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Abstract—We propose a novel multipath multi-hop adaptive and causal random linear network coding (AC-RLNC) algorithm with forward error correction. This algorithm generalizes our joint optimization coding solution for point-to-point communication with delayed feedback. AC-RLNC is adaptive to the estimated channel condition, and is causal, as the coding adjusts the retransmission rates using a priori and posteriori algorithms. In the multipath network, to achieve the desired throughput and delay, we propose to incorporate an adaptive packet allocation algorithm for retransmission, across the available resources of the paths. This approach is based on a discrete water filling algorithm, i.e., bit-filling, but, with two desired objectives, maximize throughput and minimize the delay. In the multipath multi-hop setting, we propose a new decentralized balancing optimization algorithm. This balancing algorithm minimizes the throughput degradation, caused by the variations in the channel quality of the paths at each hop. Furthermore, to increase the efficiency, in terms of the desired objectives, we propose a new selective recoding method at the intermediate nodes. Through simulations, we demonstrate that the performance of our adaptive and causal approach, compared to selective repeat (SR)-ARQ protocol, is capable of gains up to a factor two in throughput and a factor of more than three in delay.

I. INTRODUCTION

The increasing demand for network connectivity and high data rates necessitates efficient utilization of all possible resources. In recent years, the connectivity moved forward from point-to-point schemes (i.e. single path, SP) to heterogeneous multipath (MP) multi-hop (MH) networks in which intermediate nodes can cooperate and share the common medium for efficient communications. Such advanced networks tend to provide robustness and reliable communications with high data rates by simultaneously sharing the physical layer resources over each path and hop. However, it is critical to ensure that efficiency is not compromised and that in-order delivery delay is managed [1], particularly when the links are unreliable and retransmissions are required; when there are high round-trip-time (RTT) delays between the sender and the receiver; or when the state of each link/path is not fully determined. Figure 1 illustrates the considered settings of communications.

To achieve the min-cut max-flow capacity in the multipath multi-hop networks, solutions based on information-theory with a very large blocklength regime have been considered [2]. However, in streaming communications, which are utilized, for example, in audio/video transmissions, automotive, smart-city, control applications, etc., there are strict real-time constraints that demand low in-order delivery delays while the high data rates require all the available resources of the MP-MH networks. Traditional information-theory solutions with large blocklength are not able to reach this desired trade-off.

In point-to-point channels with erasures and delayed feedback, different packet-level techniques have been considered to manage and reduce the effects of this throughput-delay trade-off. Using forward error correction (FEC) according to the feedback acknowledgments, the in-order delivery delay can be reduced [3], and the performance of SR-ARQ (Selective Repeat - Automatic Repeat reQuest) protocols can be boosted [4]. Moreover, coding solutions are considered as well [5–8]. However, although part of those solutions are reactive to the feedback acknowledgments (i.e. causal), none of those solutions are tracking the varying channel condition and the rate (i.e. not adaptive). In [9] for SP communication, we have recently provided a novel adaptive and causal random linear network coding (AC-RLNC) solution with FEC. To ensure low in-order delivery delays, in this solution the sender tracks the channel variations (i.e. adaptive) using a priori and posteriori algorithms (i.e. causal), and adapts the code rate according to the erasure realizations.

Although joint optimization of coding and scheduling in SP communications has been considered in [9], joint coding and scheduling in MP and MH networks for optimizing the trade-off between throughput and in-order delivery delay remains a challenging open problem. To generalize the AC-RLNC solution to MP networks, the main difficulty lies in the discrete allocation of the new coded packets of information and FEC coded packets, over the available paths. On one hand, in order to achieve a high throughput, the sender needs to send as many packets of information as possible. On the other hand, it has to balance the failed transmissions by retransmitting several times the same packets. Furthermore, the earlier the retransmissions are sent, the lower is the delay. To obtain the desired throughput-delay trade-off, the raised open problem is how to allocate transmitted packets to the paths, at each
time slot. Moreover, in a MH network, the rate is limited by the link with the smallest rate, therefore causing bottleneck effects if the channel rate varies from hop to hop. In this paper, we propose a MP and MH adaptive causal networking solution that can learn the erasure pattern of the channels, and adaptively adjust the allocation of its retransmitted packets across the available paths. Furthermore, in the MH setting, we propose a decentralized adaptive solution which may completely avoid the bottleneck effect by reorganizing the order of global paths at each intermediate node. This novel approach will closes the mean and max in-order-delay gap and boost the throughput.

