chi < \theta_1, \\
\theta_2 \chi (2\theta_1 + \chi) + \theta_0 & \text{if } -\theta_1 < \chi < 0, \\
0 & \text{if } \chi \leq -\theta_1,
\end{cases}
\] (22)

where \( \chi \) is given by (15) and \( \{\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2\} \in \mathbb{R} \). Since, (i) the approximation given by (22) is odd-symmetric with respect to \( \chi = 0 \), and (ii) \( P_c(k,n) \bigg|_{\chi=0} = 0.5 \), then the optimal value of \( \theta_0 \) that minimizes the absolute value of the error between \( \tilde{P}_c(k,n) \) and \( P_c(k,n) \) is, \( \theta_0 = 0.5 \).

Next, we evaluate the parameters \( \{\theta_1, \theta_2\} \), by imposing an additional constraint regarding the continuity of the first derivative with respect to \( k \), which significantly simplifies the optimization problem. The proposed quadratic form guarantees continuity in the region \( \chi \in (-\theta_1, \theta_1) \). The conditions that ensure continuity of the first derivative in the regions \( \chi \in (-\infty, -\theta_1] \) and \( \chi \in [\theta_1, \infty) \), and thus for the whole region \( \chi \in (-\infty, \infty) \), are

\[
\frac{d}{dk} \tilde{P}_c(k,n) \bigg|_{\chi=\theta_1} = 0, \quad \frac{d}{dk} \tilde{P}_c(k,n) \bigg|_{\chi=-\theta_1} = 0 
\] (23)

\[
\tilde{P}_c(k,n) \bigg|_{\chi=\theta_1} = 1, \quad \tilde{P}_c(k,n) \bigg|_{\chi=-\theta_1} = 0 
\] (24)

Equations in (23) are satisfied directly by the proposed quadratic form, whereas equations in (24) are satisfied, if and only if, \( \theta_2 = 0.5/\theta_1^2 \). The remaining parameter, \( \theta_1 \), is evaluated by minimizing the integral of the absolute error

\[
\{\theta_1^*\} = \arg\min_{\theta_1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\tilde{P}_c(k,n) - P_c(k,n)| d\chi, 
\] (25)

which yields \( \theta_1 = 2.35 \). The optimization problem for the case of the quadratic approximation is

\[
\tilde{u}^{NC}(k,n) = \max_k \frac{k}{n} \tilde{P}_c(k,n),
\] (26)

where \( \tilde{P}_c(k,n) \) is given by (22). By employing the methodology discussed in Section \[III-D\] we obtain the following results regarding the optimal length of the data size

\[
\tilde{k}^* = \begin{cases} 
\frac{2}{3} (nC - \theta_1 \sqrt{nV}) + \theta_3 & \text{if } n \geq \frac{\theta_1^2 V}{4C^2}, \\
\frac{1}{3} (nC - \theta_1 \sqrt{nV}) & \text{if } 0 < n < \frac{\theta_1^2 V}{4C^2},
\end{cases}
\] (27)
Fig. 3: Optimal size of data packets as a function of channel’s blocklength, \( n \), and comparison with the expressions resulted from the linear and quadratic approximation of \( P_c(k,n) \), for \( SNR = 1 \).

where

\[
\theta_3 = \frac{\sqrt{n}}{3} \left( nC^2 - 7\theta_1^2V - 2\theta_1C\sqrt{nV} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

Then, \( \tilde{u}^{NC,*}(k,n) \) emerges by substituting the values of (22) and (27), in \( \tilde{k}^* \).

The optimal trade-off between the data packet size and the channel’s blocklength, \( n \), as well as the comparison with the provided approximations \( \hat{k}^* \) and \( \tilde{k}^* \), are depicted in Fig. 3. While both approximations perform well, the optimal data packet size emerged from the quadratic approximation, \( \tilde{k}^* \), is almost identical to \( k^* \). The optimal throughput and the throughput approximations are illustrated in Fig. 4. Again, the solution emerged from the quadratic approximation approaches very well the numerical evaluation of the optimal throughput elaborated in Section III-C.

IV. COOPERATION IN THE FINITE BLOCKLENGTH REGIME

In this section, we examine a packet-based network cooperation scenario with bursty arrivals at the source terminals. In particular, we consider a MARC scheduling and evaluate the performance of a cognitive cooperative protocol in the finite blocklength regime.

