

Dynamic Multi-Hop HARQ Scheme to Maximize E2E Reliability in the Finite Blocklength Regime

Bin Han, Muxia Sun, Yao Zhu, Yulin Hu, Anke Schmeink, Yanfu Li, and Hans D. Schotten

Abstract—The extreme requirements for high reliability and low latency in Beyond-Fifth-Generation (B5G) and Sixth Generation (6G) mobile systems are challenging the design of multi-hop relay networks. In this paper we investigate the problem of multi-hop decode-and-forward (DF) relaying in the finite blocklength (FBL) regime, and propose a dynamic multi-hop hybrid automated repeat request (DMH-HARQ) scheme, which maximizes the end-to-end (E2E) communication reliability in such systems. We also propose an integer dynamic programming (DP) algorithm to efficiently solve the optimal DMH-HARQ schedule. Constrained within a certain time frame to accomplish multi-hop relaying, our proposed approach is proven to outperform any static HARQ strategy regarding the E2E reliability.

Index Terms—HARQ, relay, FBL, dynamic programming

I. INTRODUCTION

Relaying plays an important role in wireless communications, for being an efficient way to counter channel fading and extending coverage [1], [2]. However, as emerging use scenarios of modern mobile systems are yelling for extremely high reliability and low latency, the feasibility of relaying network in such scenarios are challenged. As short codes are used to meet the latency requirements, not only the payoff of relaying is significantly reduced due to the high error rate [3], but also conventional automatic repeat request (ARQ) solutions fail to efficiently address the impaired link-level reliability as they usually do with long codes [4].

This work is inspired by the idea, that it may help better enhance the end-to-end (E2E) reliability of a multi-hop relay chain within a strictly limited time frame, by dynamically (re)allocating of remaining radio resource between repeats and successor hops w.r.t. the instantaneous transmission result. We design in this paper a dynamic hybrid ARQ (HARQ) scheme for multi-hop relaying in the finite blocklength (FBL) regime, analyze its performance, and propose an dynamic programming (DP) algorithm for its schedule optimization.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Sec. II describes and formulates the investigated problem, which is then analyzed in Sec. III and solved in Sec. IV. The proposed methods are numerically evaluated in Sec. V, followed by some further discussions in Sec. VI. To the end, we provide in Sec. VII a brief review to selected literature in related fields, before closing the paper with our conclusion and outlooks VIII.

B. Han and H. D. Schotten are with Technische Universität Kaiserslautern; M. Sun and Y. Li are with Tsinghua University; Y. Zhu, Y. Hu, and A. Schmeink are with RWTH Aachen University; Y. Hu is with Wuhan University; H. D. Schotten is with German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence. B. Han (bin.han@eit.uni-kl.de) is the corresponding author.

II. PROBLEM SETUP

A. Multi-Hop DF and DMH-HARQ

Now consider a multi-hop relaying chain with $I + 1$ nodes over I hops, each applying the decode-and-forward (DF) strategy based on simple ARQ without combining. We assume that all channels of the I hops are i.i.d., undergoing Gaussian noise and Rayleigh fading. We assume that every decoding process, together the associated feedback of acknowledgement (ACK) or negative ACK (NACK) to the predecessor node for the HARQ procedure, makes the same delay of T_1 . The overall transmission to a maximal E2E delay is limited to T_{\max} . For simplification of the analysis, we consider for every node the same symbol rate f_s , modulation order M (and therefore the bit-time length $T_b = \frac{1}{Mf_s}$), transmission power P , and noise power N . The transmitting node of each hop is capable of flexibly adjust its channel coding rate in every (re-)transmission attempt independently from others. We consider in this study a block fading scenario, where the channel h_i of each hop $i \in \mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \dots, I\}$ remains consistent over the entire time frame of T_{\max} . Each transmitting node of hop i possesses the perfect channel state information (CSI) of h_i , while knowing only its position in the relaying chain and the statistical CSI of all other hops.

Here we consider a problem of dynamic radio resource allocation among different HARQ slots over the I -hop DF chain. On every hop, the transmitting node can individually adjust its coding rate for the next (re)transmission. Since the modulation order and symbol rate are fixed, this will determine the time span of the transmission slot, which cannot exceed the remaining time of the entire transmission frame. If the message is successfully decoded, the successor node will take the turn and further forward the message, unless it is the sink node, i.e. the $(I+1)^{\text{th}}$. If the decoding fails, the receiving node will trigger the HARQ procedure by sending back a NACK to the transmitting node, which then keeps re-transmitting the message until either a successful reception or a timeout, i.e. when the remaining time falls insufficient to support any further effective transmission. In every individual repeat, the node is able to readjust its coding rate. We consider a timer embedded in the header of every message, so that every node is aware of the time remaining from the T_{\max} frame. We name this proposed approach as Dynamic Multi-Hop HARQ (DMH-HARQ), which is briefly illustrated in Fig. 1.

B. Binary Schedule Tree

From Fig. 1 we see that the complete schedule of DMH-HARQ has a structure of complete binary tree \mathfrak{T} , which can be recursively defined as a 3-tuple $\mathfrak{T} = (L(\mathfrak{T}), S(\mathfrak{T}), R(\mathfrak{T}))$,




Fig. 1: Illustration of a DMH-HARQ schedule, where the remaining (reserved) blocklength of a frame is dynamically assigned regarding the decoding result: either for forwarding upon success, or for retransmission upon failure.

where $S(\mathfrak{T})$ is a singleton set containing the root node of \mathfrak{T} , $L(\mathfrak{T})$ and $R(\mathfrak{T})$ are the binary trees rooted on the left and right children of the root node, respectively:

$$L(\mathfrak{T}) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & S(\mathfrak{T}) = \emptyset, \\ (L(L(\mathfrak{T})), S(L(\mathfrak{T})), R(L(\mathfrak{T}))) & \text{o.w.}, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

$$R(\mathfrak{T}) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & S(\mathfrak{T}) = \emptyset, \\ (L(R(\mathfrak{T})), S(R(\mathfrak{T})), R(R(\mathfrak{T}))) & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Each node s in the tree representing a certain system state, which can be defined as a three tuple $s = (t_s, i_s, k_s, \tau_s)$ where $t_s \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the remaining time, $i_s \in \mathbb{N}$ is the remaining hops to transmit the message, $k_s \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of failed HARQ attempts on the current hop, and τ_s the accumulated time spent on these k_s unsuccessful transmissions (excluding the feedback losses). Now let $n_s \triangleq n(t_s, i_s, k_s, \tau_s) \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the blocklength to be allocated, according to the policy $n(\cdot)$, to the current HARQ attempt on the current hop, i.e. the $(k_s + 1)^{\text{th}}$ HARQ attempt on the i_s^{th} last hop, when there is t_s time remaining. Thus, let \mathfrak{T}_s denote a schedule tree with $S(\mathfrak{T}_s) = \{s\}$ and \mathcal{S} the space of all feasible states, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, on the one hand we have for the left branch

