

Theoretical analysis of beaconless geocast protocols in 1D*

Joachim Gudmundsson[†] Irina Kostitsyna[‡] Maarten Löffler[§] Tobias Müller[¶]
 Vera Sacristán^{||} Rodrigo I. Silveira^{||}

Abstract

Beaconless geocast protocols are routing protocols used to send messages in mobile ad-hoc wireless networks, in which the only information available to each node is its own location. Messages get routed in a distributed manner: each node uses local decision rules based on the message source and destination, and its own location. In this paper we analyze six different beaconless geocast protocols, focusing on two relevant 1D scenarios. The selection of protocols reflects the most relevant types of protocols proposed in the literature, including those evaluated in previous computer simulations. We present a formal and structured analysis of the maximum number of messages that a node can receive, for each protocol, in each of the two scenarios. This is a measure of the network load incurred by each protocol. Our analysis, that for some of the protocols requires an involved probabilistic analysis, confirms behaviors that had been observed only through simulations before.

1 Introduction

In mobile ad-hoc wireless networks there is no fixed infrastructure or global knowledge about the network topology. Nodes communicate on a peer-to-peer basis, using only local information. Thus messages between nodes that are not within range of each other must be sent through other nodes acting as relay stations. An important special case of ad-hoc wireless networks are wireless sensor networks, in which a (usually large) number of autonomous sensor nodes collaborate to collectively gather information about a certain area.

Nodes are typically mobile devices whose location and availability may change frequently, resulting in a highly dynamic environment in which routing must be done on-the-fly. Typically, messages are not sent to a particular network address, but to some or all nodes within a geographic region. This is known as *geocasting* [7]. The main pieces of information used to send a message are the locations of the source node and the destination region (also referred to as *geocast region*), which are usually included in the actual message.¹ See Figure 1 for an illustration.

*A preliminary version of this work appeared in ANALCO 2018 [1].

[†]School of Information Technologies, University of Sydney, joachim.gudmundsson@gmail.com

[‡]Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science, Eindhoven University of Technology, i.kostitsyna@tue.nl, supported in part by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) under project no. 639.023.208.

[§]Dept. of Information and Computing Science, Universiteit Utrecht, m.loffler@uu.nl, supported by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) under project no. 639.021.123 and 614.001.504.

[¶]Bernoulli Institute for Mathematics, Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence, Groningen University, tobias.muller@rug.nl.

^{||}Dept. de Matemàtiques, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, {vera.sacristan,rodrigo.silveira}@upc.edu, partially supported by grant PID2023-150725NB-I00 funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033.

¹Some works use the term ‘packet’ to denote the indivisible unit of information sent between the nodes. In this paper we use the term ‘message’ instead, as we are interested in counting the number of transmissions and not the higher level aspects of protocols.

Many geocast protocols have been proposed. In general, existing protocols can be divided into two groups: those that assume that each node also knows the location of its 1-hop neighbors (i.e., all nodes within range) and those that do not make this assumption. In practice, the locations of neighbors can be obtained by regularly exchanging *beacon* messages in the neighborhood. Beacons imply a significant message overhead, which prevents these methods from scaling even to medium-size networks [4]: the problem is that in dense environments the number of messages *received* by each individual node, and thus the workload to decide whether and how to react to those messages, becomes prohibitive. For this reason, in this paper we are interested in the second group, the so-called *beaconless* geocast protocols.




Figure 1: A geocast example in 2D where a message should be sent from the sender (red node) to the geocast region marked as a blue rectangle.

Probably the most straightforward beaconless geocast protocol is *simple flooding*: each message is broadcasted to all neighbors, who in turn broadcast it to all their neighbors, and so on. Even though it is effective, the resulting message overhead is clearly unaffordable: essentially, it causes as much overhead as the exchange of beacons, and therefore has the same scaling problem. From there on, there have been many improvements proposed. The goal is to reduce the message overhead while still guaranteeing delivery. In the last few decades, many different geocast protocols have been proposed. The most important protocols are the subject of this paper, and will be described in detail in the next section. For a thorough review of all existing beaconless geocast protocols we refer the reader to the surveys by Maihöfer [7] and Rührup [10].