The MARC configuration is consisted of two source terminals, \( A \) and \( B \), a common cognitive relay, \( R \), and a destination, \( D \). The data packets arrive at the source terminals, \( A \) and \( B \), according to independent and
stationary Bernoulli processes with probabilities, $p_A$ and $p_B$, and mean values, $\lambda_A$ and $\lambda_B$, respectively. Each of the source terminals has an infinite size buffer memory, denoted by $Q_i$, $i \in \{A, B\}$, respectively, that stores the incoming data packets. The relay is equipped with two relaying queues, denoted by $Q_{AR}$ and $Q_{BR}$, in which they store the data packets received from the respective source terminals. The system model of MARC configuration, is depicted in Fig. 5.

There is an extensive literature regarding multiple access protocols in the presence of a cooperating relays [11]–[13]. In this work we employ the cognitive cooperation protocol, defined below.

**Definition 2. Cognitive Cooperation (CC) protocol.**

The cognitive cooperation protocol performs as follows:

1. **Source terminal** $i \in \{A, B\}$ encodes the data packet of length $k$ into a codeword of length $n$, and access the channel via a randomized TDMA scheduling with probability $\omega_i$, $i \in \{A, B\}$, and $\omega_A + \omega_B = 1$.
2. **The codeword is transmitted both to the destination and the relay node. The transmission process is supported by an ACK/NACK mechanism that informs the source terminal and the relay about the transmission status (successful or erroneous).**
3. **If data are not successfully received by either the destination or the relay, the data packet remains in the queue of the source terminal.**
iv) If data are successfully received by the destination, the source terminal removes the data packet from its queue, and the relay ignores the received packet.

v) If data are not successfully received by the destination but are successfully received by the relay, the source terminal discards the data packet from its queue, and the relay adds that packet to the respective queue (Q_{AR} or Q_{BR}).

vi) When the source terminal \(i \in \{A,B\}\) gains access to the channel but it has no data packets in its queue (queue is idle), the relay encodes a data packet from the respective queue \(Q_{iR}, i \in \{A,B\}\), into a codeword of length \(n\), and transmits it to the destination.

This protocol, though not ideal in terms of performance, is attractive due to its elegance and simple structure, that allows the interpretation of the results in the context of finite blocklength codes. The discussed methodology could had been applied to more complex protocols, however, for these protocols it would have been difficult to isolate the impact of short codes in the overall performance.

Recall, that a data packet arrives at the source terminal \(i \in \{A,B\}\), according to independent and stationary Bernoulli processes with mean \(\lambda_i, i \in \{A,B\}\). A packet departs from the queue of the source terminal, if i) channel access is granted by the randomized switch (with probability \(\omega_i, i \in \{A,B\}\)), and ii) the packet is successfully transmitted to the destination and/or the relay. The departure (service) process at
the source terminal is stationary, with average service rate

\[ \mu_i = \omega_i [P_{c,iD}(k,n) + P_{e,iD}(k,n)P_{c,iR}(k,n)] , \quad i \in \{A,B\}, \quad (28) \]

where \( P_{c,iD}(k,n) \) denotes the probability of a successful transmission from the source terminal \( i \) to the destination, \( P_{e,iD}(k,n) \) denotes the probability of an erroneous transmission from the source terminal \( i \) to the destination, and \( P_{c,iR}(k,n) \) denotes the probability of a successful transmission from the source terminal \( i \) to the relay.

The system at each source terminal \( i \) forms a DTMC with stability condition \( \lambda_i / \mu_i < 1 \), \( \forall i \in \{A,B\} \), or equivalently

\[ \lambda_i < \omega_i [P_{c,iD}(k,n) + P_{e,iD}(k,n)P_{c,iR}(k,n)] , \quad \forall i \in \{A,B\}. \quad (29) \]

The methodology to obtain the stability condition for this queue is identical to the non cooperative case, given in Appendix A, thus is omitted.

The stability region of the source terminals is obtained by summing (29) over all \( i \), \( i \in \{A,B\} \), which yields

\[ \Lambda_{CC}^S = \left\{ (\lambda_A, \lambda_B) : \frac{\lambda_A}{[P_{c,AD}(k,n) + P_{e,AD}(k,n)P_{c,AR}(k,n)]} + \frac{\lambda_B}{[P_{e,BD}(k,n) + P_{e,BD}(k,n)P_{c,BR}(k,n)]} < 1 \right\}. \quad (30) \]

A packet from the source terminal \( i \), \( i \in \{A,B\} \), enters queue \( Q_{iR} \) at the relay if i) channel access for the source terminal \( i \) is granted by the randomized switch (with probability \( \omega_i \)), ii) the transmission from the source terminal \( i \) to the relay is successful, iii) the transmission from the source terminal \( i \) to the destination is unsuccessful, and iv) the queue of the source terminal \( i \) is not idle, that is, it has at least one packet that requires transmission. The source is not idle with stationary probability \( 1 - \pi_{i,0} \), where \( \pi_{i,0} = 1 - \frac{\lambda_i}{\mu_i} \) (see analysis in Appendix A). By combining all above, the average rate of arrivals at relay’s queue \( Q_{iR}, i \in \{A,B\} \), is given by

\[ \lambda_{iR} = \omega_i (1 - \pi_{i,0})P_{e,iD}(k,n)P_{c,iR}(k,n), \quad i \in \{A,B\}. \quad (31) \]