$$S(L(\mathfrak{T}_s)) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & t_s < T_{\min}^{(i_s)}, \\ \emptyset & i_s = 0, \\ \{(t_s - n_s T_b - T_1, i_s, k_s + 1, \tau_s + n_s T_b)\} & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Here, $T_{\min}^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^i (n_{\min,j} T_b + T_1)$ where $n_{\min,j}$ is the minimal

blocklength of codeword on the j^{th} last hop (which is a function of the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) γ_i over the j^{th} last hop). Therefore, in the first case of Eq. (3), $t_s < T_{\min}^{(i)}$ denotes the condition that a remaining time t_s is insufficient to forward the message over the last i hops even when no error occurs (i.e. with only one transmission attempt on each hop), under which the DMH-HARQ procedure is terminated without success. The second case a successful completion of the DMH-HARQ over the entire chain (as there is $i = 0$ hop remaining); the third case stands for the consequence when the current HARQ attempt fails with sufficient remaining time,

i.e. the message is re-transmitted over the current hop for the $(k_s + 1)^{\text{th}}$ time.

On the other hand, for the right branch we have

$$S(R(\mathfrak{T}_s)) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & t_s < T_{\min}^{(i_s)}, \\ \emptyset & i_s = 0, \\ \{(t_s - n_s T_b - T_1, i_s - 1, 0, 0)\} & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Again, the first case implies to insufficient remaining time and the second case describes a successful completion of DMH-HARQ. The third case stands for a successful DF over an intermediate hop, when the DMH-HARQ progresses to the next hop, i.e. the $(i_s - 1)^{\text{th}}$ last hop.

C. Optimization Problem

To measure the effectiveness of a DMH-HARQ schedule, we define a utility $\xi(\mathfrak{T}_s)$ as the chance of successfully forwarding the message over the next i_s hops within a time limit of t_s , then from the recursive structure (1-2) of \mathfrak{T}_s , we have

$$\xi(\mathfrak{T}_s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \mathfrak{T}_s = \emptyset, \\ 1 & i_s = 0, \\ \varepsilon_s \xi(L(\mathfrak{T}_s)) + (1 - \varepsilon_s) \xi(R(\mathfrak{T}_s)) & \text{o.w.}, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where ε_s is the packet error rate (PER) of the $(k_s + 1)^{\text{th}}$ HARQ attempt on the i_s^{th} last hop with codeword blocklength n_s . Since $\varepsilon_s \in [0, 1]$, we know that $\xi(\mathfrak{T}_s)$ is bounded between $[0, 1]$ for any \mathfrak{T}_s .

Thus, given the time frame length T_{\max} and total number of hops I specified, the reliability of DMH-HARQ can be optimized regarding the blocklength allocation policy n :

$$\text{maximize } \xi(\mathfrak{T}_{s_0}) \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{subject to } n_{\min, i_s} \leq n_s \leq \frac{t_s - T_{\min}^{(i_s-1)}}{M f_s} \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \quad (6b)$$

where $s_0 = (T_{\max}, I, 0, 0)$. The minimal blocklength n_{\min, i_s} is set here concerning the rapid decay of link reliability regarding reducing blocklength in the FBL regime. Commonly, people set an artificial constraint that the PER ε_s for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$ shall not exceed a pre-defined threshold ε_{\max} , so that

$$n_{\min, i_s} = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \mid \varepsilon_s \leq \varepsilon_{\max}\} \quad (7)$$

III. ANALYSES: TYPE I HARQ WITHOUT COMBINING

Before diving deep into the optimal HARQ scheduling problem, we shall study the error model of each HARQ attempt. For a delay-critical scenario with stringent E2E latency constraint, such as ultra-reliable low-latency communications (URLLC), we consider the use of short code, where the blocklength of every codeword is limited. Therefore, the PER of every HARQ attempt shall be analyzed w.r.t. the finite blocklength information theory, and the performance highly depends on the selected coding and HARQ schemes.

We start our study by assuming Type I HARQ without combining, which does not exploit any information of the failed transmissions. Since it is the baseline scheme with the worst error performance among all HARQ schemes, it provides an upper bound for the PER.

A. Error Model, Constraints, and Approximations

Regarding Type I HARQ without combining, according to [5], the PER of an arbitrary HARQ attempt with blocklength m on the i^{th} hop is

$$\epsilon_i(m) = Q \left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{V_i}} \left(C_i - \frac{d}{m} \right) \ln 2 \right), \quad (8)$$

where for additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channels $V_i = 1 - \frac{1}{(1+\gamma_i)^2}$ with $\gamma_i = \frac{Pq_i}{N} = \frac{P\bar{g}}{NL_{f,i}}$. denoting the SNR on the i^{th} hop. Here, g_i is the channel gain of the i^{th} hop, which is determined by the mean channel gain \bar{g} and the random fading loss $L_{f,i}$. Thus, for all $s = (t_s, i_s, k_s, \tau_s) \in \mathcal{S}$, with the blocklength allocation policy n_s , we have

$$\epsilon_s = \epsilon_{I+1-i_s}(n_s) = Q \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_s}{V_{I+1-i_s}}} \left(C_{I+1-i_s} - \frac{d}{n_s} \right) \ln 2 \right), \quad (9)$$

which has no dependency on t_s , k_s or τ_s except for the potential dependency of n_s on them.

Following the common routine in FBL study, we can extend the space of blocklength from integer to real numbers, so as to allow non-integer values of n_s for the convenience of analysis (approximate integer solutions can be then obtained by rounding the real-valued optima). Thus, the original problem (6a) can be replaced by

$$\underset{n : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+}{\text{maximize}} \quad \xi(\mathfrak{T}_{s_0}) \quad (10)$$

Recalling (7), the lower-bound n_{\min, i_s} in constraint (6b) can be obtained from:

$$Q \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_{\min, i_s}}{V_{I+1-i_s}}} \left(C_{I+1-i_s} - \frac{d}{n_{\min, i_s}} \right) \ln 2 \right) = \epsilon_{\max}, \quad (11)$$

which depends on s only regarding i_s . Meanwhile, the upper-bound $n_{\max, s} \triangleq \frac{t_s - T_{\min}^{(i_s-1)}}{Mf_s}$ is determined by both t_s and all $n_{\min, j}$ that $1 \leq j \leq i_s - 1$, i.e., by t_s and i_s .

