

Structured Hypergraphs in Cellular Mobile Communication Systems

Ashwin Ganesan*

Abstract

An open problem is to extend the results in the literature on unit disk graphs to hypergraph models. Motivated by recent results that the worst-case performance of the distributed maximal scheduling algorithm is characterized by the interference degree of the hypergraph, in the present work we investigate properties of the interference degree of the hypergraph and the structure of hypergraphs arising from physical constraints. We show that the problem of computing the interference degree of a hypergraph is NP-hard and we prove some properties and results concerning this hypergraph invariant. We then investigate which hypergraphs are realizable, i.e. which hypergraphs arise in practice, based on physical constraints, as the interference model of a wireless network. In particular, given the results on the worst-case performance of the maximal scheduling algorithm, a question that arises naturally is: what is the maximal value of r such that the hypergraph $K_{1,r}$ is realizable? We show that this value is $r = 4$.

Index terms — Cellular systems; hypergraph models; unit disk graphs; wireless networks; distributed algorithms; maximal scheduling; interference degree.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	System Model	3
2.1	Unit Disk Graphs	3
2.2	The Hypergraph of a Wireless Network	4
2.3	The Interference Degree of a Hypergraph	5
2.4	Notation and Terminology	5
3	Related Work	6

*The author is with upGrad-INSOFE, 2nd Floor, Vamsiram Builders, Jyothi Imperial, Janardana Nagar, Lumbini Avenue, Gachibowli, . Author's mailing address: 53 Deonar House, Deonar Village Road, Deonar, Mumbai, Maharashtra 400088, India. Email: ashwin.ganesan@gmail.com

4	The Interference Degree of Structured Hypergraphs	7
5	Non-Realizable Hypergraphs	9
5.1	Preliminaries	10
5.2	The Hypergraph $K_{1,5}$ is Not Realizable	14
6	Concluding Remarks	16

1. Introduction

Combinatorial interference models for wireless communication networks such as conflict graphs and hypergraphs have been widely studied in the literature, and the performance of various protocols and distributed algorithms for resource allocation and scheduling have been investigated using these models. The combinatorial objects that arise in this context due to geometric, graph-theoretic, or physical (SINR) constraints have additional structure that can be exploited to design efficient algorithms that are guaranteed to be close to optimal for various problems. For example, unit disk graphs have additional structure - the interference degree of a unit disk graph (defined below) is at most 5 - and this implies that the performance of the distributed maximal scheduling algorithm is a factor of at most 5 away from optimal. An open problem in the literature that we consider in the present work is to extend the results in the literature on unit disk graphs to hypergraph models.

When entities in a network compete for resources, the competition can be modeled by a *conflict graph*, whose vertices correspond to the entities and whose edges correspond to pairs of vertices that cannot be assigned the same resource. Thus, many resource allocation and scheduling problems are variations of the problem of coloring the conflict graph [6] [22]. In a wireless network, nodes which are in the same vicinity interfere with each other and correspond to adjacent vertices in the conflict graph [27]. Given the conflict graph of a wireless network and the fraction of each unit of time that each node demands to be active, the *admission control problem* is to determine whether the set of demands is feasible. The optimal, centralized version of the admission control problem is NP-hard [11].

A distributed algorithm for the admission control problem that relies only on localized information and has low processing complexity is maximal scheduling [40], also known as rate constraints [24] [25] or row constraints [20]. The *interference degree* of a graph is the maximum number of vertices that are neighbors of a vertex and that are pairwise nonadjacent. In [7] [10] [11] it was shown that in the worst case, the performance of the maximal scheduling algorithm is away from optimal by a factor equal to the interference degree of the conflict graph.

In some real world problems, the conflict graph has additional structure, based on geometric or other constraints, which can be exploited to give efficient algorithms whose suboptimality is bounded by a fixed constant. For example, consider a wireless network whose nodes are equipped with omnidirectional antennas and have the same transmission range. Suppose two nodes interfere with each other whenever unit disks

centered at their locations intersect [26]. The resulting conflict graph is called a unit disk graph. The interference degree of a unit disk graph is at most 5 [32]. By the results in the preceding paragraph, the maximal scheduling algorithm is a factor of 5 away from optimal in the worst case for unit disk graphs [10] [12]. An open problem in the literature (cf. [12, p. 1333]) is to extend the results in the literature on unit disk graphs to hypergraph models.

Hypergraph interference models and physical (SINR) models capture certain complexities which cannot be captured by graphs and achieve better performance [33] [34] [37] [41] [23]. For example, in a wireless network with three nodes, it is possible for the interference to be such that any two nodes can be simultaneously active, and if all three nodes are simultaneously active then the interference is intolerable. A subset of nodes that causes intolerable interference is called a forbidden set. The interference can be modeled by a hypergraph, whose hyperedges are the minimal forbidden sets. A maximal scheduling algorithm for wireless networks under the hypergraph interference model was proposed in [31]. The interference degree of a hypergraph was defined in [15] and was shown to characterize the worst-case performance of the maximal scheduling algorithm.

In the present work, we investigate the interference degree of structured hypergraphs. The problem of computing the interference degree of a hypergraph is shown to be NP-hard, and the interference degree of certain structured hypergraphs is determined. We investigate which hypergraphs are realizable, i.e. which hypergraphs arise as the interference model of a wireless network. We prove that the maximal value of r such that the hypergraph $K_{1,r}$ is realizable is $r = 4$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the system model; formal definitions of the unit disk graph model and hypergraph model are given, and the interference degree of a hypergraph is defined. Section 3 discusses related work. In Section 4, we show that the problem of computing the interference degree of a hypergraph is NP-hard and determine the interference degree of some structured hypergraphs. In Section 5, we investigate which hypergraphs are realizable, and we prove that the hypergraph $K_{1,5}$ is not realizable. Section 6 contains concluding remarks.

2. System Model

2.1. Unit Disk Graphs

Consider a wireless network where all nodes have the same transmission range and are equipped with omnidirectional antennas. Then, the coverage area of each node is a disk centered at the location of that node. Two nodes interfere with each other if and only if the disks centered at their locations intersect. Given a set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ of stations in the Euclidean plane, the *unit disk graph generated by S* is the graph $G = (S, E)$ with vertex set S , and with two vertices $s_i, s_j \in S$ being adjacent in G whenever the Euclidean distance $d(s_i, s_j)$ between the corresponding two stations is at most 1. A graph is called a *unit disk graph* if it is generated by some set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$.