A packet departs from relay’s queue \( Q_{iR}, i \in \{A,B\} \) if i) channel access for the source terminal \( i \) is granted by the randomized switch (with probability \( \omega_i \)), ii) the source terminal is sensed idle (with stationary probability \( \pi_{i,0} \)), and iii) the transmission from the relay to the destination is successful. Therefore, the
average rate of departures from the relay’s queue $Q_{iR}, i \in \{A, B\}$, is given by

$$\mu_{iR} = \omega_i \pi_{i0} P_{c, RD}(k, n), \quad i \in \{A, B\},$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

where $P_{c, RD}(k, n)$ denotes the probability of a successful transmission from the relay to the destination. The stability condition for the individual queue $Q_{iR}, i \in \{A, B\}$ at relay, is $\frac{\lambda_{iR}}{\mu_{iR}} < 1, \forall i \in \{A, B\}$. By employing (28), (31) and (32), the stability condition translates to

$$\lambda_{iR} < \omega_i \left[\frac{P_{c, iD}(k, n) + P_{e, iD}(k, n)P_{c, iR}(k, n)}{P_{c, RD}(k, n) + P_{e, iD}(k, n)P_{c, iR}(k, n)}\right] P_{c, RD}(k, n),$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

$\forall i \in \{A, B\}$. By summing (33), over the source terminals $i \in \{A, B\}$, we obtain the stability region of the relay terminal, i.e.,

$$\Lambda^C_{CR} = \left\{(\lambda_A, \lambda_B) : \sum_{i \in \{A, B\}} \left[\frac{\lambda_i[P_{c, RD}(k, n) + P_{e, iD}(k, n)P_{c, iR}(k, n)]}{P_{c, RD}(k, n) + P_{e, iD}(k, n)P_{c, iR}(k, n)}\right] < 1\right\}. \hspace{1cm} (34)$$

Finally, the stability region of the overall system is characterized by the union of (30) and (34).

For the rest of this work, we focus our attention on the case where the SNR for the channel between the source terminal $i$ and the relay is the same $\forall i \in \{A, B\}$, and the SNR for the channel between the source terminal $i$ and the destination is the same $\forall i \in \{A, B\}$. This yields

$$P_{e, AD}(k, n) = P_{e, BD}(k, n) \triangleq P_{e, SD}(k, n) = 1 - P_{c, SD}(k, n),$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)

$$P_{e, AR}(k, n) = P_{e, BR}(k, n) \triangleq P_{e, SR}(k, n) = 1 - P_{c, SR}(k, n),$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

where $P_{e, SD}(k, n)$ denotes the probability of an erroneous transmission from any source terminal to the destination, $P_{e, SD}(k, n)$ denotes the probability of a successful transmission from any source terminal to the destination, $P_{e, SR}(k, n)$ denotes the probability of an erroneous transmission from any source terminal to the relay, and $P_{e, SR}(k, n)$ denotes the probability of a successful transmission from any source terminal to the relay.

The above conditions not only simplify the stability expressions, but also they are more compatible with the assumption of common channels that are accessed via TDMA scheduling. The stability conditions is
identified via manipulation of (29), (30) and (34), and is given by

\[ \lambda_i < \omega_i \left[ P_{SD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n) \right], \quad \forall i \in \{A,B\}, \tag{37} \]

\[ \lambda_A + \lambda_B < P_{SD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n), \tag{38} \]

\[ \lambda_A + \lambda_B < \frac{P_{SD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n)}{P_{RD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n)}, \tag{39} \]

where (38) emerged from the stability region of the source terminals, whereas (39) emerged from the stability region of the relay.

By multiplying (38) and (39) with \( \frac{k}{n} \), we obtain

\[ (\lambda_A + \lambda_B) \frac{k}{n} < \frac{k}{n} \left[ P_{SD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n) \right], \tag{40} \]

\[ (\lambda_A + \lambda_B) \frac{k}{n} < \frac{k}{n} \frac{P_{SD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n)}{P_{RD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n)}. \tag{41} \]