Contributions

We propose a novel adaptive causal coding solution with FEC for MP and MH communications with delayed feedback. The proposed solution generalizes the SP setting, in which the AC-RLNC algorithm can track the network condition, and adaptively adjust its retransmission rates a priori and posteriori over all the available resources in the network. Specifically, to balance the allocation of packets across different paths, the adaptive algorithm we utilize is based on a discrete waterfilling approach. Furthermore, in the MH setting, to reduce the bottleneck effect due to the channel variations at each hop, we propose a new decentralized optimization balancing algorithm. This adaptive algorithm can be applied independently at each intermediate node according to the feedback acknowledgments, while tracking the erasure patterns of the income and outcome channels.

We contrast the performance of the proposed approach with the one of SR-ARQ. We demonstrate that the proposed approach can, compared to SR-ARQ, achieve a throughput up to two times better and reduce the delay by a factor of more than three.

The structure of this work is as follows. In Section II, we formally describe the system model and the metrics in use. In Section III, we provide a background on the SP solution and on the MH transmission protocol. In Section IV, we present the MP solution with the simulation results. In Section V, we generalize the MP solution to MP-MH solution. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section VI.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a real-time slotted communication model with feedback in two different settings: first a multipath (MP) channel with \( P \) paths and then a multipath and multi-hop (MH) channel with \( H \) hops and \( P \) paths per hop, as represented in Figure 1. Symbol definitions are provided in Table I.

### Multipath setting

At each time slot \( t \), the sender transmits over each path \( p \in \{1, \ldots, P\} \) a coded packet \( c_{t,p} \). Forward paths between the sender and the receiver are modeled as independent binary erasure channels (BEC). Namely, erasure events are i.i.d. with probability \( \epsilon_p \) for each \( p \)-th path. According to the erasure realizations, the receiver sends at each time slot either an acknowledgment (ACK) or a negative-acknowledgment (NACK) message to the sender, using the same paths. For simplicity, feedback messages are assumed to be reliable, i.e., without errors in the feedback.

The delay between the transmission of a coded packet and the reception of the corresponding feedback is called round trip time (RTT). Defining \( \rho_p \) as the rate of the forward path \( p \), in bits/second and \( |c_{t,p}| \) as the size of coded packet \( c_{t,p} \), in bits, the maximum duration of a transmission is

\[
\text{transmission time} = t_d = \max\{|c_{t,p}|/\rho_p\}.
\]

Letting \( t_b \) be the propagation time between sender and receiver in seconds and assuming the size of feedback messages is negligible compared to the size of coded packets, the RTT is given by

\[
\text{RTT} = t_d + 2t_b.
\]

Hence, for each transmitted coded packet \( c_{t,p} \), the sender receives a ACK\((t,p)\) or NACK\((t,p)\) after RTT seconds.

### Multipath Multi-hop setting

In this setting, the sender and receiver behave exactly as in the single-hop. For simplicity, we assume that there are \( P \) paths in each hop \( h \in \{1, \ldots, H\} \), each with i.i.d. erasure probabilities \( \epsilon_{p,h} \). At each time slot, each intermediate node \( n_h \) receives from the \( h \)-th hop (and therefore either from the sender for the first node or from the previous node for the others) \( P \) coded packets from the independent paths. The node then sends \( P \) (possibly different) coded packets on the \((h+1)\)-th hop (towards next node or the receiver for the last intermediate node). For feedback acknowledgments, either a local hop-by-hop mechanism (from node to node) or a global one (directly from the receiver to the sender) can be used. Letting \( t_{h,p} \) be the propagation delay of one hop, in seconds, and assuming all hops have the same propagation delay, the propagation time \( t_p \) becomes \( t_p = Ht_{p,h} \).

\( ^1 \)A negligible size header containing transmission information may be sent with the coded packets.
Our goal for both of these settings, with parameters \( \rho \)-th and RTT, is to maximize the throughput, \( \eta \), while minimizing the in-order delay, \( D \), as given in the following definitions.

**Definition 1.** Throughput, \( \eta \). This is the total amount of information (in bits/second) delivered, in order, at the receiver in \( n \) transmissions over the forward channel. The normalized throughput is the total amount of information delivered, in order at the receiver divided by \( n \) and the size of the packets.