B. Multi-Hop Link Reliability with Perfect Global CSI

Based on the error model above, we start our analysis to the optimization problem (6) with a simplified case where perfect

CSI of all hops $i \in \mathcal{I}$ is available at every node. For the convenience of notation, in the analyses below we let

$$\xi_{\max}(s) \triangleq \max_{n: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+} \xi(\mathfrak{T}_s), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (12)$$

and the corresponding optimal blocklength allocation policy

$$n_{\text{opt}}(s) \triangleq \arg \max_{n: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+} \xi(\mathfrak{T}_s), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (13)$$

First, recall the remarks we made earlier in Sec. III-A, that given a certain s , both the PER ϵ_s and the constraints to n_s are independent from k_s or τ_s , but determined by t_s and i_s . Thus, we can assert that

Lemma 1. *With Type I HARQ without combining, $n_{\text{opt}}(s)$ is independent from k_s or τ_s , but determined by t_s and i_s , i.e. $n_{\text{opt}}(s) = n_{i_s}^{\text{opt}}(t_s)$.*

The proof of Lemma 1 is trivial and therefore omitted.

For convenience we let $s_l(\mathfrak{T}_s)$ denote the root state of $L(\mathfrak{T}_s)$, and similarly $s_r(\mathfrak{T}_s)$ the root state of $R(\mathfrak{T}_s)$. Thus, from the recursive structure Eq. (5) of the utility $\xi(\mathfrak{T}_s)$, for all s that $\mathfrak{T}_s \neq \emptyset$ and $i_s \neq 0$, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \xi_{\max}(s) \\ &= \max_{n_s} \{ \epsilon_s \xi_{\max}(s_l(\mathfrak{T}_s)) + (1 - \epsilon_s) \xi_{\max}(s_r(\mathfrak{T}_s)) \} \\ &= \max_{n_s} \left\{ \epsilon_s \max_{n_{S(L(\mathfrak{T}_s))}} \xi(L(\mathfrak{T}_s)) + (1 - \epsilon_s) \max_{n_{S(R(\mathfrak{T}_s))}} \xi(R(\mathfrak{T}_s)) \right\} \\ &= \dots \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which forms a Bellman equation. Under the error model (9), we have the following conclusions:

Lemma 2. *With Type I HARQ without combining, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$ that $i_s = 1$ (i.e. on the last hop), the optimal blocklength allocation is always a one-shot transmission $n_{\text{opt}}(s) = \frac{t_s - T_1}{T_b}$ that maximizes the utility to $\xi_{\max}(s) = 1 - \epsilon_I \left(\frac{t_s - T_1}{T_b} \right)$.*

Theorem 1. *As long as $t_s \geq T_{\min}^{(i_s-1)}$ and $i_s \geq 1$, $\xi_{\max}(s)$ is a continuous and strictly monotone increasing function of t_s .*

The proofs are provided in Appendices A–B, respectively.

C. Multi-Hop Link Reliability with Imperfect CSI

As we have discussed in Sec. II, in the multi-hop relaying scenario, it shall be considered that each node i has only a perfect CSI of the i^{th} hop. For all the successor hops $\{i+1, i+2, \dots, I\}$, it possesses only the statistical CSI, i.e. the probability density function (PDF) f_{G_i} of their channel gains g_i , which can be reasonably assumed consistent and identical for every hop $i \in \mathcal{I}$, i.e. $f_{G_i} \equiv f_G$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus, in an arbitrary state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ where the node $I+1-i_s$ is forwarding the message, the node cannot accurately estimate $\epsilon_{s'}$ for any state s' that $i_{s'} < i_s$ upon the blocklength allocation $n_{s'}$ anymore, but only the expectation upon the random channel gain:

$$\bar{\epsilon}_{s'} = \int_0^{+\infty} \epsilon_{s'} f_G(g_{i_{s'}}) dg_{i_{s'}}. \quad (15)$$

Note that for any specific $\gamma_{i_{s'}} \geq 0$, $\varepsilon_{s'}$ is convex and monotone decreasing w.r.t. $n_{s'}$. Thus, as a linear combination of various samples of $\varepsilon_{s'}$ over $\gamma_{i_{s'}} \in [0, +\infty)$, $\bar{\varepsilon}_{s'}$ is also convex and monotone decreasing w.r.t. $n_{s'}$, so that Theorem 1 remains applicable even when only statistical CSI of for all successor hops is available at each node.

IV. ALGORITHM DESIGN

A. Optimal DMH-HARQ: Integer Dynamic Programming

From Lemma 1 we know that when applying Type I HARQ without combining, the DMH-HARQ scheduling is a typical Markov decision process (MDP), where the expected utility ξ_s from any certain status s is independent from its historical states or actions, but only relying on the remaining time t_s and the blocklength allocation policy n_s . Such kind of problems can be generally solved by recursive approaches that gradually evaluate and improve the decision policy by traversing the entire feasible region of states, typical examples are policy iteration and value iteration. However, such approaches are challenged by two issues when dealing with Eq. (14). First, (9) provides no closed-form analytical solution n_s for an arbitrary ε_s . Second, with $n_s \in \mathbb{R}^+$, both the feasible region \mathcal{S} and the set of possible actions becomes infinite, making it impossible to traverse the solution space within limited time.

Nevertheless, it shall be remarked that the real-value relaxation $n_s \in \mathbb{R}^+$ was taken, like in classical FBL works, only for the convenience of analysis. Indeed, representing the blocklength per transmission in the unit of channel use, the final solution $n_{\text{opt}}(s)$ can only take integer values from \mathbb{N}^+ . Meanwhile, to apply FBL approaches while guaranteeing to meet the stringent latency requirement, as referred earlier, n_s is strictly constrained by (6b). Thus, both the action set and the feasible region of status are usually of reasonable sizes, enabling us to apply classical integer DP techniques to directly solve the global optimum. A typical implementation is to recursively solve $n_{\text{opt}}(s)$ from the last hop where $i_s = 1$ on, hop-by-hop onto the first one where $i_s = I$. The recursive algorithm is essentially accompanied with look-up table (LUT) to store the optimal achievable utility over the solution space, as described by Algorithm 1:

- Two global dictionaries, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{succ}}$, are defined in the main optimizing function `OptSchedule` as LUTs for the solutions of local hop (based on perfect CSI) and successor hops (based on statistical CSI), respectively. Each LUT maps the state space \mathcal{S} onto \mathbb{R}^+ to record the achievable utility $\xi_{\text{max}}(s)$.
- The functions `Best!` and `BestSucc!` are implemented to recursively solve the optimal blocklength allocation policy n_s and the associated best utility $\xi_{\text{max}}(s)$ regarding perfect and imperfect CSI, respectively. Especially, `BestSucc!` is called by `Best!` to estimate the achievable utility over successor hops. *The global dictionaries dictionary $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{succ}}$ are therewith updated, respectively.*
- The function `ScheduleTreeGen` is implemented to generate the binary schedule tree \mathfrak{T} from the dictionary $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}$ that stores the blocklength allocation policy.

B. Hop-by-Hop CSI Update and Reschedule

Note that by running Algorithm 1 at node $i \in \mathcal{I}$, the optimal schedule \mathfrak{T}_s is solved based on the perfect CSI of the i^{th} hop and statistical CSI of all hops thereafter, which shall not be adopted by any other node. Indeed, upon a successful decoding of the message received from its predecessor node, each node $i \in \mathcal{I}$ shall individually solve its own optimal schedule \mathfrak{T}_s regarding the instantaneous system state s and its real-time channel measurement g_i of the i^{th} hop. The complete procedure can be briefly summarized as in Algorithm. 2.