Next, let

\[ X^{CC}(k,n) \triangleq (\lambda_A + \lambda_B) \frac{k}{n}, \tag{42} \]

\[ u^{CC}_S(k,n) \triangleq \frac{k}{n} \left[ P_{SD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n) \right], \tag{43} \]

\[ u^{CC}_R(k,n) \triangleq \frac{k}{n} \frac{P_{SD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n)}{P_{RD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n)}. \tag{44} \]

where \( X^{CC}(k,n) \) denotes the overall rate of the network, \( u^{CC}_S(k,n) \) denotes the throughput of the source, and \( u^{CC}_R(k,n) \) denotes the throughput of the relay. Since, (40) and (41), must both hold, then, the stability of the network is characterized by the union of (40) and (41). Moreover, by observing that \( u^{CC}_R(k,n) < u^{CC}_S(k,n) \), then the stability region of the overall system is solely characterized by the stability region of the relay, and is given by

\[ \Lambda^{CC}_R = \left\{ (\lambda_A, \lambda_B) : (\lambda_A + \lambda_B) \frac{k}{n} < u^{CC}_R(k,n) \triangleq \frac{k}{n} \frac{P_{SD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n)}{P_{RD}(k,n) + P_{SD}(k,n)P_{SR}(k,n)} \right\}. \tag{45} \]

From (45), we deduce that the overall throughput of the network, \( u^{CC}(k,n) \), is equal to the the overall throughput of the relay, i.e.,

\[ u^{CC}(k,n) = u^{CC}_R(k,n) \tag{46} \]

Note from (45), that the overall rate, \( X^{CC}(k,n) \), can be arbitrarily close \( u^{CC}(k,n) \). Thus, the optimal rate
Fig. 6: Throughput for the no cooperation scheme and the cognitive cooperation scheme, for fixed blocklength $n = 1000$. The channels from the source to the destination, from the source to the relay, and from the relay to the destination, are AWGN with SNR for (a) 0.2, 0.35 and 1, respectively, and for (b) 0.2, 0.5 and 1, respectively.

is evaluated by maximizing the overall throughput of the network, $u^{CC}(k,n)$, with respect to the data size, $k$. This results to the following optimization problem.

$$u^{CC,*}(k,n) = \max_k u^{CC}(k,n). \quad (47)$$

Although the optimization problem defined by (47) is not necessarily concave, it can be evaluated via exhaustive search. This does not introduce any additional complexity, due to the integer nature of the optimization problem.

The throughput of the non cooperative scheme and the throughput of the cognitive cooperation scheme, for two different channel triplets, is given in Fig. 6. For the selected SNR triplet that is depicted in Fig. 6(a), the increase of the throughput due to cooperation is negligible, whereas for another SNR triplet depicted in Fig. 6(b), cooperation increases throughput approximately by 25%. However, taking into consideration the commitment of additional resources (relay, buffer memories and channels), the gain in the performance that cognitive cooperation exhibits over the non cooperative scheme, cannot be characterized as satisfactory. Comments for the insufficient performance of the cognitive cooperation protocol are given in the following remark.

**Remark 3.** The throughput of the overall system, $u^{CC}(k,n)$, employs the statistics of all available channels.
Optimizing throughput with respect to \( k \), results in an optimal data packet size \( k^* \), that is employed both from the source terminal and the relay. Thus, \( k^* \) emerges as a compromise between the statistics of those channels. This is a critical drawback that is reflected on the performance of the overall network, since, different channels with different statistical characteristics pack the same amount of data into the codeword of length \( n \). An obvious solution to this problem is to allow the source terminal and the relay to pack different amount of data into the codeword (e.g. source packs \( k_S \) bits into the codeword while the relay packs \( k_R \) bits into the codeword), however, this is highly impracticable, since, it introduces significant amount of complexity to the destination.

V. COGNITIVE COOPERATION VIA BATCH AND FORWARD

Motivated by the insufficient performance of the cognitive cooperation protocol, we propose a novel strategy that addresses the concerns encapsulated in Remark 3 and boosts the performance of the cognitive cooperation protocols in the finite blocklength regime. We evaluate the performance of the proposed strategy for the particular cognitive cooperation protocol given in Definition 2, however, this approach is quite general and can be embedded into the structure of existing cognitive cooperation protocols.

The proposed Batch-And-Forward (BAF) strategy, keeps the data packet size the same for all individual nodes of the network, however, each node is allowed to batch more than one data packets into the codeword of length \( n \). The number of data packets that are batched into the fixed length codeword, is denoted by \( L \). Thus, this approach exploits the individual statistical characteristics of the different channels of the network, without imposing additional complexity on the overall scheme.