**Definition 2.** In-order delivery delay, \( D \). This is the difference between the time an information packet is first transmitted in a coded packet by the sender and the time that the same information packet is decoded, in order at the receiver, and successfully acknowledged [1].

More precisely, we consider the mean and max in-order delay \( D_{\text{mean}} \) and \( D_{\text{max}} \). While \( D_{\text{mean}} \) reduces the overall delay, \( D_{\text{max}} \) is critical for real-time applications that need a low inter-arrival time between packets.

### III. BACKGROUND

Before we consider the MP and MH protocols in details, we present the SP AC-RLNC algorithm suggested in [9] and the capacity achieving protocol described in [10].

#### a) SP AC-RLNC algorithm:
In [9], an adaptive causal random linear network coding algorithm for a single-hop single-path setting is described. We review here several key features of that protocol.

**Coded packets and sliding window mechanism:** Raw packets of information are encoded using RLNC. Each coded packet \( c_t \), called a degree of freedom (DoF), is obtained as

\[
c_t = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{W}_{\text{min}}}^\mathbb{W}_{\text{max}} \mu_i \cdot x_i,
\]

with \( \{ \mu_i \}_{i \in \mathbb{W}_{\text{min}}}^{\mathbb{W}_{\text{max}}} \), random coefficients in the field \( \mathbb{F}_2 \) of size \( z \). \( \{ x_i \}_{i \in \mathbb{W}_{\text{min}}}^{\mathbb{W}_{\text{max}}} \), the raw information packets and \( \mathbb{W}_{\text{min}} \) and \( \mathbb{W}_{\text{max}} \), the limits of the current window.\(^3\) At each time step, the sender can either transmit a new coded packet or repeat the last sent combination\(^4\). \( \mathbb{W}_{\text{max}} \) is thus incremented each time a new DoF is sent while \( \mathbb{W}_{\text{min}} \) corresponds to the oldest raw packet that is not yet decoded. We denote by DoF(\( c_t \)) the DoF’s contained in \( c_t \), i.e. the number of information packets in \( c_t \).

**Tracking the path rate and DoF rate:** Given the feedback acknowledgments, the sender can track the erasure probability \( \epsilon \) (and thus the path rate \( r \), defined as \( r = 1 - \epsilon \)) as well as the DoF rate \( d = md/ad \), with \( md \) and \( ad \) being respectively the number of erased and repeated DoF’s. These quantities are needed by the two FEC mechanisms that counteract the erasures.

\( ^2 \) As shown in [2], if \( z \) is large enough, a generation of \( k \) raw information packets can be decoded with high probability using Gaussian elimination on \( k \) coded packets.

\( ^3 \) “Same” and “new” refer here to the raw packets of information contained in the linear combination. Sending the same linear combination thus means that the raw packets are the same but with different random coefficients.

\( ^4 \) \( [x] \) corresponds to rounding \( x \) to the nearest integer.

### IV. MULTIPATH COMMUNICATION

In this section, we propose to merge the AC-RLNC solution described in Section III (for SP), with an adaptive algorithm...
balancing the allocation of new RLNC’s and FEC RLNC’s on the paths. Figure 2 shows the adaptive causal coding process on the single hop multipath network. The adaptive algorithm is based on a discrete water filling approach, i.e., bit-filling (BF), as given in [12]. However, the BF is modified in order to take into account both rate and in-order delay objectives. To reach the desired trade-off between throughput and delay in the MP network, we suggest to utilize the key features of the SP AC-RLNC algorithm, especially the a-priori and a-posteriori FEC mechanisms, as well as the tracking of the channel rate and the DoF rate via the feedback acknowledgments. Yet, in the MP network, to maximize the throughput while minimizing the in-order delay, allocation of new coded packets and retransmissions demands to consider adaptively the available resources across all the channels. The main components of the packet level protocol and the balanced allocation algorithm over the different paths are described next in Section IV-A. The symbol definitions are provided in Table I. In Section IV-B, the simulation results of the solution we suggest for the MP network are presented.