If $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ generates G , then we say S is a *realization* of G . The unit disk graph assumption has been used often by researchers in the sensor networks community to model the topology of wireless networks [26].

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a vertex $v \in V$ and a subset $W \subseteq V$, let $\alpha(G)$ denote the independence number of G , let $\Gamma(v)$ denote the set of neighbors in G of vertex v , and let $G[W]$ denote the subgraph of G induced by W . The *interference degree* of a graph G , denoted by $\sigma(G)$, is defined to be $\max_{v \in V} \alpha(G[\Gamma(v)])$ [11] [7]. Thus, $\sigma(G) = r$ if and only if G contains the star $K_{1,r}$ as an induced subgraph and G does not contain the star $K_{1,r+1}$ as an induced subgraph.

It can be shown that the star $K_{1,5}$ is a unit disk graph, and that the star $K_{1,6}$ is not a unit disk graph [32]. To see why $K_{1,6}$ is not a unit disk graph, observe that the maximum distance between any two points in a 60° sector of a unit circle is 1; hence, if six stations are placed in the unit ball, then the distance between some two stations is at most 1. It follows that the interference degree of a unit disk graph is at most 5. This implies that a certain greedy, distributed algorithm for admission control, called maximal scheduling (or row constraints) (cf. [20] [25]), is a factor of at most 5 away from optimal for unit disk graphs [12].

2.2. The Hypergraph of a Wireless Network

A hypergraph is a pair (V, \mathcal{E}) where V is a finite set, called the vertex set or ground set, and \mathcal{E} is a collection of subsets of V . The elements of \mathcal{E} are called hyperedges (or edges). Thus, hypergraphs generalize graphs in the sense that the size of a hyperedge $E \in \mathcal{E}$ is not restricted to be 2.

Consider a wireless network $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$, where $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$ is a set of stations (or transceivers), α is the path-loss exponent, and β is the reception threshold. The parameter β is sometimes also called the SINR threshold for successful reception [37] (though we ignore noise in the present model), and refers to the maximum interference that is tolerable. We shall identify the symbol s_i , used for a station, with its location in the Euclidean plane, so that $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$. It will be assumed throughout this paper that the path-loss exponent $\alpha = 4$.

For $W \subseteq S$, the energy (or interference) at $w \in W$ due to transmissions by the stations in $W - \{w\}$ is defined to be

$$E(W - \{w\}, w) = \sum_{s \in W - \{w\}} \frac{1}{d(s, w)^4},$$

where $d(a, b)$ denotes the Euclidean distance between points a and b .

Given a wireless network $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$, a subset $W \subseteq S$ is called a *forbidden set* for the wireless network \mathcal{A} if the interference is intolerable at some station in W when all the other stations in W are active. In other words, a subset W of stations is forbidden if there exists a station $w \in W$ such that

$$E(W - \{w\}, w) = \sum_{s \in W - \{w\}} \frac{1}{d(s, w)^4} \geq \beta.$$

A forbidden set is a *minimal forbidden set* if it does not properly contain a forbidden set. The hypergraph interference model is defined by taking the hyperedges to be the minimal forbidden sets:

Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ be a wireless network, where S is a set of points in \mathbb{R}^2 , $\alpha = 4$ is the path loss exponent, and β is the reception threshold. The hypergraph generated by \mathcal{A} is defined to be the hypergraph $H = (S, \mathcal{E})$, where \mathcal{E} is the collection of all minimal forbidden sets.

This additive model of interference and definition of the hypergraph as a collection of minimal forbidden subsets has been investigated in [33] [34] [37]. If the wireless network \mathcal{A} generates the hypergraph H , then \mathcal{A} is called a *realization* of H . An *independent set* (or *feasible set*) of the hypergraph $H = (S, \mathcal{E})$ is a subset of S that does not contain any hyperedges. Thus, an independent set corresponds to a subset of the stations that can be simultaneously active. Clearly, a subset of an independent set of a hypergraph is an independent set, and a superset of a forbidden set is a forbidden set.

2.3. The Interference Degree of a Hypergraph

In this subsection, we recall from the literature [15] the definition of the interference degree of a hypergraph, which characterize the worst-case performance of the distributed maximal scheduling algorithm.

Let $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph. Define the set $N(i)$ of neighbors of vertex i by

$$N(i) := \{j \in V : \{i, j\} \subseteq E \text{ for some } E \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{I}(H)$ denote the set of all independent sets of the hypergraph H .

Definition 2. [15] The interference degree $\sigma(H)$ of a hypergraph $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ is defined as follows. For $i \in V$, define

$$\Delta'_i := \max_{J \subseteq N(i): J \in \mathcal{I}(H)} \sum_{j \in J} \Delta_{ij},$$

and define

$$\Delta''_i := \max_{J \subseteq N(i): J \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{I}(H)} 1 + \sum_{j \in J} \Delta_{ij}.$$

Let $\Delta' := \max_{i \in V} \Delta'_i$, and $\Delta'' := \max_{i \in V} \Delta''_i$. Then, the interference degree of the hypergraph H is defined by

$$\sigma(H) := \max\{\Delta', \Delta''\}.$$

2.4. Notation and Terminology

The notation and terminology on hypergraphs used in the sequel is standard; any further terminology not explicitly recalled here can be found in [5] [3] [4]. In the sequel, $[N]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$.

A hypergraph is said to be *realizable* if it arises as the interference model of a wireless network, i.e. if it is generated by some wireless network in the sense of Definition 1.

Let $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ and $H' = (V', \mathcal{E}')$ be hypergraphs. The hypergraphs H and H' are *isomorphic* if there exists a bijection f from V to V' such that $f(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{E}'$, where $f(\mathcal{E}) := \{f(E) : E \in \mathcal{E}\}$ and $f(E)$ ($E \subseteq V$) is the image $\{f(x) : x \in E\}$ of E under f . Thus, two hypergraphs are isomorphic if they are the same hypergraph up to a relabeling of the points.

If S is a finite set, then $S^{(r)}$ denotes the collection of all r -subsets of S . A hypergraph (S, \mathcal{E}) is said to be *r -uniform* if the size of each hyperedge is r , i.e. if $\mathcal{E} \subseteq S^{(r)}$. Thus, a 2-uniform hypergraph is just a graph. The *complete r -uniform hypergraph*, denoted by $K_n^{(r)}$, is defined to be the hypergraph with vertex set $[n]$ and with the edge set equal to the collection $[n]^{(r)}$ of all r -subsets of $[n]$.