Next, we embed the BAF strategy at the relay of the cognitive cooperation protocol, and evaluate the performance of the overall network. This is implemented by replacing item vi) of Definition 2 with the following item.

vi) The relay batches \( L \) data packets from the queue \( Q_{iR}, i \in \{A, B\} \), and encodes them into a codeword of length \( n \). When the source terminal \( i \in \{A, B\} \) gains access to the channel, and it has no data packets in its queue (queue is idle), the relay transmits the codeword consisting of the \( L \) data packets to the destination. If there are less than \( L \) data packets in the respective queue at the relay, the relay does not transmit any information.
All the other procedures of Definition 2 do not change. The BAF strategy for a source terminal $i$ - relay pair is depicted in Fig. 7.

This approach yields a stability region, that is given in the subsequent Theorem.

**Theorem 3.** Suppose the individual channels satisfy (35) and (36), and that the relay employ the BAF strategy. Let $u_{BAF}(Lk,n)$ denote the overall throughput of cooperative scheme. Then, for a fixed blocklength $n$, the stability region of the BAF cooperative scheme satisfies

$$(\lambda_A + \lambda_B) \frac{k}{n} < u_{BAF}(Lk,n),$$

where $k = 1,2,\ldots$, $L = 1,2,\ldots$, and

$$u_{BAF}(Lk,n) = \min \left\{ u^C_C(k,n), u^R_{BAF}(Lk,n) \right\} ,$$

$$u^C_C(k,n) = \frac{k}{n} \left[ P_{c,SD}(k,n) + P_{e,SD}(k,n) P_{c,SR}(k,n) \right] ,$$

$$u^R_{BAF}(Lk,n) = \frac{Lk}{n} \left[ P_{c,SD}(k,n) + P_{e,SD}(k,n) P_{c,SR}(k,n) \right] \frac{P_{c,RD}(Lk,n)}{P_{c,RD}(Lk,n) + P_{e,SD}(k,n) P_{c,SR}(k,n)} .$$

*Proof.* See Appendix C.

As shown in Appendix C, the arrivals and departures at the relay form a batch queue [19]. For com-
pleteness, in Appendix D we discuss the limiting behaviour of the induced batch queue and provide the characterization for the stationary distribution. The condition for the existence of a stationary distribution, which guarantees the stability of the queue, can also emerge from the provided analysis in Appendix D.

Let $X^{BAF}(k, n) \overset{\Delta}{=} (\lambda_A + \lambda_B) \frac{k}{n}$ denote the rate of the overall system when BAF strategy is employed at the relay. Theorem 3 states that in order for the system to be stable the overall rate cannot exceed the overall throughput of the network, $u^{BAF}(Lk, n)$. Since, the rate can be arbitrarily close to the overall throughout, the maximum rate is obtained by maximizing the overall throughput of the network. The maximization is performed over the data size, $k$, and the batch size, $L$. The following Corollary emerges directly from the analysis above, and is a direct implication of Theorem 3.

**Corollary 1.** Let $X^{BAF,\ast}(k, n)$ denote the optimal rate of the overall system when BAF strategy is employed at the relay. Then,

$$X^{BAF,\ast}(k, n) < u^{BAF,\ast}(Lk, n),$$

where

$$u^{BAF,\ast}(Lk, n) = \max_{L,k} \min \left\{ u^{CC}_S(k, n), u^{BAF}_R(Lk, n) \right\}.$$  

The performance of the cognitive cooperation protocol with BAF strategy at the relay, is illustrated in Fig. 8. For the selected $SNR$ triplet depicted in Fig. 8(a), the optimal data packet size is 182 bits, whereas for the selected $SNR$ triplet depicted in Fig. 8(b), the optimal data packet size is 227 bits. For both cases the optimal batching size is $L = 2$. It is obvious that for both cases, the BAF strategy can significantly enhance the performance of the overall system (approximately by 75%, in both scenarios), compared to the cognitive cooperation protocol without BAF. For both of the scenarios above, the $SNR$ of the channel between the relay and the destination, is higher than the $SNR$ of the channel between the source terminal and the destination, thus, is beneficiary for the overall performance of the network to apply the BAF strategy at the relay. For other scenarios in which the the $SNR$ of the channel between the source terminal and the destination, is higher than the $SNR$ of the channel between the relay and the destination, it would have been beneficial to have applied the BAF strategy at the source terminals. A multiple batching approach that can enhance the performance of more complex networks, is discussed in the following remark.
Fig. 8: Throughput of the cognitive cooperation protocol embedded with the BAF strategy, for fixed blocklength $n = 1000$, and comparison with the no cooperation scheme and the cognitive cooperation protocol. The channels from the source to the destination, from the source to the relay, and from the relay to the destination, are AWGN with SNR for (a) 0.2, 0.35 and 1, respectively, and for (b) 0.2, 0.5 and 1, respectively.