Given the importance of geocast protocols and the many options available, there have been a few comparative studies that assessed the efficiency and efficacy of different methods under different scenarios, using low-level computer simulations. Maihöfer [7] presents simulations for four geocast protocols (flooding, two variants of flooding restricted to a forwarding zone, and a greedy-based protocol) for sparse networks with 100–1000 nodes that move within a square region, and use random circular geocast regions as destinations. The results are analyzed in terms of total number of messages transmitted (network load) and success rate. As expected, the experiments show that flooding has the highest success rate, but does not scale well, while the other methods are much better in terms of network load, but suffer from lower success rate. Hall [2] evaluated four methods (M heuristic, T heuristic, CD and CD-P, and several combinations of them) in 14 different scenarios, many of them based on realistic training applications. The parameters studied were success rate and average latency. The simulation was done using a high fidelity simulator capable of modeling realistic MAC and queuing behavior, allowing to reflect the effects of high network load in the different protocols. The main conclusion in [2] is that CD-P performs best in terms of both success rate and latency. Interestingly, the experiments also show that for restricted flooding heuristics, an increase in the redundancy parameters does not always lead to higher success rate due to more collisions and medium contention.

In contrast with previous comparisons, in this paper we are interested in analyzing the

behavior of beaconless geocast protocols from a theoretical perspective. To that end, we present a structured overview of six different protocols that represent the main existing protocols in the literature, and identify important quality criteria to analyze them mathematically.

The protocols analyzed are simple flooding, M heuristic [3], T heuristic [3], CD [2], CD-P [2], and delay-based protocols (that include, as particular cases, protocols like BLR [4], GeRaF [12] and GeDiR [11]). This selection of protocols reflects the main types of beaconless geocast protocols, and includes those evaluated in previous computer simulations [2, 7].²

Several criteria can be taken into account when comparing the behavior of different protocols. The *success rate* measures the fraction of sent messages that actually reach the target. For those that arrive, the *hop count* indicates how many steps (forwards) are needed. In this paper we only focus on what we consider to be the most significant measure within this context: the maximum number of messages that a node receives (**RecMess**). This parameter measures the work or energy consumption for a node, as well as the overall network load and therefore, its congestion. We note that network load is directly related to success rate, thus indirectly this aspect is also being considered, as done in previous comparisons [2, 7]; we do consider the theoretical success probability of the protocols (in case of no collisions) separately. We also note that, in most situations, **RecMess** is larger than the number of sent messages, because for intermediate nodes, the sending of a message occurs only as a consequence of receiving one before.

The behavior of a geocast protocol, in general, must be analyzed in the context of a particular geometric setting (i.e., a certain configuration of nodes and radio obstacles).

In this paper, we focus on two fundamental geometric scenarios in 1D: unbounded range and bounded range. Even though it is clear that the full complexity of these protocols can only be appreciated in two dimensions, we show that the 1D scenarios considered, despite their apparent simplicity, already pose interesting challenges, and expose many of the essential differences between the protocols studied. Moreover, understanding 1D situations is useful for many 2D scenarios as well, in which there are local situations that behave essentially as one-dimensional (see Figure 2).

Results and paper structure. For each of the two scenarios, bounded and unbounded range, we analyze the worst- and expected-case performance for each protocol. The results obtained corroborate many of the findings previously obtained only by simulations, and provide new insights into the difficulties of the 2-dimensional case where, in addition, escaping from local optima is necessary and requires combining different techniques. In fact, we note that the 1D setting has been used before to understand the behavior of the CD and CD-P heuristics [2]. A summary of our results is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

In Section 2 we review the important geocast protocols that will be the subject of our analysis. In Section 3 we discuss the scenarios considered in this paper together with model choices. The theoretical analysis is presented in three parts. In Section 4 we analyze the maximum number of messages that a node can receive. In order to obtain more fine-grained bounds, in Section 5 we analyze the expected number of received messages assuming fair medium access [8] for two of the protocols. The proofs of some of these results are very extensive, so they are presented separately in Sections 6 and 7. The last part of the analysis, presented in Section 8, is devoted to analyzing the effect of delay functions in the number of received messages. Finally, we present some concluding remarks in Section 9.

²Note that, in practice, protocols are often combined: a message is forwarded if at least one protocol requires it to do so. This increases success rates, at the cost of a higher total number of messages in the system.




Figure 2: The 1D scenario serves as a first step towards the general question, and is already relevant in situations where the local geometry is essentially 1-dimensional, e.g., in narrow passages. In the figure, points represent nodes and green polygons obstacles.