3. Related Work

Many researchers have investigated the structure of conflict graphs of wireless networks under additional assumptions that are based on geometric, physical (SINR), or graph-theoretic considerations, and exploited this structure for algorithm design.

For example, the unit disk graph assumption has been well-studied by researchers in the sensor networks community. In [32], an algorithm is given that has a performance guarantee of 3 for the maximum independent set problem for unit disk graphs, even though this problem is hard to approximate for general graphs. In [32], an online algorithm for vertex coloring is given that has a competitive ratio of 6 for unit disk graphs. The interference degree of a unit disk graph is at most 5, and so the maximal scheduling algorithm is a factor of at most 5 away from optimal for unit disk graphs [10] [12]. A distributed algorithm for admission control known as the scaled clique constraints are a factor of at most 2.2 away from optimal for unit disk graphs [20].

Under the primary interference model (also known as the 1-hop interference model or the node-exclusive interference model), the conflict graph is a so-called line graph [18]. In this case, the optimal, centralized version of the admission control and scheduling problems can be solved in polynomial time [21]. Under the primary interference model, distributed algorithms that rely only on localized information have been proposed and their performance has been analyzed [38] [28] [10] [12] [14] [13]. Secondary interference models are investigated in [2] [16], and the K -hop interference model is investigated in [39].

Given any conflict graph, the worst case performance of the distributed admission control and scheduling algorithm known as maximal scheduling was analyzed in [7] and independently in [9] [10] [11] and shown to be equal to the interference degree of the conflict graph. The worst-case performance of the maximal scheduling algorithm under the hypergraph interference model was analyzed in [15] and was shown to be equal to the interference degree of the hypergraph.

Under a certain unit disk graph-based model called the bidirectional (equal power) communication model, the interference degree of the conflict graph is at most 8 [7].

Line networks, wherein all nodes lie on the same line, were studied in [30]. Under the protocol interference model (cf. [19]), the interference degree of the conflict graph of certain line networks was shown to be at most 3, and this bound is best possible [14]. A *claw* in a graph is an induced subgraph isomorphic to $K_{1,3}$. When the interference degree of a graph is at most 2, the graph is claw-free; in this case, efficient algorithms exist for many problems, including the maximum independent set problem [35] [36] [8]. Recently, it was shown that the interference degree of conflict graphs arising in NOMA cellular networks is at most 2 [29].

In the protocol interference model of [19], the transmission range of a node is a unit ball centered at that node's location. In [1], it is shown that the unit disk graph model can sometimes be too optimistic (cf. [1, Fig. 2]) and sometimes too pessimistic (cf. [1, Fig. 4]), and SINR diagrams that partition the plane into reception zones are investigated. The authors show that when all stations are simultaneously active, the reception zones satisfy certain properties; this is a different problem from the one studied in [34] [37] and in the present work, where only certain subsets of stations can be simultaneously active.

Hypergraph models for cellular systems were investigated in [33] [34] [37], which discuss the physical (or SINR) model considered in the present work.

4. The Interference Degree of Structured Hypergraphs

Given that the worst-case performance of the maximal scheduling algorithm under the hypergraph interference model is characterized by the interference degree of the hypergraph, in the present section we investigate certain properties of this hypergraph invariant. We show that the problem of computing the interference degree of a hypergraph is NP-hard, and we prove some basic properties of this hypergraph invariant and compute the interference degree of certain structured hypergraphs. These results extend or generalize the previous results in the literature on graph models to hypergraph models.

Theorem 3. *The problem of computing the interference degree of a graph is NP-hard.*

Proof: The proof is by reduction from the independence number problem. The independence number $\alpha(G)$ of a graph G is the maximum number of vertices that are pairwise nonadjacent. The problem of computing the independence number of a graph is NP-hard [17]. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, construct an augmented graph G' , which is obtained from G by joining a new vertex x to each vertex of G . Thus, G' has $|V| + 1$ vertices and $|E| + |V|$ edges. The interference degree $\sigma(G')$ of the augmented graph G' is equal to the independence number $\alpha(G)$. Hence, $\alpha(G) \geq k$ if and only if $\sigma(G') \geq k$. ■

Theorem 4. *The problem of computing the interference degree of a hypergraph is NP-hard.*

Proof: Given any graph $G = (V, E)$, construct a 2-uniform hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ with the same set of edges as G . Then, the interference degree of the hypergraph H is equal to the interference degree of the graph G [15, p. 2955]. Hence, the problem of computing the interference degree of a graph is a special case of the problem of computing the interference degree of a hypergraph. The assertion follows from Theorem 3. ■

While the problem of computing the interference degree of a graph is NP-hard in general, the problem of computing the interference degree of a unit disk graph can be solved in polynomial time: given a unit disk graph G , since its interference degree is at most 5, it suffices to examine, for each vertex $v \in V(G)$, the 5-subsets in its set $\Gamma(v)$ of neighbors, and compute the maximum size of an independent set in each of these 5-subsets.

In the study of interference degree of graphs, two extreme examples that arise are the star graph $K_{1,r}$, which has the largest possible interference degree for a given number of vertices, and the complete graph K_n , which has the smallest possible interference degree for any graph. The result $\sigma(K_{1,r}) = r$ has been generalized to hypergraphs in [15, Corollary 9], where the interference degree of β -star hypergraphs was determined. The next result shows that the interference degree of the complete r -uniform hypergraph $K_n^{(r)}$ is $2 - \frac{1}{r-1}$; the special case of this result when $r = 2$ is the fact (cf. [10, p. 303] [12, p.1326]) that the interference degree of the complete graph K_n is 1.