C. Computational Complexity Analysis

As described above, Algorithm 1 implements a recursive DP approach to compute the integer dynamic program. The recursive algorithm considers the DMH-HARQ as an I -stage DP problem, each stage representing a hop. Meanwhile, each hop-level sub-problem that starting with state s makes also an $\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{max},s})$ -stage DP problem itself, each stage representing an available channel use in the schedule.

According to the computational complexity analysis of the Closed-Loop ARQ (CLARQ) algorithm [6], which has the same structure with each hop-level sub-problem, we know that the time complexity of each hop-level sub-problem is $\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{max},s})$. Since for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$ hop, $n_{\text{max},s}$ is upper-bounded by $n_{\text{MAX}} \triangleq \frac{t_s - T_{\text{min}}^{(I-1)}}{M f_s}$, the time complexity of solving the optimal DMH-HARQ at the i^{th} last node is $\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{MAX}}^i)$. Taking the hop-by-hop execution of Algorithm 2 into account, the overall time complexity of the DMH-HARQ approach over the I -hop relay chain is $\mathcal{O}\left[\sum_{i=1}^I n_{\text{MAX}}^i\right] = \mathcal{O}(n_{\text{MAX}}^I)$.

In realistic scenarios of deployment, such a time complexity can critically challenge the online computation of optimal DMH-HARQ schedule, especially due to the time-varying channel gains g_i , which leads to high delay and significant power consumption. To address this issue, it is a practical solution to implement a LUT in each relay node, which that contains a set of offline solved dictionaries regarding various channel conditions. Since the operation of searching for a specific entry in a dictionary-based LUT has only a time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(1)$, the devices can be rapidly adapted to the appropriate specification w.r.t. the real-time channel measurement, leading to an overall time complexity as low as $\mathcal{O}(I)$ for the entire I -hop DMH-HARQ process.

Algorithm 1: Integer DP for DMH-HARQ schedule optimization

```

1 function OptSchedule( $s, g_{i_s}, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, T_b, T_1$ ):
2    $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}} \leftarrow \text{Dict}([\ ])$  // Empty dictionary.
3    $\mathcal{D}_{\text{succ}} \leftarrow \text{Dict}([\ ])$ 
4   Best!( $t_s, i_s, g_{i_s}, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{succ}}$ ) // Solve the optimal blocklength allocation policy.
5    $\mathfrak{T}_s \leftarrow \text{ScheduleTreeGen}(t_s, i_s, 0, 0, \mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}, T_b, T_1)$  // Generate the binary schedule tree.
6 return  $\mathfrak{T}_s$ 
7
8 function Best!( $t_s, i_s, g_{i_s}, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{succ}}$ ):
9    $n_{\min, i_s} \leftarrow \min\{n : \varepsilon_s(n) \leq \varepsilon_{\max}\}$  // W.r.t. Eq. (9).
10   $\bar{n}_{\min} \leftarrow \min\{n : \bar{\varepsilon}(n) \leq \varepsilon_{\max}\}$  // W.r.t. Eq. (15).
11  if  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}.find([t_s, i_s]) \neq \emptyset$  then
12     $[\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}] \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}.find([t_s, i_s])$  // Already solved, directly read from the LUT.
13  else if  $t_s < [(i_s - 1)\bar{n}_{\min} + n_{\min, i_s}]T_b + i_s T_1$  then
14     $[\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}] \leftarrow [0, 0]$  // Insufficient radio resource left, DMH-HARQ terminated.
15     $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}.append([t_s, i_s] \rightarrow [\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}])$  // Append the new result to LUT.
16  else if  $i_s == 1$  then
17     $n_{\text{opt}} \leftarrow \lfloor \frac{t_s - T_1}{T_b} \rfloor$  // Last hop, one-shot as optimum.
18     $\xi_{\text{opt}} \leftarrow \varepsilon_s(n_{\text{opt}})$ 
19     $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}.append([t_s, i_s] \rightarrow [\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}])$ 
20  else
21     $n_{\text{opt}} \leftarrow \arg \max\{\varepsilon_s(n)\text{Best!}(t_s - nT_b - T_1, i_s, g_{i_s}, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{succ}}) +$ 
22       $[1 - \varepsilon_s(n)]\text{BestSucc!}(t_s - nT_b - T_1, i_s - 1, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{succ}})\}$ 
23     $\xi_{\text{opt}} \leftarrow \varepsilon_s(n_{\text{opt}})\text{Best!}(t_s - n_{\text{opt}}T_b - T_1, i_s, g_{i_s}, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{succ}}) +$ 
24       $[1 - \varepsilon_s(n_{\text{opt}})]\text{BestSucc!}(t_s - n_{\text{opt}}T_b - T_1, i_s - 1, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{succ}})$ 
25     $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}.append([t_s, i_s] \rightarrow [\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}])$ 
26  end
27 return  $\xi_{\text{opt}}$ 
28
29 function BestSucc!( $t_s, i_s, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D}$ ):
30  // This is a deviated version of Best! that has only statistical CSI for every hop, including the current one.
31   $\bar{n}_{\min} \leftarrow \min\{n : \bar{\varepsilon}(n) \leq \varepsilon_{\max}\}$ 
32  if  $\mathcal{D}.find([t_s, i_s]) \neq \emptyset$  then
33     $[\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}] \leftarrow \mathcal{D}.find([t_s, i_s])$ 
34  else if  $t < i(\bar{n}_{\min}T_b + T_1)$  then
35     $[\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}] \leftarrow [0, 0]$ 
36     $\mathcal{D}.append([t_s, i_s] \rightarrow [\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}])$ 
37  else if  $i_s == 1$  then
38     $n_{\text{opt}} \leftarrow \lfloor \frac{t_s - T_1}{T_b} \rfloor$ 
39     $\xi_{\text{opt}} \leftarrow \varepsilon_s(n_{\text{opt}})$ 
40     $\mathcal{D}.append([t_s, i_s] \rightarrow [\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}])$ 
41  else
42     $n_{\text{opt}} \leftarrow \arg \max\{\bar{\varepsilon}(n)\text{BestSucc!}(t_s - nT_b - T_1, i_s, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D}) +$ 
43       $[1 - \bar{\varepsilon}(n)]\text{BestSucc!}(t_s - nT_b - T_1, i_s - 1, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D})\}$ 
44     $\xi_{\text{opt}} \leftarrow \bar{\varepsilon}(n_{\text{opt}})\text{BestSucc!}(t_s - n_{\text{opt}}T_b - T_1, i_s, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D}) +$ 
45       $[1 - \bar{\varepsilon}(n_{\text{opt}})]\text{BestSucc!}(t_s - n_{\text{opt}}T_b - T_1, i_s - 1, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, \mathcal{D})$ 
46     $\mathcal{D}.append([t_s, i_s] \rightarrow [\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}])$ 
47  end
48 return  $\xi_{\text{opt}}$ 
49
50 function ScheduleTreeGen( $t_s, i_s, k_s, \tau_s, \mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}, T_b, T_1$ ):
51  // Recursively generate the binary schedule tree  $\mathfrak{T}$  from the dictionary  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}$  that stores the blocklength
52  // allocation policy.
53  if  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}.find([t_s, i_s]) == \emptyset$  then
54     $\mathfrak{T}_s \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
55  else
56     $(\xi, n) \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}.find([t_s, i_s])$ 
57     $\mathfrak{T}_s \leftarrow (\text{ScheduleTreeGen}(t_s - nT_b - T_1, i_s, k_s + 1, \tau_s + nT_b, \mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}, T_b, T_1), \{(t_s, i_s, k_s, \tau_s)\},$ 
58       $\text{ScheduleTreeGen}(t_s - nT_b - T_1, i_s - 1, 0, 0, \mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}, T_b, T_1))$ 
59  end
60 return  $\mathfrak{T}_s$ 