A. Adaptive Coding Algorithm

Here we detail the MP solution, described in Algorithm 1.

a) A priori mechanism (FEC): After the transmission of \( k = P(\text{RTT} - 1) \) new RLNC’s, \( m_p = [r_p \text{RTT} - 1] \) FEC’s are sent on the \( p \)-th path. This mechanism tries to provide a sufficient number of DoF’s to the receiver, by balancing the expected number of erasures. Note that \( m_p \) may vary from path to path, according to the estimated erasure probability of each path.

b) A posteriori mechanism (FB-FEC): The retransmission criterion of the FB-FEC mechanism has to reflect, at the sender’s best knowledge, the ability of the receiver to decode RLNC’s. Let \( md_p \) be the number of missing DoF’s (i.e. the number of new coded packets that have been erased), and \( ad_p \) be the number of added DoF’s (i.e. the number of repeated RLNC’s that have reached the receiver). The retransmission criterion can be expressed as \( md_p > ad_p \). Indeed, if the number of erased new packets is not balanced by enough repetitions, then decoding is not possible. However, at the sender side, \( md_p \) and \( ad_p \) cannot be computed exactly due to the RTT delay. At time step \( t \), the sender can only compute accurately these quantities for the RLNC’s sent before \( t^* = t - \text{RTT} \) and that have thus a feedback acknowledgment. But for those sent between \( t^* \) and \( t \), two quantities have to be estimated, for instance using the average rate of each path. Thus, letting \( md_t \) and \( ad_t \) (resp. \( md_{t^*} \) and \( ad_{t^*} \)) correspond to the RLNC’s with (resp.) feedback acknowledgments, \( md_t = md_{t^*} + md_p \) and \( ad_t = ad_{t^*} + ad_p \) are computed through (3) and (4). Note that in these equations, the different sets are defined in Table I, and \(|S|\) denotes the cardinality of set \( S \).

\[ md_1 = |N \cap C \cap \mathcal{U}|, \quad md_2 = \sum_{p=1}^{P} \epsilon_p |P_p \cap C \cap \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{U}| \]  \( (3) \)

\[ ad_1 = |A \cap C \cap \mathcal{U}|, \quad ad_2 = \sum_{p=1}^{P} \epsilon_p |P_p \cap C \cap \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{U}| \]  \( (4) \)

Note that \( C = C^* \cup C^a = A \cup N \cup \mathcal{F} \).
Algorithm 1 multipath protocol for packet scheduling

1: Initialize transmission:
2: while packets to transmit do
3: if Feedback available then
4: Update ε_p for each path
5: Update m_p and u_d
6: Update ∆
7: end if
8: Size limit transmissions:
9: if w > ∆ then
10: Retransmit same RLNC until DoF(c_l) = 0
11: else
12: FEC transmissions:
13: for all paths with m_p > 0 do
14: Retransmit same RLNC
15: end for
16: if remaining paths then
17: FB-FEC transmissions:
18: if ∆ > 0 then
19: Determine FB-FEC paths
20: Transmit same RLNC on these paths
21: end if
22: New transmissions:
23: for all remaining paths do
24: if not EW then
25: Transmit new RLNC
26: end if
27: end for
28: FEC transmission (initialization):
29: if EW then
30: Set m_p := [ε_p(RTT - 1)]
31: for all remaining paths do
32: Transmit same RLNC
33: end for
34: end if
35: end if
36: end while

It is important to note that by tuning the chosen parameter th (reflected in ∆ [5]) it is possible to obtain the desired throughout-delay trade-off. Moreover, to maximize the performance of the proposed approach, it is required to solve problem [7] only when the estimations of the rates change. To reduce the complexity of the optimization problem, once the number of paths is high, we can consider a relaxation of the optimization, e.g., using Knapsack problem algorithms [14], [15].

B. Simulation Results

The performance of the MP AC-RLNC protocol is compared with two other protocols, as presented in Figure 4.

a) Setting and protocols: We consider the setting of Figure I with H = 1, P = 4, RTT = 20, and with ε31 = 0.2 and ε41 = 0.8, while the erasure probabilities of the two other paths (ε11 and ε21) vary in the range of [0.1 0.8].

The MP AC-RLNC protocol has been simulated with th = 0 and δ = 2w. To emphasize the gain we get by tracking the channel condition, adjusting the retransmissions, and with the discrete BF algorithm, we compare the MP protocol with the SP AC-RLNC [9], applied independently on each path. The tunable parameters of the SP AC-RLNC protocol are the same as the MP one. Furthermore, we compare these protocols with SR-ARQ [16]–[18], to show the gain we get with adaptive and causal network coding. Again, the SR-ARQ protocol is used independently on each path. The results of Figure 4 have been averaged on 150 different channel realizations, where the filled curves correspond to the mean performances while the error bars represent the standard deviation from the mean.

b) Results: Based on the results of Figure 4, the throughput is slightly increased (around 15%) compared to the SP AC-RLNC protocol but nearly doubled with regards to SR-ARQ, independently of the erasure probabilities. On the delay point of view, both the mean and max in-order delay are dramatically reduced with the MP protocol. More precisely, compared to SP AC-RLNC protocol, the MP protocol performs nearly twice as better in term of mean delay and between 2 to 3 times better in terms of max delay. With regards to the SR-ARQ protocol, performances are nearly 4 times better for the mean delay and between 4 to 6 times better for the max one. For higher RTT’s, the gap between our solution and other protocols increases.