**Remark 4.** Consider a network of $j$ terminal nodes (sources and/or relays) where each node applies the BAF strategy with batching sizes $\{L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_j\}$, respectively. Fix the values of $k_{\text{min}} \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ and let $k \geq k_{\text{min}}$. Characterize the union of the stability region for the network, and maximize it with respect to $\{k, L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_j\}$. Though bounding the value of $k$ such that $k \geq k_{\text{min}}$ may result to suboptimal solution compared with the unbounded case, it is imperative, since, it precludes very small and impractical values of data packets.

Though the majority of the classical cooperative techniques can be employed for short packet communication, they cannot fully correspond to the special characteristics of short codes, since, they were not particularly designed to perform optimally in the finite blocklength regime. The proposed approach, however, can significantly enhance the performance of the network, while at the same time it meets the finite blocklength requirements. Moreover, it can reduce the requirements in metadata, a challenging task in the actual implementation of short codes [3], since, it avoids the unnecessary repetition of metadata (e.g. address of the source terminal and the destination). Perhaps the most attractive feature of the BAF strategy, is that it can be embedded into existing cooperative protocols, without imposing any additional complexity to the system. The drawback of this approach is that it might increase the latency of the overall system,
however, this effect can be eliminated by imposing an additional constraint on the batching number, $L$, such that latency requirements are satisfied.

**VI. CONCLUSION**

In this work, we employed tools and results from information theory, stochastic processes and queueing theory, in order to provide a comprehensive framework regarding the analysis of a TDMA network with bursty traffic, in the finite blocklength regime. In particular, we examined the stability of a TDMA network, evaluated the optimal throughput for fixed blocklength constraints, and identified the optimal trade off between data length and latency, both numerically and via the proposed closed form approximations. Moreover, we examined the MARC-TDMA network, evaluated the stability conditions for a particular cognitive cooperation protocol, and proposed the BAF strategy that can enhance the finite blocklength performance of cognitive protocols. The BAF strategy can be easily embedded in existing cooperative techniques without imposing additional complexity. In the current work we did not address issues regarding metadata, such as, impact of metadata on the performance and design of metadata for short codes. This is a challenging task for the performance analysis of URLLC, that will be investigated as a part of future work.

**APPENDIX**

A. *Proof of Theorem 1*

The stability conditions of the underlying Markov chains at the two terminals depend on the existence, or non-existence, of a stationary distribution, defined by

$$
\pi_{i,j} = \lim_{m \to \infty} P(S_m = j), \ j \geq 0, i \in \{A,B\}. \tag{54}
$$

The characterization of the stationary distribution for the Geo/Geo/1 queue emerges by employing the global balance equations [26], which yields

$$
\pi_{i,0} = \frac{1-q_i}{-q_1 + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{p_i(1-q_i)}{q_i(1-p_i)} \right)^m} = \frac{q_i-p_i}{q_i}, \ i \in \{A,B\}, \tag{55}
$$

$$
\pi_{i,j} = \left( \frac{p_i(1-q_i)}{q_i(1-p_i)} \right)^j \frac{1}{1-q_i} \pi_{i,0}, \ j \geq 1, \ i \in \{A,B\}. \tag{56}
$$
Therefore, the stationary distribution is non-zero, only if

\[ \frac{p_i(1-q_i)}{q_i(1-p_i)} < 1, \quad \forall i \in \{A, B\}, \]  

(57)

or equivalently

\[ q_i > p_i, \quad \forall i \in \{A, B\}. \]  

(58)

Otherwise, \( \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (p_i(1-q_i)/q_i(1-p_i)) \) would be infinite and there would be no stationary distribution.

By substituting the average arrival rate, \( \lambda_i = p_i \), and average departure rate \( \mu_i = q_i = \omega_i (1-P_c(k_i,n)) \), in (58), we obtain the following stability condition

\[ \lambda_i < \omega_i (1-P_c(k_i,n)) \frac{\Delta}{\omega_i P_c(k_i,n)}, \quad \forall i \in \{A, B\}. \]  

(59)

For the special case where \( k_A = k_B = k \), then \( P_c(k_A,n) = P_c(k_B,n) = P_c(k,n) \), we have

\[ \lambda_i < \omega_i P_c(k,n), \quad \forall i \in \{A, B\}. \]  

(60)

Since \( \omega_A + \omega_B = 1 \), the stability for the overall system consisted of the two terminals A and B, is calculated from (59), as follow

\[ \lambda_A + \lambda_B < (\omega_A + \omega_B) P_c(k,n) = P_c(k,n). \]  

(61)

Multiplying both sides of (61) with \( \frac{k}{n} \), we obtain

\[ X(k,n) = \left( \lambda_A + \lambda_B \right) \frac{k}{n} < \frac{k}{n} P_c(k,n) = u(k,n), \]  

(62)

which completes the proof.