```

Algorithm 2: I-hop DMH-HARQ with CSI update

```

1 Initialization:  $[g_1, g_2, \dots, g_I], f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, T_{\max}, T_b, T_1$ 
2  $s \leftarrow (T_{\max}, I, 0, 0)$ 
3 for  $i = I, I - 1, \dots, 1$  do
4    $\mathfrak{T}_s \leftarrow \text{OptSchedule}(s, g_i, f_G, \varepsilon_{\max}, T_b, T_1)$ 
5    $s' \leftarrow s$ 
6   while true do
7     (Re-)transmit regarding  $\mathfrak{T}_s$ 
8     Update  $s$  regarding the transmission result
9     if  $n_s = 0$  then
10      return // Termination state
11     else if  $i_s < i_{s'}$  then
12      break // Current hop succeeded
13     end
14   end
15 end
16 return

```

V. NUMERICAL EVALUATION

To evaluate our proposed approaches, we conducted numerical simulations to benchmark DMH-HARQ against baseline solutions with respect to different specifications of the system and the environment.

A. Baseline Methods

Three baseline methods are implemented and evaluated in our simulations:

- 1) Naive static HARQ with incremental redundancy (IR), where the (re)transmission times on each hop and coding rate of every individual (re)transmission are pre-scheduled. For each hop, IR is applied to combine the codes sent in different transmissions. Since the performance is highly dependent on the (re)transmission times and the coding rate, here we consider the approximate upper bound provided by *Makki et al.* in [4], which is only achievable with ideal Gaussian codebooks allowing non-integer blocklength. Note that the performance of Type II HARQ without combining is guaranteed outperformed by that with IR. Under a naive schedule, the same length of time is assigned to every hop.
- 2) Optimal static HARQ-IR, which follows the same principle of pre-scheduled retransmission as the naive static HARQ-IR does. However, the sub-frame lengths allocated to different hops are jointly optimized so as to minimize the E2E packet loss rate. Similarly, Type II HARQ-IR is applied and the upper bound in [4] is considered.
- 3) Listening-based cooperative ARQ, which was proposed by *Goel et al.* in [7]. Similar to the naive static HARQ approach, every hop is assigned with the same length of sub-frame and pre-scheduled with the same number of (re)transmissions and coding rate. However, if the DF on some hop i succeeds before using up all the pre-scheduled (re)transmission slots assigned to it, the DF on hop $i + 1$ will immediately be triggered, inheriting all the remaining time resource from its predecessor hop. In our simulation, each hop is pre-scheduled with 2 (re)transmission slots, applying Type-II HARQ without combining.

B. Simulation Setup

The setup of our simulation campaign is detailed in Tab. I. Among all the parameters, there are four of our interest to test the sensitivity of our approach, namely the total time frame length T_{\max} , the number of hops I , the decoding/feedback delay T_1 , and the mean channel gain \bar{g} . Each of these key parameters is assigned with a default value and a test range. When benchmarking the approaches regarding one key parameter over its test range, all the rest key parameters are specified to their default values. For every individual specification, $n_{\text{MC}} = 100\,000$ runs of Monte-Carlo test are conducted, each run with an independently generated set of channel conditions for the I hops, with which all approaches are tested.

TABLE I: Setup of the simulation campaign

Parameter	Value	Remark
f_s	250kSPS	Symbol rate, corresponding to the 4 μ s OFDM symbol duration in 5G numerology 4
M	2	Modulation order, 2 for BPSK
P	1 mW	Transmission power
N	1 mW	Noise power
d	16 bit	Payload of each message
ε_{\max}	0.5	Maximal allowed PER per transmission
T_{\max}	1 ms	Default time frame length
\mathbf{T}_{\max}	[0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1] ms	Test range of time frame length
I	4	Default number of hops
\mathbf{I}	[3, 4, 5, 6, 7]	Test range of hops number
Lf, i	\sim Rayleigh(1)	Small-scale fading
T_1	12 μ s	Default decoding/feedback delay
\mathbf{T}_1	[12, 24, 48, 96, 192] μ s	Test range of decoding/feedback delay
\bar{g}	0 dB	Mean channel gain
$\bar{\mathbf{g}}$	[0, 2.5, 5, 7.5] dB	Test range of mean channel gain
n_{MC}	100 000	Runs per Monte-Carlo test

C. Results and Analyses

The results of sensitivity tests regarding T_{\max} , I , T_1 and \bar{g} are illustrated in Figs. 2–5, respectively. Generally, the E2E packet loss rate monotone increase as *i*) the average blocklength that can be allocated to each hop (exclusive of the decoding/feedback delay) decreases; and *ii*) the SNR drops.

We observe from the results that the DMH-HARQ approach consistently outperforms all baselines, which is credited to the DP algorithm that guarantees to achieve the theoretical maximum of the Bellman sum (14). Especially, with more available blocklength per hop, since the overall possible numbers of HARQ attempts over the I -hop chain increases, this performance gain brought by DP is also increasing. To the contrary, when the channel is harsh or the radio resource is extremely limited, the constraint (6b) is likely forcing to allow only one transmission slot per hop, so that the optimal DMH-HARQ schedule converges to the optimal one-shot-per-hop schedule, with just gives the performance upper bound of optimal static HARQ-IR in FBL [4].

Remark that the listening-based cooperative ARQ approach also allocates the radio resource to different hops in a technically dynamic manner. However, its mechanism design only allows the successor hops to inherit unused resource from predecessors, not the other way around. With a same fixed blocklength for every (re)transmission, it results in a longer effective sub-frame for the late hops that are closer to the final information sink than the for early hops that are closer to the source. However, as it can be derived from [8], as a stochastic DP, the optimal solution shall be just the opposite: to allocate more resource to the early hops than the late ones. In the end, the listening-based cooperative ARQ approach cannot hit the optimum of the DP problem (6), and has only a limited gain from the dynamic scheduling. This impact is even more critical in the FBL regime where ARQ/HARQ generally work poor, leading to a significant gap to the performance in the

infinite blocklength (IBL) regime. As we see from the results, the listening-based cooperative ARQ approach performs the worst among all baselines.