Lemma 5. *The interference degree of the complete r -uniform hypergraph $H = K_n^{(r)}$ is*

$$\sigma(H) = 2 - \frac{1}{r-1}.$$

Proof: Consider the complete r -uniform hypergraph $K_n^{(r)}$, which has vertex set $[n]$ and edge set $[n]^{(r)}$. By Definition 2, we need to determine Δ'_i and Δ''_i ($i \in [n]$). By symmetry, these values are independent of i . So fix $i \in [n]$. Since the hypergraph is complete, each vertex is in the neighborhood set of all other vertices, i.e. $N(i) = V - \{i\}$. Each hyperedge has size r , whence $\Delta_{ij} = \frac{1}{r-1}$, for all $j \neq i$. The hyperedges are exactly the r -subsets of the vertex set, which implies that the maximum size of an independent set J in $N(i)$ is $r - 1$. Hence,

$$\Delta'_i = \max_{J \subseteq N(i): J \in \mathcal{I}(H)} \sum_{j \in J} \Delta_{ij} = (r-1) \frac{1}{r-1} = 1.$$

The maximum size of an independent set J in $N(i)$ such that $J \cup \{i\}$ is an independent set is $r - 2$. Hence,

$$\Delta''_i = \max_{J \subseteq N(i): J \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{I}(H)} 1 + \sum_{j \in J} \Delta_{ij} = 1 + \frac{r-2}{r-1} = 2 - \frac{1}{r-1}.$$

By Definition 2,

$$\sigma(H) = \max\left\{1, 2 - \frac{1}{r-1}\right\} = 2 - \frac{1}{r-1}.$$

■

In the special case $r = n$, we get that the interference degree of the hypergraph $([n], \{[n]\})$ consisting of a single hyperedge is $2 - \frac{1}{n-1}$. This gives the interference degree of hypergraphs $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ when $|\mathcal{E}| = 1$.

The interference degree of certain structured hypergraphs such as *beta-stars* and complete uniform hypergraphs have been obtained. The question of whether these structured hypergraphs are realizable is a future research direction.

The independence number of a hypergraph H , denoted by $\alpha(H)$, is the maximum size of an independent set in H . It's clear from Definition 2 that $\sigma(H) \leq \alpha(H)$:

Lemma 6. *The interference degree of a hypergraph is at most its independence number.*

Proof: Let $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph. By Definition 2, $\Delta_{ij} \leq 1$, for all $i, j \in V$. Hence, for $i \in V$,

$$|\Delta'_i| \leq \max_{J \subseteq N(i): J \in \mathcal{I}(H)} |J| \leq \alpha(H),$$

and

$$|\Delta''_i| \leq \max_{J \subseteq N(i): J \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{I}(H)} 1 + |J| \leq \alpha(H).$$

Hence, $\sigma(H) \leq \alpha(H)$. ■

The minimum and maximum possible values of a hypergraph with ground set $V = [n]$ is obtained next.

Lemma 7. *Let $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph with ground set $V = [n]$. Then,*

$$1 \leq \sigma(H) \leq n - 1,$$

and both bounds are tight.

Proof: By definition of Δ''_i , we have $\sigma(H) \geq 1$. If the edge set \mathcal{E} is empty, then the neighborhood sets $N(i)$ are empty, and so $\Delta''_i = 1$ for all i and $\sigma(H) = 1$. If the edge set is nonempty, then the maximum size of an independent set in H is at most $n - 1$. By Lemma 6, $\sigma(H) \leq n - 1$. The star hypergraph $K_{1,n-1}$ attains the upper bound, and the complete 2-uniform hypergraph $K_n^{(2)}$ attains the lower bound. ■

5. Non-Realizable Hypergraphs

Recall that the worst-case performance of the maximal scheduling algorithm under the hypergraph interference model is characterized by the interference degree of the hypergraph. In the special case the hypergraph (V, \mathcal{E}) is 2-uniform, its interference degree is equal to the interference degree of the graph (V, \mathcal{E}) [15, p. 2955]. Thus, the interference degree of the 2-uniform hypergraph $K_{1,r}$ is r . When investigating performance guarantees of the distributed maximal scheduling algorithm for hypergraph interference models, a question that arises naturally is: what is the maximal value of r such that the hypergraph $K_{1,r}$ is realizable? This question is investigated in this section and answered in Corollary 16.

In this section, we prove that the 2-uniform hypergraph $K_{1,5}$ is not realizable. In other words, we show that for any placement of six stations $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_5\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ in the Euclidean plane and for any reception threshold β , the hypergraph generated by the wireless network $\langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ is not isomorphic to $K_{1,5}$. Thus, while the maximal value of r such that the graph $K_{1,r}$ is a unit disk graph is $r = 5$, we show that the maximal value of r such that the hypergraph $K_{1,r}$ is realizable is $r = 4$.

Theorem 8. *The hypergraph $K_{1,5}$ is not realizable.*

We prove this assertion by a sequence of lemmas. The final proof is in Section 5.2.

5.1. Preliminaries

In this subsection, we first show that hypergraph models can be viewed as a generalization of the unit disk graph model (cf. Lemma 9) and we show that the 2-uniform hypergraph $K_{1,4}$ is realizable (cf. Example 10). We then prove some preliminary results that are used in the proof of Theorem 8 in subsection 5.2.

Definition 1 of the hypergraph of a wireless network $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ can be generalized by restricting the maximum size of a hyperedge to be at most some value k . In the special case $k = |S|$, there is no restriction on the size of a hyperedge, and so we get Definition 1 above. In the special case $k = 2$, the resulting hypergraph is a unit disk graph, and conversely (see Lemma 9 below) every unit disk graph can be obtained as the hypergraph of a wireless network with $k = 2$; thus, we can view the unit disk graph construction as a special case of a more general method of construction.

Lemma 9. *Suppose $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ is a wireless network, where $\alpha = 4$ and $\beta = 1$. Let $G = (S, E)$ be the unit disk graph generated by S , and let $H = (S, \mathcal{E})$ be the hypergraph generated by \mathcal{A} . Then, $\mathcal{E} \cap S^{(2)} = E$.*

Proof: Let $\{x, y\} \subseteq S$. The Euclidean distance $d(x, y) \leq 1$ if and only if $\frac{1}{d(x,y)^4} \geq 1$, which is the case if and only if $\{x, y\}$ is a forbidden set. Every 2-subset of S that is forbidden is a minimal forbidden set and belongs to \mathcal{E} . Thus, $\{x, y\} \in E$ if and only if $\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{E}$. Thus, $E = \mathcal{E} \cap S^{(2)}$ and $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. ■

As a corollary, we obtain the following: Given any unit disk graph $G = (S, E)$, there exists a wireless network $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ such that the hypergraph $H = (S, \mathcal{E})$ generated by \mathcal{A} satisfies $\mathcal{E} \cap S^{(2)} = E$. Conversely, given any wireless network $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ and the hypergraph $H = (S, \mathcal{E})$ generated by \mathcal{A} , the graph $G = (S, \mathcal{E} \cap S^{(2)})$ is a unit disk graph.

The next example shows that the hypergraph $K_{1,4}$ is realizable.