V. MULTI-HOP MULTIPATH COMMUNICATION

In this section, we generalize the MP solution given in Section IV to the MP and MH setting introduced in Section II, in which each node can estimate the erasure probability of the incoming and outgoing paths according to the local feedback. To present our MH protocol, we use the example of Figure 5.

In that MH setting, in the asymptotic regime, using RLNC, the min-cut max-flow capacity C (2.6 in the example) can be achieved by mixing together coded packets from all the paths at each intermediate node (see Section III). Hence, one could use P parallel SP AC-RLNC protocols with the node recoding protocol to get a throughput very close to the min-cut max-flow capacity. However, due to the mixing between the paths, dependencies are introduced between the FEC’s and the new RLNC’s. This will thus result in a high in-order delay.

To reduce the in-order delay, the MP algorithm we suggest in Section IV can be used on P global paths, using RLNC independently on each path. A naive choice of global paths is shown in the upper part of Figure 4. In that setting, due to the min-cut max-flow capacity, the maximum throughput of each path is limited by its bottleneck (i.e. the link with the smallest rate). Doing so, the maximum throughput (i.e. the sum of the min-cut of each path) can thus be much lower than the capacity of the network, as it can be seen from the example of Figure 5, in which the throughput is 1.5.

6 Those results are not shown here due to limited space.
7 The paths are described by their color and their type of arrow.
8 In Figure 5 bottlenecks are denoted by a curvy symbol behind the rate.
A. Adaptive Coding Algorithm

Here we describe the suggested MP and MH solution.

a) Global paths - problem formulation: In order for the \( h \)-th node to transmit packets over the paths maximizing the rate, it needs to know the local matching \( L(p, h) \), such that, \( L(p, h) = j \) implies that the \( j \)-th path of the \( (h + 1) \)-th hop is matched with the \( p \)-th path of the \( h \)-th hop. The definition of the global paths can be done equivalently through a global matching \( G(p, h) \), such that, \( G(p, h) = j \) implies that the \( j \)-th path of the \( h \)-th hop belongs to the \( p \)-th global path. We point out that even if these two definitions are equivalent, the local matching is particularly convenient to express the global paths in a decentralized way. Moreover, it is important to note that, for \( L \) and \( G \) to be an admissible matching, each local path must be matched with exactly one other local path at each node. Hence, \( L \) and \( G \) are defined respectively as the set of admissible local and global matchings. The values of \( L \) and \( G \) are shown in the example given in Figure 5 are respectively equal to

\[
L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 3 & 4 & 2 \\ 4 & 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 \\ 3 & 4 & 4 \\ 4 & 3 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Once admissible global paths are determined, the maximum achievable throughput \( \eta_{\text{max}} \) corresponds to the sum of the min-cut of each global path. Defining \( r_{G(p,h)} \) as the rate of the \( (p, h) \)-th path in the \( h \)-th hop, \( \eta_{\text{max}} \) is thus equal to

\[
\eta_{\text{max}}(G) = \sum_{p=1}^{P} \min_{h=1 \ldots H} r_{G(p,h)}.
\]

Consequently, since \( G \) and \( L \) are equivalent, the global path problem can be expressed as

\[
L = \arg \max_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \eta_{\text{max}}(L).
\] (8)

b) Global paths - suggested solution: Looking at each global path independently, it appears that rate is lost each time two segments of the global paths are unbalanced (i.e. having different rates). In order to match the paths in a balanced way, we thus suggest the following optimization problem.

**Proposition 2** (Balancing Optimization). Given incoming paths with rate \( r_{\text{in}} \) and outgoing paths with rate \( r_{\text{out}} \), the matching \( l \) between these paths is defined as

\[
l = \arg \min_{l \in \text{Perm}(P)} \sum_{p=1}^{P} |r_{\text{in}}(p) - r_{\text{out}}(\tilde{l}(p))|,
\]

with \( r_{\text{out}}(\tilde{l}(p)) \) the rate of the \( \tilde{l}(p) \)-th outgoing path and \( \text{Perm}(P) \) being the set of all permutations of the vector \( [1, 2, \ldots, P] \).