Fig. 2: Sensitivity test regarding the time frame length




Fig. 3: Sensitivity test regarding the number of hops




Fig. 4: Sensitivity test regarding the decoding/feedback delay




Fig. 5: Sensitivity test regarding the path loss

VI. FURTHER DISCUSSIONS

A. IR Gain

So far, we have proven that even when applied without any combining technique, DMH-HARQ is able to outperform the optimal static HARQ-IR. A natural idea, of course, is to further enhance the performance of DMH-HARQ with soft combining, especially with an ideal IR, where the PER formula (9) must be replaced by

$$\varepsilon_s = Q \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_s + \frac{\tau_s}{T_b}}{V_{I+1-i_s}}} \left(C_{I+1-i_s} - \frac{d}{n_s + \frac{\tau_s}{T_b}} \right) \ln 2 \right). \quad (16)$$

Though IR is guaranteed to reduce the achievable E2E packet loss rate of DMH-HARQ, it costs more computational effort. The inclusion of τ_s into ε_s rejects Lemma 1. To keep it an MDP so that the integer DP based framework of Algorithm 1 still applies, τ_s must play its role as part of the system state when solving the decision policy, i.e. n_s . The dictionaries $\mathcal{D}_{\text{local}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{succ}}$ in Algorithm 1 shall map $[t_s, i_s, \tau_s]$ instead of $[t_s, i_s]$ to $[\xi_{\text{opt}}, n_{\text{opt}}]$. This will significantly increase the effective size of the state space, raising the time complexity of solving n_s at each node from $\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{MAX}}^I)$ to $\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{MAX}}^{2I})$.

B. Multiple Access Design

In this paper we have been focusing on a single multi-hop data link. In practical scenarios such like industrial Internet-of-Things (IIoT) and vehicle-to-everything (V2X), multiple such data links usually coexist in the same radio environment, or even share some of the relaying nodes sometimes, leading to cross-user interference that degrades the signal-to-interference-and-noise ratio (SINR). While modern radio technologies are commonly integrated with interference management solutions to mitigate strong interference, most of the popular methods will fail in the context of DMH-HARQ, since they rely on a prior knowledge of the scheduled transmission slots of user equipment (UE)s and a prediction of the interfering traffic pattern. The mechanism of dynamically making decisions for (re)transmissions that are not aligned with fixed time frames, however, makes it impossible to make such predictions accurately. It becomes therefore a more appropriate design to use time-division multiple access (TDMA) rather than orthogonal frequency-division multiple access (OFDMA) for DMH-HARQ.

More over, the TDMA design in DMH-HARQ can be potentially combined with the target wake time (TWT) mechanism, which is utilized by the IEEE 802.11ax standard, to further raise the time efficiency of DMH-HARQ: after successfully forwarding a message of some user, the first relaying node can send a triggering message to the next awaiting user, so that it is immediately waken from sleep and start its the DMH-HARQ process, instead of waiting till the last user completing its multi-hop relay. In such way, the data links of different users can be parallelized in a pipeline fashion over the multiple hops, so that the E2E delay is reduced.

VII. RELATED WORK

The problem of multi-hop relay has been attracting great interest in the wireless field since long, for it has a rich potential to offer extended cell coverage and improved channel capacity [1]. Generally, there are two families of relay technologies, namely DF and amplify-and-forward (AF). Albeit the disadvantage of higher implementation complexity, DF comprehensively outperforms AF in latency-reliability performance [9], and is therefore preferred by many researchers. Literature has investigated multi-hop DF from various perspectives, including modulation scheme [10], selective relaying route [11], and relay station placement [12], and ARQ strategy [13].

Over the past few years, the emerging wireless use scenario of URLLC is challenging off-the-shelf multi-hop relay. The extreme requirement of low E2E latency in URLLC is leading to even more stringent time constraint over each individual hop, which is barely achievable with conventional technologies. To meet such a stringent latency requirement, URLLC transmissions are likely carried out with short packet, i.e., the codewords cannot be considered as infinite long. With such so-called FBL codes, many theories and propositions in classical information theory fail to apply since the Shannon limit is no more asymptotically achievable. To accurately characterize the relationship between achievable data rate and reliability in the FBL regime, *Polyanskiy et al.* derived in [5] a closed-form expression for the single-hop transmission in AWGN channels. Later on, this FBL characterization was generalized, extended into Gilbert-Elliot channels [14] and quasi-static flat-fading channels [15]. Recently, the FBL model in random access channel has also been analyzed [16]. On the basis of those results, the performance FBL communication systems has been investigated in context of various wireless networking technologies, such as multi-input multi-output (MIMO) [17], OFDMA [18], non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) [19] and multi-access edge computing (MEC) [20].

Specifically for FBL relay networks, the system performance are generally investigated in a deterministic manner in the most existing works [3], [21]–[24]. In particular, the authors of [3] studied the performance bound of two-hop FBL relay system with perfect CSI, which was later extended to the scenarios with only partial CSI available [21]. Moreover, the authors of [22] investigated a potential use case where unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) behaves as the relay between source and destination to improve the system performance. Energy harvesting was introduced in [23] where the relay solely relies on the harvested energy to forward the information. The authors of [24] studied the impact of imperfect successive interference cancellation (SIC) in NOMA schemes on relay system that causes by the FBL transmission error.

Another interesting FBL use case is the closed-loop communication, which is not only common in MEC but also strongly related to FBL relay networks, because it behaves in a similar way as a two-hop relay chain does. The authors of [6] proposed for this use case the so-called CLARQ algorithm, which dynamically re-allocates blocklengths between uplink retransmission and downlink reception, so as to minimize the closed-loop error rate. Moreover, in [25] they analyzed

the optimal one-shot transmission scheme, which is a special case of CLARQ, under both constraints of latency and energy consumption.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOKS

In this paper, we have studied the problem of dynamic HARQ in multi-hop FBL relay networks, proposed a DMH-HARQ scheme and an associated DP algorithm to optimize it. The proposed methods are proven by numerical simulations as effective and outperforming conventional baselines, even when without any code combining.