Example 10. Consider the wireless network $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$, where $S = \{s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4\}$, $s_0 = (0, 0)$, $s_1 = (1, 0)$, $s_2 = (0, 1)$, $s_3 = (-1, 0)$, and $s_4 = (0, -1)$. Suppose $\alpha = 4$ and $\beta = 1$. Then, $\frac{1}{d(s_0, s_i)^4} \geq \beta$ ($i \in [4]$), and so $\{s_0, s_i\}$ is a forbidden set for all $i \in [4]$.

We show that $W = \{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is feasible. By symmetry, it suffices to show that the energy $E(W - \{s_1\}, s_1)$ at s_1 due to transmissions by $\{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$ is less than

the reception threshold β . We have that

$$\begin{aligned} E(W - \{s_1\}, s_1) &= \sum_{w \in \{s_2, s_3, s_4\}} \frac{1}{d(w, s_1)^4} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2})^4} + \frac{1}{2^4} + \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2})^4} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since W is feasible, the minimal forbidden sets of the wireless network \mathcal{A} are precisely the subsets $\{s_0, s_i\}$ ($i \in [4]$). Thus, the hypergraph generated by the wireless network \mathcal{A} is the 2-uniform hypergraph $K_{1,4}$. ■

Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ be a wireless network and let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, s \mapsto s'$ be any map that preserves distances. For example, π could be a rigid motion such as a rotation, a reflection, or a translation. Let $S' := \{\pi(s) : s \in S\}$ be the set of new locations of the stations. Because π preserves distances, it is clear that the hypergraph generated by $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ and the hypergraph generated by $\mathcal{A}' = \langle S', \alpha, \beta \rangle$ are isomorphic.

Lemma 11. *Given a wireless network $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ and a positive real number ρ , define the scaled wireless network $\mathcal{A}' := \langle S', \alpha, \beta' \rangle$, where $S' = \{s' : s \in S\}$, $s' = T_\rho(s)$ is the new location of station s obtained using the scaling transformation $T_\rho : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ that maps $s = (x, y)$ to $s' := (\rho x, \rho y)$, and $\beta' := \frac{\beta}{\rho^\alpha}$. Then, the hypergraphs generated by \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' are isomorphic.*

Proof: Let $W \subseteq S$, and let $W' \subseteq S'$ be the image of S under the scaling transformation T_ρ . It suffices to show that W is a forbidden set for the wireless network \mathcal{A} if and only if W' is a forbidden set for the wireless network \mathcal{A}' , because that would imply the map $f : S \rightarrow S', s \mapsto s'$ is an isomorphism between the corresponding hypergraphs.

Fix $w \in W$. Then, the energy at w' due to transmissions by the set of stations $W' - \{w'\}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} E(W' - \{w'\}, w') &= \sum_{s' \in W' - \{w'\}} \frac{1}{d(s', w')^\alpha} \\ &= \sum_{s \in W - \{w\}} \frac{1}{(\rho d(s, w))^\alpha} \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho^\alpha} E(W - \{w\}, w). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, W' is a forbidden subset for the wireless network \mathcal{A}' if and only if W is a forbidden subset for the wireless network \mathcal{A} . The map from S to S' that takes s to s' is an isomorphism from the hypergraph generated by \mathcal{A} to the hypergraph generated by \mathcal{A}' . ■

In the rest of this subsection, we prove lemmas that are used in the proof of Theorem 8 in Section 5.2. The reader may skip the rest of this subsection now and return to it later, while going through the proof of Theorem 8.

In the sequel, the *unit ball* refers to the set $\{(x, y) : x^2 + y^2 \leq 1\}$ of all points in \mathbb{R}^2 that are within unit distance from the origin, and the *unit circle* refers to the

boundary $\{(x, y) : x^2 + y^2 = 1\}$ of the unit ball. The unit ball (minus the origin) is the set $\{(x, y) : x^2 + y^2 \leq 1, (x, y) \neq (0, 0)\}$.

Lemma 12. *The maximum distance between any two points in a 60° sector of the unit ball is 1.*

Proof: Let a, b be two points in a 60° sector of the unit ball, with polar coordinates $a = (r_1, \theta_1)$ and $b = (r_2, \theta_2)$, where $0 \leq r_1, r_2 \leq 1$, and where $0 \leq \theta_1, \theta_2 \leq \pi/3$ without loss of generality. It will be shown that the Euclidean distance $d(a, b)$ is at most 1.

If $r_1 = 0$ or $r_2 = 0$, then $d(a, b) \leq 1$ because the radius of the unit ball is 1. So suppose $r_1, r_2 > 0$. Let $\psi = |\theta_1 - \theta_2|$. By the law of cosines,

$$\begin{aligned} d(a, b) &= r_1^2 + r_2^2 - 2r_1r_2 \cos \psi \\ &\leq r_1^2 + r_2^2 - 2r_1r_2 \cos \pi/3 \\ &= r_1^2 + r_2^2 - r_1r_2 \\ &= \frac{r_1^3 + r_2^3}{r_1 + r_2} \\ &\leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds because $\psi \leq \pi/3$, and the second inequality holds because $r_1^3 \leq r_1$ and $r_2^3 \leq r_2$ when $0 \leq r_1, r_2 \leq 1$. Equality holds throughout if and only if $r_1 = 1, r_2 = 1$ and $\psi = \pi/3$. ■

We show next that if any two points in the unit ball (minus the origin) are at distance at least 1, then pushing the two points radially outward to the boundary of the unit ball will not decrease the Euclidean distance between the points.

Lemma 13. *Suppose $W = \{s_1, \dots, s_5\}$ is a set of points in the unit ball (minus the origin). Suppose the distance between any two distinct points of W is greater than 1. Let $W' := \{s'_1, \dots, s'_5\}$ be obtained by moving each point $s_i \in W$ radially outward to the point s'_i on the boundary of the unit ball. Thus, if s_i has polar coordinates (r_i, θ_i) , where $0 < r_i \leq 1$, then s'_i has polar coordinates $(1, \theta_i)$ ($s_i \in W$). Then, $d(s'_i, s'_j) \geq d(s_i, s_j)$, for all $i, j \in [5], i \neq j$.*

Proof: Let a, b be points with polar coordinates $a = (r_1, \theta_1)$, $b = (r_2, \theta_2)$, where $0 < r_1, r_2 \leq 1$ and such that $d(a, b) \geq 1$. Define the points $a' := (1, \theta_1)$ and $b' := (1, \theta_2)$. It suffices to prove that $d(a', b') \geq d(a, b)$.