9The global matching of the first hop is such that the \( p \)-th local path belongs to the \( p \)-th global path, i.e. \( G(p, 1) = p \forall p = 1 \ldots P \).

10This restriction prevents non-admissible matchings.
Using (9), the matching of the MP-MH channel is defined in the following way. The first node finds the first matching \( l_1 \) by solving (5) with \( r_{in}(p) = r_{p1} \) and \( r_{out}(p) = r_{p2} \). Then, for the second node, the incoming rate \( r_{in} \) can be computed as the min-cut of the partially built paths and \( r_{out} \) is set to the rates of next hop. Again, (9) can be solved to find \( l_2 \). This procedure can be repeated until the last node is reached and the local matching \( L \) is built as \( L = [l_1, l_2, ..., l_{H-1}] \). Algorithm 2 summarizes the protocol.

![Figure 6. Performances of the multi-hop protocol with RTT = 12 [slots], th = 0 and \( \bar{\sigma} = 2k \), on 4 paths, averaged on 150 iterations. The top results are for end-to-end feedback (from the receiver to the sender), while the bottom results are for hop-by-hop feedback (from each intermediate node and receiver).](image)

**Algorithm 2: Greedy balancing protocol**

1. Set \( r^{(1)}_{in}(p) = r_{p1}, \forall p = 1...P \)
2. for \( h = 1...H - 1 \) do
3. Set \( r^{(h)}_{out}(p) = r_{p,h+1}, \forall p = 1...P \)
4. Find \( l_h \) by solving (9)
5. Permute \( r^{(h)}_{in} \) according to \( l_h \) to get \( r^* \), such that \( r^*(p) \) is matched with \( r_{p,h+1} \)
6. Set \( r^{(h+1)}_{in}(p) = \min(r^*, r_{p,h+1}) \)
7. Send \( r^{(h+1)}_{in} \) to the next node
8. end for

Note that Algorithm 2 can be implemented in a decentralized way, with a minimum amount of communication between the nodes. Since the nodes can estimate the erasure probabilities of the adjacent paths, the only needed communication at the \( h \)-th hop is the propagation of \( r^{(h)}_{in} \).

c) Global paths - Efficient balancing: In order to determine the matching in an efficient way, (9) can be reformulated as a minimum weight matching in a bipartite graph, also called assignment problem [19]. Indeed, a complete bipartite graph with two classes having \( P \) vertices each, corresponding respectively to \( r_{in} \) and \( r_{out} \), can be built. The edge linking \( r_{in}(p) \) and \( r_{out}(p^*) \) is weighted by \( |r_{in}(p) - r_{out}(p^*)| \). In that graph, (9) is equivalent to finding a perfect matching (each input path is matched with exactly one output path) with a minimum weight (minimize the sum of the rate differences). Several efficient solutions are suggested in the literature for balancing. For example, we can utilize the so called Hungarian algorithm [19], given in Algorithm 3 its complexity being in \( O(n^3) \). This algorithm works on the matrix \( A \), whose rows (resp. columns) correspond to the first (resp. second) class and whose elements are the weights of the corresponding edges.

**Algorithm 3: Hungarian algorithm [19]**

1: Initialize \( A \)
2: Subtract from each row (resp. column) its minimum
3: while True do
4: Cover all zeros with a minimum number of lines
5: if \( P \) lines are needed then
6: break;
7: else
8: Set \( k \) to the minimum element of \( A \)
9: Subtract \( k \) from covered elements
10: Add \( k \) to covered twice elements
11: end if
12: end while
13: Build the matching from the position of the 0’s

d) Selective mixing: The AC-RLNC MP protocol can be applied on the balanced global paths. Yet, mixing packets between some of the paths can improve the algorithm. From Figure 5, it can be seen on one hand that defining global paths reduces the maximum throughput. On the other hand, mixing all packets between all the paths suppresses the usefulness of FEC and FB-FEC transmissions. But if at intermediate nodes, new packets are mixed together on one hand and the FEC’s and FB-FEC transmissions. Yet, mixing packets between some of the paths can improve the algorithm. From Figure 5, it can be seen on one hand that defining global paths reduces the maximum throughput. On the other hand, mixing all packets between all the paths suppresses the usefulness of FEC and FB-FEC transmissions. But if at intermediate nodes, new packets are mixed together on one hand and the FEC’s and FB-FEC on the other hand, the throughput will be increased without increasing the delay.