Protocol	1D unbounded reach	1D bounded reach ($r \ll n$)
Simple flooding	$\mathbf{RecMess} = (n - 2)k$	$\mathbf{RecMess} = 2rk$
M-heuristic	$\mathbf{RecMess} = Mk$	$\min(\frac{M}{2}, 2r)k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq \min(M, 2r)k$
T-heuristic	$\lceil \frac{n}{2T} \rceil k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq \lceil \frac{n}{T} \rceil k$	$\lceil \frac{r}{T} \rceil k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq \lceil \frac{2r}{T} \rceil k$
CD & CD-P	$k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq nk$	$2k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq 2rk$

Table 1: Summary of results in worst-case analysis of activation order, where n is the number of nodes, k is the total number of messages, and r is the communication range (refer to Section 3 for precise definitions). Note that delay-based heuristics are omitted from this table as they influence the activation order, which does not affect the worst-case performance.

Protocol	1D unbounded reach	1D bounded reach ($r \ll n$)
CD	$\mathbf{RecMess} \in \begin{cases} \Theta(k^2 \log(\lceil n/k \rceil + 1)), & \text{if } k \leq n \\ \Theta(nk), & \text{if } k > n \end{cases}$	$\mathbf{RecMess} \in O(k^{3/2})$
CD-P	$\mathbf{RecMess} \in \Theta(k \log n)$	$\mathbf{RecMess} \in \Theta(k)$

Table 2: Summary of results in probabilistic analysis of activation order.

2 Geocast protocols

We begin by describing the basic geocast framework operating at each node, following [2]. We consider a setting with n nodes represented by points in 1D, and k messages that must be sent between the nodes. During the execution of a particular protocol, messages may be sent by the original senders, received by other nodes, and either retransmitted or deleted.

Each message is assumed to contain a unique ID, the location of the sender, and the destination (geocast region). Each node has limited memory, which we assume is larger than k but considerably smaller than n . We assume that received messages are stored in a queue. When a node receives a message, it checks if it has already received a message with the same ID. If not, it creates a new record for the ID, and enqueues the message for potential later retransmission (possibly after storing some extra information about the message). When a message reaches the top of the transmission queue and is ready to be transmitted, a *heuristic check* is performed. If passed, the message is transmitted, otherwise discarded. The main difference between the different protocols lies on how this heuristic check is performed. In general terms, this check is a combination of local decision rules. Often, one of these rules is a location predicate to control the region where each message must travel (e.g., to guarantee that messages are only forwarded within a certain zone that contains the geocast region).

In the remaining of the paper we focus on the following beaconless geocast protocols, which can be categorized as: simple flooding, restricted flooding, distance-based, and delay-based.

2.1 Simple flooding

The simple flooding protocol works as follows. When a node receives a message, first it checks if it has been broadcasted before. If not, then the message is broadcasted, and its ID stored in order to make sure it will not be broadcasted again.

This strategy is simple and robust, but it is non-scalable, as it produces an excessive and unnecessary network load. In the following, we describe several heuristics intended to reduce such flood load. Nevertheless, it is interesting to consider simple flooding not only for comparison purposes, but also because it is used as a building block in other protocols (e.g., [5]).

2.2 Restricted flooding

In order to reduce the number of unnecessary transmissions of the same message, one can limit retransmissions in several ways [2]. The following two heuristics apply different approaches for this: a direct limit on the number of retransmissions, or an implicit limit, by only making “far away” nodes retransmit already heard messages.

M heuristic [3]. The MinTrans (M) heuristic explicitly controls redundancy through a parameter $M > 1$: A node broadcasts a received message if and only if the number of transmissions received for that ID is less than M . The redundant propagation allowed by the parameter M helps against problems such as message collisions and getting out from local optima.

T heuristic [3]. The Threshold (T) heuristic uses location information for spreading the geocast propagation outward: A node retransmits a received message if and only if the closest among all transmitters of messages with the same ID is at least a distance T from it.

2.3 Distance-based heuristics

The restricted flooding heuristics are likely to have delivery failures in the presence of obstacles. The following protocols were designed to help solve this problem.