If $r_1, r_2 < 1$, then define $\rho := \frac{1}{\max\{r_1, r_2\}}$. Because $\rho > 1$, the transformation T_ρ that maps the point (r, θ) to $(\rho r, \theta)$ increases the distance between any two points, i.e. T_ρ satisfies the property that for any two points a and b , $d(T_\rho(a), T_\rho(b)) \geq d(a, b)$. Thus, it can be assumed without loss of generality that at least one of the two points a or b , say, lies on the boundary of the unit ball. Thus, $r_1 = 1$.

Because a rotation of the Euclidean plane preserves distances, it can be assumed that $\theta_1 = 0$. So, in polar form, the coordinates of a and b can be assumed to be $a = (1, 0)$ and $b = (r_2, \theta_2)$, where $0 < r_2 \leq 1$, and $\theta_2 > \pi/3$ because $d(a, b) > 1$. By symmetry about the horizontal axis, we may assume the point b lies in the first or second quadrant.

Observe that $a' = (1, 0)$ and $b' = (1, \theta_2)$. Define $D := d(a, b)$ and $D' := d(a', b')$. Then, $D = \sqrt{(r_2 \cos \theta_2 - 1)^2 + (r_2 \sin \theta_2)^2}$ and $D' = \sqrt{(\cos \theta_2 - 1)^2 + (\sin \theta_2)^2}$. It needs to be proved that $D' \geq D$.

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} (D')^2 - D^2 &= 1 - 2(1 - r_2) \cos \theta_2 - r_2^2 \\ &\geq 1 - (1 - r_2) - r_2^2 \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds because $\theta > \pi/3$, and the second inequality holds because $r_2 \leq 1$. ■

As we'll see later, the next lemma will be used to prove that if five points are placed on the boundary of the unit ball, then there exist three consecutive points that form a forbidden subset in the sense that the interference at the middle of these three points - due to transmission by the other two points - is larger than 1.

Lemma 14. *Let $f(\delta_1)$ be the function*

$$f(\delta_1) := \frac{1}{d(s_1, s_2)^4} + \frac{1}{d(s_1, s_5)^4},$$

where the points s_1, s_2 and s_5 have polar coordinates $s_1 = (1, 0)$, $s_2 = (1, \pi/3 + \delta_1)$ and $s_5 = (1, -\pi/3 - \delta_5)$ (as shown in Figure 1), $\delta_5 = 2\pi/15 - \delta_1$, and the domain is $0 \leq \delta_1 \leq 2\pi/15$. Then, the minimum value of $f(\delta_1)$ is greater than 1.

Proof: Negating the angle of s_5 does not change the distance between s_5 and s_1 ; so assume that $s_5 = (1, \pi/3 + \delta_5)$. Let $\delta := \delta_1 - \pi/15$. The points s_1, s_2 and s_5 can be expressed in terms of δ in polar form as $s_1 = (1, 0)$, $s_2 = (1, 2\pi/5 + \delta)$ and $s_5 = (1, 2\pi/5 - \delta)$.

Define the function $g(\delta) = d(s_1, s_2)^{-4} + d(s_1, s_5)^{-4}$, where $s_1 = (1, 0)$, $s_2 = (1, 2\pi/5 + \delta)$, $s_5 = (1, 2\pi/5 - \delta)$, and the domain is $[-\pi/15, \pi/15]$. Because $f(\delta_1) = g(\delta + \pi/15)$, it suffices to show that the minimum value of $g(\delta)$ is greater than 1.

It can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} g(\delta) &= \frac{1}{4(1 - \cos(\frac{2\pi}{5} + \delta))^2} + \frac{1}{4(1 - \cos(\frac{2\pi}{5} - \delta))^2}, \\ g'(\delta) &= -\frac{\sin(\frac{2\pi}{5} + \delta)}{2(1 - \cos(\frac{2\pi}{5} + \delta))^3} + \frac{\sin(\frac{2\pi}{5} - \delta)}{2(1 - \cos(\frac{2\pi}{5} - \delta))^3}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$g''(\delta) = \frac{3 - \cos(\frac{2\pi}{5} + \delta) - 2 \cos^2(\frac{2\pi}{5} + \delta)}{2(1 - \cos(\frac{2\pi}{5} + \delta))^4} + \frac{3 - \cos(\frac{2\pi}{5} - \delta) - 2 \cos^2(\frac{2\pi}{5} - \delta)}{2(1 - \cos(\frac{2\pi}{5} - \delta))^4}.$$

Because $3 - \cos \alpha - 2 \cos^2 \alpha > 0$ when $|\cos \alpha| < 1$, $g''(\delta) > 0$ for all δ . Also, $g'(0) = 0$. Thus, $g(\delta)$ is convex and attains a global minimum at $\delta = 0$. It can be verified that $g(0) = \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{5}$, which is greater than 1. ■

5.2. The Hypergraph $K_{1,5}$ is Not Realizable

We now prove Theorem 8, which states that the hypergraph $K_{1,5}$ is not realizable. First, we show that in determining which hypergraphs are realizable, it can be assumed without loss of generality that the reception threshold β is equal to 1.

Lemma 15. *Let H be a hypergraph. If H is realizable, then H is realizable for some wireless network $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ having $\beta = 1$.*

Proof: Suppose the hypergraph H is realizable. Then, there exists a wireless network $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ that generates H . Define the scaling factor $\rho := e^{\frac{\ln \beta}{\alpha}}$. Let $\mathcal{A}' = \langle S', \alpha, \beta' \rangle$ be the wireless network obtained by scaling the wireless network \mathcal{A} by a factor ρ in the manner defined in the statement of Lemma 11. By Lemma 11, the wireless network $\mathcal{A}' = \langle S', \alpha, 1 \rangle$ generates H . ■

We now prove that the hypergraph $K_{1,5}$ is not realizable.

Proof of Theorem 8: By way of contradiction, suppose there exists a wireless network $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ that generates the hypergraph $(S, \mathcal{E}) = K_{1,5}$, where $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_5\}$ and \mathcal{E} is the collection $\{\{s_0, s_i\} : i \in [5]\}$ of five hyperedges. Recall that $\alpha = 4$. By Lemma 15, it can be assumed that $\beta = 1$. Since a translation of the Euclidean plane is a rigid motion and preserves distances, it can be assumed that the station s_0 is located at the origin.