**B. Proof of Theorem**

Fix \( n \geq 1 \), and let \( f(k,n) = \frac{k}{n} \) and \( h(k,n) = P_c(k,n) \). The objective function can then be rewritten as \( u^{NC}(k,n) = f(k,n) h(k,n) \). By Definition 1 \( f(k,n) \) is a log-concave function of \( k \), since i) \( f(k,n) > 0 \), and ii) \( \log f(k,n) \) is a concave function of \( k \). The function \( h(k,n) \) is by definition the cdf of a normal distribution, which can be shown to be log-concave function of \( k \) [20 Section 3.5]. Since both the functions \( f(k,n) \) and \( h(k,n) \) are log-concave, then by Lemma 1 the function \( u^{NC}(k,n) \) is also a log-concave function of \( k \).
C. Proof of Theorem 3

The BAF cooperative scheme concerns only the relay and not the source terminals. Hence, (i) the average departure rate from the source terminal is identical to the expression in (28), and (ii) the stability region for the source terminals is identical to cognitive cooperation case, and is given by

\[(\lambda_A + \lambda_B) \frac{k}{n} < \frac{k}{n} \left[ P_{c,SD}(k,n) + P_{e,SD}(k,n)P_{c,SR}(k,n) \right] = u_{CC}^{S}(k,n). \]  

(63)

The arrivals at the queue \( Q_{iR}, i \in \{A, B\} \) at the relay, are Bernoulli distributed, and can be either one with probability \( p_{iR} = \omega_i(1 - \pi_{i,0})P_{c,SD}(k,n)P_{c,SR}(k,n), \ i \in \{A, B\} \), where

\[ \pi_{i,0} = 1 - \frac{\lambda_i}{\mu_i}, i \in \{A, B\}, \]  

(64)

or zero with probability \( 1 - p_{iR} \). Hence, the average number of arrivals is given by

\[ \lambda_{iR} = p_{iR} = \omega_i(1 - \pi_{i,0})P_{c,SD}(k,n)P_{c,SR}(k,n), \ i \in \{A, B\}, \]  

(65)

which is identical with the average arrival rate of the conventional cooperation scheme. Since \( L \) packets are batched together, the total size of the data packets that are encoded into a codeword of length \( n \), is \( Lk \). The departures from the queue \( Q_{iR}, i \in \{A, B\} \) at the relay, are also Bernoulli distributed, with departure probability, at a given time slot, \( q_{iR} = \omega_i(\pi_{i,0})P_{c,RD}(Lk,n), \ i \in \{A, B\} \). The average departure rate is therefore given by

\[ \mu_{iR} = Lq_{iR} = L\omega_i(\pi_{i,0})P_{c,RD}(Lk,n), \ i \in \{A, B\}. \]  

(66)

Let, \( w_{iR}, i \in \{A, B\} \) denote the probability of having zero arrivals or departures. Since, the relay sends data only if the source terminal is idle, arrivals and departures cannot occur at the same time slot, thus, \( w_{iR} = 1 - p_{iR} - q_{iR}, \ i \in \{A, B\} \). The system at each queue, \( Q_{iR}, i \in \{A, B\} \), of the relay can be described by the DTMC depicted in Fig. 9 with states \( \{S_{i,j}, \ i \in \{A, B\}, \ j \geq 0\} \), that denote the number of packets in the system. From the analysis above, is straightforward to deduce that the stochastic process \( \{S_{i,j}, \ i \in \{A, B\}, \ j \geq 0\} \), forms a Geo/Geo^L/1 DTMC chain. The stability condition for Geo/Geo^L/1 queue [19], is

\[ \frac{\lambda_{iR}}{\mu_{iR}} < L, \ \forall i \in \{A, B\}, \]  

(67)
Fig. 9: Discrete time Markov chain induced by the arrivals and departures at a relay that employs batch-and-forward strategy.

By substituting (64)-(66) in (67), and by summing over \( i \in \{A, B\} \), we obtain

\[
(\lambda_A + \lambda_B) \frac{k}{n} < \frac{Lk}{n} P_{c,RD}(Lk,n) \left[ P_{c,SD}(k,n) + P_{e,SD}(k,n)P_{c,SR}(k,n) \right] \overline{P}_{c,SD}(k,n) + P_{e,SD}(k,n)P_{c,SR}(k,n) \right] = u_{BAF}^{R}(Lk,n)
\]

(68)

Since the stability of the overall network requires both, (63) and (68), to be satisfied, then the solution is given by the union of (63) and (68), that is

\[
(\lambda_A + \lambda_B) \frac{k}{n} < \min\{u_{CC}^{S}(k,n), u_{BAF}^{R}(Lk,n)\}
\]

(69)

This completes the proof.