CD heuristic [2]. The Center-Distance (CD) heuristic relies on proximity: A node retransmits a received message if and only if its distance to the center of the geocast region is less than that of all originators of transmissions received for the message ID. This heuristic reduces some of the scalability problems of a previous method, Ko and Vaidya’s “Scheme 2” [5], which considered only the distance of the first transmitter heard of the same message instead of that of all of them.

CD-P heuristic [2]. This protocol uses priority queues in order to further reduce the scalability problems of the CD heuristic. It works as follows: Each time the node can transmit, it transmits any message that has not been transmitted at all yet (if any) or it retransmits, among all heard messages, the one whose transmission would give the largest reduction in distance to the center of the geocast region.

2.4 Delay-based heuristics

Some strategies to further reduce redundancy combine the local decision rules in the previous protocols with retransmission delays, which are based on *delay functions*. In principle, the local decision rules are independent of the delay function used, leading to a large number of possibilities.

Existing delay-based heuristics, discussed in some detail below, can be quite different, making it hard to analyze them in a unified way in our theoretical framework. In some sense, delay functions can be viewed as a way to choose a specific *activation order* (see Section 3.2) for the nodes.

BLR heuristic [4]. In the Beacon-Less Routing (BLR) protocol, each node determines when to retransmit a received message based on a dynamic forwarding delay function which returns a value in the range $[0, MD]$, where MD is a constant representing the maximum delay. The node retransmits the package after such delay, unless some other node does it before, in which case the retransmission is canceled. Three delay functions have been suggested in [4], based on the following parameters: r (transmission range), p (progress towards destination of the orthogonal projection of the current node onto the line connecting the previous node to the destination), and d (distance from current node to the source-destination line):

$$\text{delay}_1 = MD \cdot \frac{r-p}{r}, \quad \text{delay}_2 = MD \cdot \frac{p}{r}, \quad \text{delay}_3 = MD \cdot \frac{e^{\sqrt{p^2+d^2}}}{e}.$$

GeRaF heuristic [12]. The Geometric Random Forwarding (GeRaF) protocol partitions logically the area around the destination of a message m into n_m areas $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_{n_m}$, such that all points in \mathcal{A}_i are closer to the destination than any point in \mathcal{A}_{i+1} for $1 \leq i < n_m$.

Once m is transmitted, up to n_m phases start, during which all nodes listen during a fixed amount of time. In the first phase, nodes in region \mathcal{A}_1 get to reply. If only one node replies, then that one will forward the message. If there are more, some collision resolution scheme must be used. If there is no reply, then it is the turn to reply for nodes in region \mathcal{A}_2 . This process continues until some node in the non-empty region closest to destination replies.




Figure 3: Illustration of the scenarios. Top: with unbounded reach, the k messages arrive immediately to all nodes, but that does not prevent intermediate nodes from forwarding the messages. Bottom: with range $r = 2$, the messages sent from node 1 only reach up to node 3, so forwards are necessary to reach the target, n .

Greedy routing (beaconless version). Greedy routing forwards the message to the neighbor of the current node that is closest to the geocast region. Even though it does not guarantee delivery, greedy routing strategies are often used as building block of geocast protocols. For this reason we also consider greedy routing in our analysis. One example is Geographic Distance Routing (GeDiR) [11]. GeDir assumes that every node knows the locations of its neighbors. However, it can be made beaconless by using a delay function based on the following parameters: r (transmission range), d (distance from previous node to destinations), and x (distance from current node to destination).

$$\text{delay}_4 = \text{MD} \cdot \frac{x + r - d}{2r}.$$

This strategy tries to get out of local minima by sending the message to the best positioned neighbor, even if it is not closer to the destination.

3 Model

3.1 The 1D scenarios

In this paper we study two fundamental scenarios for a set of nodes in 1D, where the leftmost of n nodes sends k messages to the rightmost node (i.e., the geocast region only contains the rightmost node). For simplicity, nodes are evenly spread at unit distance along the line.

The two scenarios considered are nodes with *unbounded* and *bounded* communication range (see Figure 3). In the first case, every transmitted message is assumed to arrive to all other nodes, while in the bounded reach scenario, a message transmitted by a node arrives only to the nodes at distance at most r . Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that $r \ll n$. The unbounded case is interesting because the n intermediate nodes form a dense bottleneck, a situation that can easily arise in practice (even for nodes in 2D), as illustrated in Figure 2.