Let $W := \{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_5\}$. Because $\{s_0, s_i\}$ ($i \in [5]$) is a forbidden set, the distance between the stations s_0 and s_i is at most 1. Thus, the set W of stations lies inside the unit ball (minus the origin). Observe that W does not contain a hyperedge, and hence W is an independent set of the hypergraph. In other words, for all $w \in W$, the interference is tolerable at w in the sense that

$$E(W - \{w\}, w) = \sum_{s \in W - \{w\}} \frac{1}{d(s, w)^4} < 1.$$

We will arrive at a contradiction by proving that this inequality is violated for every set of five locations in the unit ball (minus the origin) for W .

For $i, j \in [5], i \neq j$, we have that $\{s_i, s_j\}$ is not a forbidden subset, whence the distance between s_i and s_j is greater than 1. Thus, the distance between any two stations in W is greater than 1.

The points in W can be pushed radially outward to the boundary of the unit ball, i.e. to the unit circle, and by Lemma 13 this transformation does not decrease the distance between any two points in W and hence preserves feasibility of W . Thus, we can assume that the hypergraph $K_{1,5}$ is generated by a wireless network $\langle S, \alpha, \beta \rangle$, such that $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_5\}$, $\alpha = 4$, $\beta = 1$, and the set of points $W = \{s_1, \dots, s_5\}$ lies on the unit circle.

A rotation of the Euclidean plane preserves distances; hence, we can assume without loss of generality that s_1 lies on the unit circle at angle 0, i.e. that the polar coordinates of s_1 are $(1, 0)$. Without loss of generality, suppose the remaining points s_2, s_3, s_4, s_5 lie on the unit circle in clockwise order. Let θ_i ($i \in [4]$) denote the angle between s_i and s_{i+1} , and let θ_5 denote the angle between s_5 and s_1 ; see Figure 1.




Figure 1: Five stations on the unit circle, with stations s_1, s_2 and s_5 close enough to each other that $\delta_1 + \delta_5 = 2\pi/15$.

Because the distance between any two points in W is greater than 1, we have that $\theta_i > \pi/3$, for all i . Because the sum of any four of these angles is greater than $4\pi/3$, each of these angles θ_i is less than $2\pi/3$. Thus, $\pi/3 < \theta_i < 2\pi/3$, for $i \in [5]$.

Define $\delta_i = \pi/3 - \theta_i$, for $i \in [5]$. Because $\sum_{i=1}^5 \theta_i = 2\pi$, we have that $\sum_{i=1}^5 \delta_i = \pi/3$. Since the sum of these five numbers is $\pi/3$, there must be some two consecutive numbers on the circle, say δ_1 and δ_5 , that sum to at most $2\pi/15$. Thus, there exist three points in W , namely s_1, s_2 and s_5 that are very close to each other in the sense that $\delta_1 + \delta_5 \leq 2\pi/15$. We will show that the subset $\{s_1, s_2, s_5\}$ is a forbidden subset, even when these three points are farthest apart under the said conditions, i.e. even if $\delta_1 + \delta_5 = 2\pi/15$.

Thus, we may assume that three of the points of W are at locations $s_1 = (1, 0)$, $s_2 = (1, \pi/3 + \delta_1)$, and $s_5 = (1, -\pi/3 - \delta_5)$, where $\delta_5 = 2\pi/15 - \delta_1$. In terms of δ_1 , the interference at s_1 due to transmissions by s_2 and s_5 is given by

$$f(\delta_1) = \frac{1}{d(s_1, s_2)^4} + \frac{1}{d(s_1, s_5)^4},$$

where the domain for f is $[0, 2\pi/15]$. By Proposition 14, the minimum value of $f(\delta_1)$ is greater than 1. Because the reception threshold β is equal to 1, the subset $\{s_1, s_2, s_5\}$ is a forbidden subset. Hence, its superset W is also a forbidden set, contradicting the fact that W is an independent set. ■

Corollary 16. *The largest value of r such that the hypergraph $K_{1,r}$ is realizable is $r = 4$.*

Proof: The assertion follows from Example 10 and Theorem 8. ■

Note that Corollary 16 does not imply that the maximum possible interference degree of any realizable hypergraph is 4. Determining the realizability of hypergraphs that contain other structures (besides $K_{1,r}$) is a future research direction.

6. Concluding Remarks

Motivated by recent results that the worst-case performance of the distributed maximal scheduling algorithm under the hypergraph interference model is characterized by the interference degree of the hypergraph, in the present work, we investigated the properties of this hypergraph invariant, and in particular, the properties of hypergraphs that are realizable. The problem of computing the interference degree of a hypergraph was shown to be NP-hard and some properties of the interference degree of hypergraphs were proved. An open problem in the literature is to extend the results in the literature on unit disk graphs to hypergraph models. In particular, an objective is to investigate the additional structure possessed by hypergraphs that are realizable. In the present work, we showed that the maximal value of r such that the hypergraph $K_{1,r}$ is realizable is $r = 4$. Our work extends the results in the literature on unit disk graphs to hypergraph models.

There are many directions for further research. Determining which structured hypergraphs are realizable and determining the maximum possible interference degree of realizable hypergraphs are problems for further research.

References

- [1] C. Avin, Y. Emek, E. Kantor, Z. Lotker, D. Peleg, and L. Roditty. SINR Diagrams: Convexity and Its Applications in Wireless Networks. *Journal of the ACM*, 59(4):1–34, August 2012.
- [2] H. Balakrishnan, C. L. Barrett, V. S. A. Kumar, M. V. Marathe, and S. Thite. The Distance-2 Matching Problem and Its Relationship to the MAC-Layer Capacity of Ad Hoc Wireless Networks. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 22(6):1069–1079, August 2004.
- [3] C. Berge. *Graphs and Hypergraphs*. Elsevier Science Ltd., 1985.
- [4] C. Berge. *Hypergraphs*. Elsevier, 3rd edition, 1989.
- [5] B. Bollobás. *Combinatorics: Set Systems, Hypergraphs, Families of Vectors, and Combinatorial Probability*. Cambridge University Press, USA, 1986.
- [6] G. J. Chaitin. Register Allocation & Spilling via Graph Coloring. In *Proceedings of the 1982 SIGPLAN Symposium on Compiler Construction*, SIGPLAN '82, pages 98–105, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, 1982. ACM.