D. Limiting behaviour of Geo/Geo/1 queue.

Consider the DTMC \( \{S_{i,j}, \ i \in \{A,B\}, \ j \geq 0\} \) depicted in Fig. 9 with state space \( \{0,1,2,\ldots\} \), where \( \{S_{i,j}, \ i \in \{A,B\}, \ j \geq 0\} \) denotes the number of packets at the queue at time instant \( j \). Since the behaviour of the two queues at the relay is identical, and to keep the notation simple, we drop the queue index \( i \in \{A,B\} \) from the notation. Let \( P \) the transition probability matrix and let \( \pi = [\pi_0, \pi_1, \pi_2,\ldots] \) denote the limiting distribution of \( P \). If the stability condition holds, that is, \( \frac{\lambda_R}{\mu_R} < L \) [19], the stationary distribution exists, is equivalent to the limiting distribution, and is given by

\[
\pi = \pi P, \quad \text{and} \quad \pi 1 = 1.
\]

(70)
By expanding (70), we get

\[ p_R \pi_0 = q_R \pi_L, \]
\[ p_R \pi_j = p_R \pi_{j-1} + q_R \pi_{j+1}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq L - 1, \]
\[ (p_R + q_R) \pi_j = p_R \pi_{j-1} + q_R \pi_{j+1}, \quad j > L. \]

In order to characterize the stationary distribution, we employ the Z-Transform approach \[27\]. Towards this direction we multiply the \( j^{th} \) equation with \( Z^j \), that is,

\[ p_R \pi_0 = q_R \pi_L, \]
\[ p_R \pi_j Z^j = p_R \pi_{j-1} Z^j + q_R \pi_{j+1} Z^j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq L - 1, \]
\[ (p_R + q_R) \pi_j Z^j = p_R \pi_{j-1} Z^j + q_R \pi_{j+1} Z^j, \quad j > L, \]

and add sum over all \( j \), which yields

\[ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} p_R \pi_j Z^j + \sum_{j=L}^{\infty} q_R \pi_j Z^j = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} p_R \pi_{j-1} Z^j + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} q_R \pi_{j+1} Z^j = p_R Z \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \pi_{j-1} Z^{j-1} + \frac{q_R}{Z} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \pi_{j+1} Z z^j Z^{j+1}. \]

By applying the Z-Transform \( \Pi(Z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \pi_j Z^j \), we obtain

\[ (p_R + q_R) \Pi(Z) - q_R \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \pi_j Z^j = p_R Z \Pi(Z) + \frac{q_R}{Z} \Pi(Z) - \frac{q_R}{Z} \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \pi_j Z^j. \]

Then, solving with respect to \( \Pi(Z) \), we have

\[ \Pi(Z) = \frac{(1 - z^L) \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \pi_j Z^j}{LpZ^{L+1} - (1 + \rho L)zL + 1}, \quad (71) \]

where \( \rho = \frac{p_R}{q_R} \). The denominator in (71) has \( L-1 \) poles, one of which at \( |z| = 1 \). It can be shown from Rouché’s theorem \[27\] that \( L-1 \) poles lie within the unit circle and one pole, denoted by \( z_0 \), lies within the range \( |z| > 1 \), as long as the stability condition holds. The numerator must have the same \( L-1 \) poles within the unit circle as the denominator has, otherwise \( \Pi(Z) \) blows up. Since these zeros cannot come from the term \( (1 - z^L) \), they must come from the summation term, \( \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \pi_j Z^j \). Based on the analysis above, we write (71), as

\[ \Pi(Z) = \frac{(1 - z^L)}{K(1 - z^L)(1 - \frac{z}{z_0})}, \]
where \( K \) is evaluated by the condition \( \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \pi_i = 1 \), which by the definition of Z-transform is translated as \( \Pi(Z = 1) = 1 \). This yields,

\[
K = \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{z}{z_0}\right)} , \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi(Z) = \frac{(1 - z^L) \left(1 - \frac{1}{z_0}\right)}{L(1 - z) \left(1 - \frac{z}{z_0}\right)}.
\]

The evaluation of the pole \( z_0 \), is performed by finding the roots of the denominator in (71). This can also be employed to verify that the pole \( z_0 \) lies outside of the unit circle only if the stability condition, i.e., \( \frac{p_R}{q_R} = \frac{\lambda_R}{\mu_R} < L \), holds. Finally, the stationary distribution emerges via the inverse Z-Transform of \( \Pi(Z) \), which results to the following expressions.

\[
\pi_j = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{L} (1 - z_0^{-(j+1)}) & 0 \leq j \leq L - 1, \\
\rho (z_0 - 1) z_0^{-j-1} & j \geq L.
\end{cases}
\]

(72)
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