As for the next step, we are looking forward to applying IR to DMH-HARQ, and extending our analyses and optimization methods in this paper thereto. Deeper study to the multiple access design for DMH-HARQ and its integration with TWT is also an interesting topic for future study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The work by Affiliation 1 was supported by WWW under grant number wwwww. The work by Affiliation 2 was supported by XXX under grant number xxxxx. The work by Affiliation 3 was supported by YYY under grant number yyyyy. The work by Affiliation 3 was supported by ZZZ under grant number zzzzz.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 2

Proof. For the last hop ($i_s = 1$), consider an *arbitrary* DMH-HARQ scheme with maximal K transmission attempts, where the blocklength of k^{th} (re-)transmission is m_k for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. Obviously, since $i_s = 1$, the utility equals the overall chance of successful transmission. Using Type I HARQ without combining, that is

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= 1 - \epsilon_I(m_1) + \epsilon_I(m_1) [1 - \epsilon_I(m_2)] \\ &\quad + \epsilon_I(m_1)\epsilon_I(m_2) [1 - \epsilon_I(m_3)] + \dots \\ &\quad + \epsilon_I(m_1) \dots \epsilon_I(m_{K-1}) [1 - \epsilon_I(m_K)] \\ &= 1 - \prod_{k=1}^K \epsilon_I(m_k) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Meanwhile, according to [4], if it is Type-II HARQ with IR applied, the overall chance of successful transmission is equivalent to that of an *one shot* transmission:

$$\xi_{\text{os}} = 1 - \epsilon_I \left(\sum_{k=1}^K m_k \right). \quad (18)$$

Obviously, under the same blocklength allocation and channel conditions, Type II HARQ-IR always outperforms Type I HARQ without combining in error rate, i.e., $\prod_{k=1}^K \epsilon_I(m_k) \geq \epsilon_I \left(\sum_{k=1}^K m_k \right)$, which takes the equality only when $K = 1$. Furthermore, given the fixed remaining time t_s , we always have the constraint $\sum_{k=1}^K (m_k T_b + T_1) \leq t_s$, which means

$$\sum_{k=1}^K m_k \leq \frac{t_s - K T_1}{T_b} \leq \frac{t_s - T_1}{T_b}, \quad (19)$$

where the first equality is taken only when t_s is sufficiently exploited, and the second taken only when $K = 1$. Additionally, it always holds that $\partial \epsilon_I(m)/\partial m < 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Thus, we have

$$\prod_{k=1}^K \epsilon_I(m) \geq \epsilon_I\left(\frac{t_s - T_1}{T_b}\right), \quad (20)$$

where the equality is only taken when $K = 1$ and $m_1 = \frac{t_s - T_1}{T_b}$, and the Lemma is therewith proven. \square

APPENDIX B PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proof. For the first step, we prove the monotone of $\xi_{\max}(s)$ regarding t_s as follows. Given any feasible system status $s_0 = (t_{s_0}, i_{s_0}, k_{s_0}, \tau_{s_0})$, let n_{opt} be an optimal blocklength allocation policy¹ that generates the DMH-HARQ schedule $\mathfrak{T}_{s_0}^{\text{opt}}$ with maximized utility $\xi_{\max}(s_0)$. According to Lemma 2, there must be $n_{\text{opt}}(s) = \frac{t_s}{T_b} - T_1$ for all s that $i_s = 1$.

Given an arbitrary $\Delta t > 0$, let $s^{<\Delta t>}$ denote $(t_s + \Delta t, i_s, k_s, \tau_s)$, we can always construct a sub-optimal n_{sub} that

$$n_{\text{sub}}(s) = \begin{cases} n_{\text{opt}}(s^{<-\Delta t>}) + \frac{\Delta t}{T_b} & i_s = 1, \\ n_{\text{opt}}(s^{<-\Delta t>}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Now apply n_{sub} on the initial state $s_1 = s_0^{\Delta t}$ to generate another DMH-HARQ schedule $\mathfrak{T}_{s_1}^{\text{sub}}$, it is straightforward to derive that $\mathfrak{T}_{s_0}^{\text{opt}}$ and $\mathfrak{T}_{s_1}^{\text{opt}}$ have the identical structure, except that for each non-empty node s in $\mathfrak{T}_{s_0}^{\text{opt}}$, the corresponding node of $\mathfrak{T}_{s_1}^{\text{opt}}$ is

$$s' = \begin{cases} s & i_{s'} = 0, \\ s^{<\Delta t>} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

And error rates of each transmission attempt regarding the two schedules, denoted as ε_s and $\varepsilon'_{s'}$, respectively, must fulfill

$$\varepsilon'_{s'} \begin{cases} < \varepsilon_s & i_{s'} = 1, \\ = \varepsilon_s & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Recalling Eq. (14), it always hold $\xi(\mathfrak{T}_{s_1}^{\text{sub}}) > \xi_{\max}(s_0)$. Meanwhile, there is always some n'_{opt} that generates an optimal schedule $\mathfrak{T}_{s_1}^{\text{opt}}$ with maximal $\xi_{\max}(s_1) \geq \xi(\mathfrak{T}_{s_1}^{\text{sub}})$. Thus:

$$\xi_{\max}(s_1) = \xi_{\max}(s_0^{<\Delta t>}) > \xi_{\max}(s_0) \quad \forall s_0, \forall \Delta t > 0, \quad (24)$$

i.e. $\xi_{\max}(s)$ is strictly monotone increasing regarding t_s .

Next, we come to prove the continuity of this function. According to Eq. (9), ε_s is continuous function of t_s , so $\xi_{\max}(s)$ can be guaranteed t_s -continuous, if both $\xi_{\max}(s_l(\mathfrak{T}_s))$ and $\xi_{\max}(s_r(\mathfrak{T}_s))$ are continuous functions of t_s . This sufficient condition can be derived via mathematical induction as follows.

Starting with the two *termination cases* of $t_s < T_{\min}^{(i_s)}$ and $i_s = 0$, respectively, according to Eqs. (1) and (2) we have

$S(L(\mathfrak{T}_s)) = S(R(\mathfrak{T}_s)) = \emptyset$. Recalling (5), for the termination cases we have $\xi_{\max}(s) = \xi(\mathfrak{T}_s) \equiv 0$, which are both t_s -continuous. Therefore, the utility $\xi_{\max}(s)$ itself is also t_s -continuous.

Then consider the last hop where $i_s = 1$, according to Lemma 2 we know that $\xi_{\max}(s)$ is achieved when $n_s = \frac{t_s - T_1}{T_b}$, leading to a left branch where $t_{s_l(\mathfrak{T}_s)} = 0 < T_{\min}^{(1)}$ and a right branch where $i_{s_r(\mathfrak{T}_s)} = 0$, both are termination cases. Thus, as proven above we have both $\xi_{\max}(s_l(\mathfrak{T}_s))$ and $\xi_{\max}(s_r(\mathfrak{T}_s))$ are t_s -continuous, and therefore $\xi_{\max}(s)$ the same as well.