- [7] P. Chaporkar, K. Kar, X. Luo, and S. Sarkar. Throughput and Fairness Guarantees Through Maximal Scheduling in Wireless Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(2):572–594, February 2008.
- [8] Y. Faenza, G. Oriolo, and G. Stauffer. Solving the Weighted Stable Set Problem in Claw-Free Graphs via Decomposition. *Journal of the ACM*, 61(4):1–41, July 2014.
- [9] A. Ganesan. On some sufficient conditions for distributed QoS support in wireless networks. Technical Report, 2008.
- [10] A. Ganesan. On Some Sufficient Conditions for Distributed Quality-of-Service Support in Wireless Networks. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Networks & Communications and the Workshop on Applications of Graph Theory in Wireless Ad hoc Networks and Sensor Networks, NetCom '09 and GraphHoc '09*, pages 301–306, Chennai, Tamilnadu, India, 2009. IEEE.
- [11] A. Ganesan. The performance of an upper bound on the fractional chromatic number of weighted graphs. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 23(5):597–599, May 2010.
- [12] A. Ganesan. Performance of sufficient conditions for distributed quality-of-service support in wireless networks. *Wireless Networks*, 20(6):1321–1334, August 2014.
- [13] A. Ganesan. Distributed Algorithms for QoS in Wireless Ad Hoc Networks Under the Primary Interference Model. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Wireless Communications, Signal Processing, and Networking (WiSPNET)*, pages 63–66, Chennai, India, August 2020. IEEE.
- [14] A. Ganesan. Performance Guarantees of Distributed Algorithms for QoS in Wireless Ad Hoc Networks. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 28(1):182–195, February 2020.
- [15] A. Ganesan. On some distributed scheduling algorithms for wireless networks with hypergraph interference models. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(5):2952–2957, May 2021.
- [16] A. Ganesan. Performance analysis of a distributed algorithm for admission control in wireless networks under the 2-hop interference model. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Distributed Computing and Networking, ICDCN '21*, pages 96–105, Nara, Japan, January 2021. ACM.
- [17] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1979.
- [18] C. Godsil and G. F. Royle. *Algebraic Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.

- [19] P. Gupta and P. Kumar. The capacity of wireless networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 46(2):388–404, March 2000.
- [20] R. Gupta, J. Musacchio, and J. Walrand. Sufficient rate constraints for QoS flows in ad-hoc networks. *Ad Hoc Networks*, 5(4):429–443, May 2007.
- [21] B. Hajek and G. Sasaki. Link scheduling in polynomial time. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 34(5):910–917, September 1988.
- [22] W. Hale. Frequency assignment: Theory and applications. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 68(12):1497–1514, 1980.
- [23] M. M. Halldórsson and R. Wattenhofer. Wireless Network Algorithmics. In B. Steffen and G. Woeginger, editors, *Computing and Software Science, Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LNCS)*, volume 10000, pages 141–160. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019.
- [24] B. Hamdaoui and P. Ramanathan. Rate feasibility under medium access contention constraints. In *Proceedings of the 2003 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, volume 6 of *GLOBECOM '03*, pages 3020–3024, San Francisco, CA, USA, December 2003.
- [25] B. Hamdaoui and P. Ramanathan. Sufficient conditions for flow admission control in wireless ad-hoc networks. *ACM SIGMOBILE Mobile Computing and Communications Review*, 9(4):15–24, October 2005.
- [26] M. Huson and A. Sen. Broadcast scheduling algorithms for radio networks. In *Proceedings of MILCOM '95*, volume 2, pages 647–651, San Diego, CA, USA, 1995. IEEE.
- [27] K. Jain, J. Padhye, V. N. Padmanabhan, and L. Qiu. Impact of Interference on Multi-hop Wireless Network Performance. In *Proceedings of the 9th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*, MobiCom '03, pages 66–80, San Diego, CA, USA, 2003. ACM.
- [28] M. Kodialam and T. Nandagopal. Characterizing achievable rates in multi-hop wireless mesh networks with orthogonal channels. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 13(4):868–880, August 2005.
- [29] A. Kose, M. Koca, E. Anarim, M. Medard, and H. Gokcesu. Graph-Theoretical Dynamic User Pairing for Downlink NOMA Systems. *IEEE Communications Letters*, 25(10):3234–3238, October 2021.
- [30] A. Köse and M. Médard. Scheduling wireless ad hoc networks in polynomial time using claw-free conflict graphs. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual IEEE International Symposium on Personal, Indoor, and Mobile Radio Communications*, PIMRC '17, pages 1–7, Montreal, QC, Canada, October 2017. IEEE. ISSN: 2166-9589.

- [31] Q. Li and R. Negi. Maximal Scheduling in Wireless Ad Hoc Networks With Hypergraph Interference Models. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 61(1):297–310, January 2012.
- [32] M. V. Marathe, H. Breu, H. B. Hunt, S. S. Ravi, and D. J. Rosenkrantz. Simple heuristics for unit disk graphs. *Networks*, 25(2):59–68, March 1995.
- [33] R. J. McEliece and K. N. Sivarajan. Performance limits for FDMA cellular systems described by hypergraphs. In *Proceedings of the 3rd IEE Conference on Telecommunications*, pages 360–365, Edinburgh, UK, 1991.
- [34] R. J. McEliece and K. N. Sivarajan. Performance limits for channelized cellular telephone systems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 40(1):21–34, January 1994.
- [35] G. J. Minty. On maximal independent sets of vertices in claw-free graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 28(3):284–304, June 1980.
- [36] D. Nakamura and A. Tamura. A revision of Minty’s algorithm for finding a maximum weight stable set of a claw-free graph. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan*, 44(2):194–204, 2001.
- [37] S. Sarkar and K. N. Sivarajan. Hypergraph models for cellular mobile communication systems. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 47(2):460–471, May 1998.
- [38] C. E. Shannon. A theorem on coloring the lines of a network. *Journal of Mathematics and Physics*, 28(1-4):148–151, 1949.
- [39] G. Sharma, R. R. Mazumdar, and N. B. Shroff. On the Complexity of Scheduling in Wireless Networks. In *Proceedings of the 12th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, MobiCom ’06*, pages 227–238, Los Angeles, CA, USA, 2006. ACM.
- [40] X. Wu and R. Srikant. Scheduling efficiency of distributed greedy scheduling algorithms in wireless networks. In *Proceedings the 25th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications, INFOCOM ’06*, pages 1–12, Barcelona, Spain, April 2006.
- [41] H. Zhang, L. Song, and Z. Han. Radio Resource Allocation for Device-to-Device Underlay Communication Using Hypergraph Theory. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 15(7):4852–4861, 2016.