3.2 Activation order

We analyze the maximum number of messages that any node receives (**RecMess**), among all nodes. We are interested in the possible values of **RecMess**.

The value of **RecMess** depends not only on the protocol, but also on the order in which the nodes *activate*. Even though in theory nodes process messages instantly after their reception, in practice transmissions may cause collisions. We abstract from the way in which collisions are handled by assuming that nodes activate in some sequential order.

First, in Section 4, we analyze the protocols in a pessimistic setting, by taking the maximum **RecMess** over all possible activation orders.

Second, to achieve sharper and more realistic bounds, in Section 5 we consider the special case where activation orders are drawn from a fair distribution, which is known in the literature as *fair medium access* [8]. Under this model, the transmission is done in rounds, in which only one node is activated, and where each node has the same probability of being the one being activated.

Finally, in Section 8 we analyze **RecMess** under delay-based heuristics, where the protocol purposely tries to control the activation order by means of the delay function.

3.3 Message grid representation

The 1D setting and the assumption that nodes are activated sequentially, allow us to represent the state of the message queues of every node using an $n \times k$ table, that we call *message grid*. The columns of the message grid represent nodes and the rows represent messages. In particular, each column represents the message queue of the corresponding node. In each round, one of the columns is chosen, and the corresponding node is activated. The protocol used may cause or not the retransmission of one of the messages in the queue, removing it from the queue. In addition, when the activated node transmits a message, that may cause that message to be added or deleted from the queues of other nodes, depending on the protocol.

Figures 4 and 5 illustrate the different protocols run on an example data set with $k = 4$ and $n = 6$, for each scenario.³ Each row shows the first 7 rounds of a different protocol. At each round, the message grid is shown, and the column of the activated node is highlighted in blue.

In the unbounded reach scenario (Figure 4), we assume that the initial state is the state after some start node transmitted all $k = 4$ messages, which means that all columns contain the same four messages in the same order. In the bounded reach scenario (Figure 5) this means that only the first $r = 2$ columns contain those messages.

All protocols are run in the same activation order.

4 Worst-case analysis of activation order

In this section we analyze the maximum (and minimum) value of **RecMess** over all possible activation orders, for each of the protocols, and for both scenarios.

4.1 Simple flooding

In both scenarios all nodes, except from the leftmost one, eventually will receive each message and therefore all nodes, except for the rightmost one, will retransmit each message. Note that this is true independently of the activation order, and therefore **RecMess** is independent of the activation order for this protocol.

In the unbounded reach case, all the nodes except for the rightmost will send each of the k original messages, and therefore each node will receive $n - 2$ copies of each message (from all but the rightmost and itself), thus **RecMess** = $(n - 2)k$.

In the bounded reach case, every node except from the r rightmost and r leftmost nodes will receive each message from exactly $2r$ neighbors. Therefore the maximum number of messages that any node can receive is **RecMess** = $2rk$.

³In order to make the figures more insightful, we depict the situation as if messages may get instantly added to or deleted from the queues of non-active nodes, while according to our activation model, each column only changes when the node gets activated.




Figure 4: The different protocols run on an example data set with $k = 4$ and $n = 6$, for the unbounded reach scenario. The activation order used in the illustration for the top five protocols is $\langle 3, 2, 5, 1, 4, 2 \rangle$.




Figure 5: The different protocols run on an example data set with $k = 4$ and $n = 6$, for the bounded reach scenario. The activation order used in the illustration is $\langle 3, 2, 5, 1, 4, 2 \rangle$.

Theorem 1. *For the simple flooding protocol we have:*

- $\mathbf{RecMess} = (n - 2)k$ in the unbounded reach scenario.
- $\mathbf{RecMess} = 2rk$ in the bounded reach scenario.

4.2 M heuristic

In the unbounded reach scenario this protocol guarantees that there are never more than M copies of each messages transmitted. Therefore, every node, except for those that send the message, will receive every message M times, leading to $\mathbf{RecMess} = Mk$. This is independent of the activation order.

In the bounded reach scenario we distinguish two cases: $2r \leq M$ and $2r > M$. In the first case the M heuristic is equivalent to simple flooding, therefore it is also independent of the activation order, and **RecMess** = $2rk$.

If $2r > M$, we begin by observing that, regardless of the activation order, all messages eventually reach the destination.