For other hops other than the last one, i.e. $i_s \in \{2, 3, \dots, I\}$, according to the DMH-HARQ principle (1) and (2), it is obvious that there are only three possible combinations of its left and right branches:

- 1) $s_l(\mathfrak{T}(s)) = \emptyset, i_{s_r(\mathfrak{T}(s))} = \emptyset$;
- 2) $s_l(\mathfrak{T}(s)) = \emptyset, i_{s_r(\mathfrak{T}(s))} = i_s - 1$;
- 3) $i_{s_l(\mathfrak{T}(s))} = i_s, i_{s_r(\mathfrak{T}(s))} = i_s - 1$.

For case 1), $\xi_{\max}(s) \equiv 0$, which is t_s -continuous. For case 2), $\xi_{\max}(s_l(\mathfrak{T}_s))$ is t_s -continuous as proven above, so that $\xi_{\max}(s)$ can be guaranteed t_s -continuous if only $\xi_{\max}(s_r(\mathfrak{T}_s))$ is t_s -continuous. For case 3), we recall Lemma 1 that $n_{\text{opt}}(s)$ depends only on t_s and i_s , so that $\xi_{\max}(\mathfrak{T}(s))$ and $\xi_{\max}(L(\mathfrak{T}(s)))$ are different samples for the *same* function of t_s . Since the iterative generation of the left branch in decision tree is determined to terminate with an empty set, i.e. case 1) or 2), we can conclude that for a \mathfrak{T}_s in case 3), both $\xi_{\max}(s)$ and $\xi_{\max}(s_l(\mathfrak{T}(s)))$ are guaranteed t_s -continuous if $\xi_{\max}(s_r(\mathfrak{T}_s))$ is t_s -continuous. Since the iterative generation of the right branch in decision tree always ends up with one of the two termination cases, which are both t_s -continuous, we can conclude from the analyses above that $\xi_{\max}(s)$ is also t_s -continuous for all s where $i_s > 1$.

Thus, the continuity is proven for all $i \in \mathcal{S}$. With both the monotone and the continuity derived, the theorem is proven. \square

¹The existence of such optima is guaranteed by the bounded range of $\xi(s_0)$. However, the uniqueness of n_{opt} is not guaranteed. Hence we use the term ‘‘an optimal policy’’ instead of ‘‘the optimal policy’’ here.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Athanasopoulos, P. Tsiakas, K. Voudouris, I. Georgas, and G. Agapiou, "Multi-hop relay in next generation wireless broadband access networks: An overview," in *International Conference on Mobile Lightweight Wireless Systems*. Springer, 2010, pp. 543–554.
- [2] S. Karmakar and M. K. Varanasi, "The diversity-multiplexing tradeoff of the dynamic decode-and-forward protocol on a MIMO half-duplex relay channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 6569–6590, 2011.
- [3] Y. Hu, J. Gross, and A. Schmeink, "On the capacity of relaying with finite blocklength," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 1790–1794, 2016.
- [4] B. Makki, T. Svensson, and M. Zorzi, "Finite block-length analysis of the incremental redundancy HARQ," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 529–532, 2014.
- [5] Y. Polyanskiy, H. V. Poor, and S. Verdú, "Channel coding rate in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 2307–2359, 2010.
- [6] B. Han, Y. Zhu, M. Sun, V. Sciancalepore, Y. Hu, and H. D. Schotten, "CLARQ: A dynamic ARQ solution for ultra-high closed-loop reliability," vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 280–294, 2022.
- [7] J. Goel and H. Jagadeesh, "Listen to others' failures: Cooperative ARQ schemes for low-latency communication over multi-hop networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 20, no. 9, pp. 6049–6063, 2021.
- [8] R. Bellman, "Some problems in the theory of dynamic programming," *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 37–48, 1954.
- [9] A. Chaaban and A. Sezgin, "Multi-hop relaying: An end-to-end delay analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 2552–2561, 2016.
- [10] K. Dhaka, R. K. Mallik, and R. Schober, "Performance analysis of decode-and-forward multi-hop communication: A difference equation approach," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 339–345, 2012.
- [11] G. Farhadi and N. C. Beaulieu, "Fixed relaying versus selective relaying in multi-hop diversity transmission systems," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 956–965, 2010.
- [12] J. Ibrahim, A. Rehman, M. S. B. Ilyas, M. Shehzad, and M. Ashraf, "Optimization and traffic management in IEEE 802.16 multi-hop relay stations using genetic and priority algorithms," *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Security*, vol. 14, no. 7, p. 599, 2016.
- [13] S. Maagh, M. Y. Sharif, and A. Almaini, "On the dynamic decode-and-forward relay listen-transmit decision rule in intersymbol interference channels," in *Proceedings of the 9th WSEAS international conference on Data networks, communications, computers*, 2010, pp. 26–29.
- [14] Y. Polyanskiy, H. V. Poor, and S. Verdú, "Dispersion of the Gilbert-Elliott channel," in *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2009, pp. 2209–2213.
- [15] W. Yang, G. Durisi, T. Koch, and Y. Polyanskiy, "Quasi-static multiple-antenna fading channels at finite blocklength," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 4232–4265, 2014.
- [16] M. Effros, V. Kostina, and R. C. Yavas, "Random access channel coding in the finite blocklength regime," in *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2018, pp. 1261–1265.
- [17] X. Zhang, J. Wang, and H. V. Poor, "Statistical delay and error-rate bounded QoS provisioning for mURLLC over 6g CF M-MIMO mobile networks in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 652–667, 2021.
- [18] B. Han, Y. Zhu, Z. Jiang, M. Sun, and H. D. Schotten, "Fairness for freshness: Optimal age of information based OFDMA scheduling with minimal knowledge," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 20, no. 12, pp. 7903–7919, 2021.
- [19] X. Sun, S. Yan, N. Yang, Z. Ding, C. Shen, and Z. Zhong, "Short-packet downlink transmission with non-orthogonal multiple access," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 4550–4564, 2018.
- [20] Y. Zhu, Y. Hu, A. Schmeink, and J. Gross, "Energy minimization of mobile edge computing networks with HARQ in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, pp. 1–1, 2022.
- [21] Y. Hu, A. Schmeink, and J. Gross, "Optimal scheduling of reliability-constrained relaying system under outdated CSI in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 6146–6155, 2018.
- [22] C. Pan, H. Ren, Y. Deng, M. El-kashlan, and A. Nallanathan, "Joint blocklength and location optimization for URLLC-enabled UAV relay systems," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 498–501, 2019.
- [23] Y. Hu, Y. Zhu, M. C. Gursoy, and A. Schmeink, "SWIPT-enabled relaying in IoT networks operating with finite blocklength codes," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 74–88, 2019.
- [24] A. Agarwal, A. K. Jagannatham, and L. Hanzo, "Finite blocklength non-orthogonal cooperative communication relying on SWIPT-enabled energy harvesting relays," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 3326–3341, 2020.
- [25] B. Han, Y. Zhu, A. Schmeink, and H. D. Schotten, "Time-energy-constrained closed-loop FBL communication for dependable MEC," in *2021 IEEE Conference on Standards for Communications and Networking (CSCN)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 180–185.