**B. Simulation Results**

The performances of the MP-MH AC-RLNC protocol are compared with two other protocols, as presented in Figure 6.

\[11\]We do not prove that Algorithm 2 solves exactly problem (8). Nevertheless, it provides efficiently a good solution to that problem.
We consider the setting of Figure 1 with $H=3$, $P=4$, with

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
\epsilon_{11} & \epsilon_{12} & \epsilon_{13} \\
\epsilon_{21} & \epsilon_{22} & \epsilon_{23} \\
\epsilon_{31} & \epsilon_{32} & \epsilon_{33} \\
\epsilon_{41} & \epsilon_{42} & \epsilon_{43}
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
0.1 & 0.6 & 0.3 \\
0.8 & 1 & 1 \\
0.2 & 0.7 & 0.4 \\
0.4 & 0.2 & 0.8
\end{pmatrix},
$$

with $\epsilon_1$ and $\epsilon_2$ varying in the range of [0.1 0.8]. The results are shown for a $RTT$ delay of 12 time slots.

The proposed protocol has been simulated with $th=0$ and $\bar{o}=2w$. First, we compare in the upper graph of Figure 6 our solution with end to end protocols. Specifically, as for the multipath case, the SP AC-RLNC protocol and the SR-ARQ protocol are applied independently on the $P$ balanced global paths we get with Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$. However, no recoding is performed at the intermediate nodes. Secondly, in order to not depend on node recoding, we investigate in the lower graph of Figure 6 the performances of the hop by hop SR-ARQ protocol on two different settings. In one setting, it is applied to one single global path that is build from the best path of each hop. In the other, it is applied on the $P$ balanced paths.

The metrics have been averaged on 150 different channel realizations, where the filled curves correspond to the mean performances while the error bars represent the standard deviation, as for the MP results.

b) Results: From Figure 6 one can see that the MP-MH AC-RLNC protocol performs dramatically better both with regards to the rate and in-order delay. As expected, in the upper graph, one can see that the rate is improved a lot with regards to end to end protocols. The rate is doubled for good channel conditions ($\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 0.1$) and multiplied by 3 for bad channel channel conditions ($\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 0.8$), for the SP AC-RLNC algorithm. Compared with the SP SR-ARQ protocols, performances are even better. Yet, the improvements are even more dramatic from the delay point of view. The mean and max in-order delay are reduced by a factor 15 for good channel conditions and up to a factor 40 for bad ones, for both the AC-ARLNC and the SR-ARQ protocols. From the lower part of Figure 6, it can be seen that the hop by hop SR-ARQ protocol is also much worse than our solution. The improvement we get on the rate is small (10%) for good channel conditions but it becomes significant (35%) when channels are bad. From the delay point of view, the gain is significant since both the mean and max in-order delay are reduced approximately by a factor 10. The hop by hop SR-ARQ protocol on only 1 path has obviously a much lower rate. For the in-order delay, the improvements we get highly depend on the channel configuration (changing slightly the erasure probabilities gives very different results) but the MH AC-RLNC protocol is still better independently of the configuration of the channel.

VI. CONCLUSION

We proposed a MP-MH adaptive and causal coding algorithm for communications with delayed feedback. The MP algorithm, and especially the combination of the a-priori and a-posteriori mechanisms with efficient bit-filling packet allocation, outperforms significantly the existing protocols. By tuning the parameters of the algorithm, the desired throughput-delay trade-off is obtained. Splitting the MH protocol into the suggested balancing optimization and the MP algorithm gives very promising results. Indeed, MP-MH AC-RLNC protocol has a higher throughput and a much lower delay compared to SR-ARQ. Specifically, in the end-to-end setting without recoding in the intermediate nodes, it reaches a very high delay and a lower throughput. The hop-by-hop SR-ARQ is less impacted by the absence of recoding. Nevertheless, this comes at the price of a high sensitivity to the channel configuration and the order of the hops, while each node needs to be able to perform the full SR-ARQ protocol.

Future work includes the derivation of bounds on the mean and maximum in order delivery delay and throughput. Extensions also include the study of general mesh networks.
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