Observation 1. *For the M heuristic, in the bounded reach scenario, all messages reach the destination regardless of the activation order.*

Proof. Consider a message μ . At any point in time, let v be the rightmost node that has received a copy of μ . We argue that v has received μ fewer than M times, and therefore the message will be transmitted beyond v .

Suppose that v has received μ $M > 1$ times. Then at least one retransmission of μ originated from a node at distance smaller than r to the left of v . But then this message must have reached at least one node to the right of v , contradicting that v was the rightmost node that received a copy of μ . \square

In the worst case every node receives every message M times, so **RecMess** $\leq Mk$. We show next that every node receives each single message at least $M/2$ times.

Lemma 2. *For the M heuristic, in the bounded reach scenario with $2r > M$, every node receives each message at least $M/2$ times, for any activation order.*

Proof. Let the nodes be numbered from left to right v_1 to v_n , and consider the situation after running the whole protocol. Consider a message μ . First we observe that for two neighboring nodes v_i and v_{i+1} , the number of times that v_i can have received μ is at most two times more than v_{i+1} . This is because there are only two nodes that can be heard by v_i but not by v_{i+1} , namely v_{i-r} and v_{i+1} itself.

Assume there is a node v_i that received μ exactly $c < M$ times. Then nodes $v_{i \pm j}$ have received μ at most $c + 2j$ times. There are $M - c$ nodes for which $c + 2j < M$, all at distance smaller than M from v_i . Therefore, all these nodes will have retransmitted μ and v_i will have received all these retransmissions, thus $c \geq M - c$. From this, it follows that $c \geq M/2$. \square

From this lemma we can conclude that **RecMess** $\geq Mk/2$. We summarize with the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *For the M heuristic we have:*

- **RecMess** = Mk in the unbounded reach scenario.
- $\min(\frac{M}{2}, 2r)k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq \min(M, 2r)k$ in the bounded reach scenario.

4.3 T heuristic

In the unbounded reach scenario, due to the unit-distance distribution of the nodes and assuming $T \in \mathbb{N}$, when a node transmits a message, then this message is deleted from the queues of its T left and its T right neighbors. Thus, depending on the activation order: $\lceil \frac{n}{2T} \rceil k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq \lceil \frac{n}{T} \rceil k$.

In the bounded reach scenario, if $T \geq r$, no message will ever be forwarded. If $T < r$, then each node u can receive a message from at most $2r$ nodes. Each time it receives one, at least T and at most $2T$ of the nodes within reach of u delete the message from their queues. Thus: $\lceil \frac{r}{T} \rceil k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq \lceil \frac{2r}{T} \rceil k$.

Theorem 4. *For the T heuristic we have:*

- $\lceil \frac{n}{2T} \rceil k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq \lceil \frac{n}{T} \rceil k$ in the unbounded reach scenario.
- $\lceil \frac{r}{T} \rceil k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq \lceil \frac{2r}{T} \rceil k$ in the bounded reach scenario.

4.4 CD and CD-P heuristics

The number of messages received in the CD or CD-P heuristic depends heavily on the order in which the nodes are chosen. In the best case, the last node is chosen consecutively k times, and every node receives only k messages, since all the nodes delete the message as soon as they hear it from a node farther ahead. In the worst case, the nodes are chosen from left to right, and all nodes receive all messages n times, as bad as in simple flooding. So, $k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq nk$.

In the bounded reach scenario, in the best case, each message is transmitted only by the node closest to the target. Then each node receives each message only twice: once from the left and once from the right. In the worst case, messages are retransmitted by the node farthest from the target, causing all nodes to retransmit every message. However, because of the bounded reach, the flooding effect is somewhat mitigated: each node has only $2r$ neighbors and receives each message $2r$ times. So, $2k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq 2rk$.

Theorem 5. *For the CD and CD-P heuristics, we have:*

- $k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq nk$ in the unbounded reach scenario.
- $2k \leq \mathbf{RecMess} \leq 2rk$ in the bounded reach scenario.

5 Probabilistic analysis of activation order

In this section we assume *fair medium access*, which dictates a uniform distribution for the chosen node at each round on the set of all nodes with non-empty queues. Under this model, we can use probabilistic analysis to make a more precise prediction of the number of received messages in practice.

Since our bounds on $\mathbf{RecMess}$ are already tight for simple flooding and the M and T heuristics, in this section we will focus on CD and CD-P. Although conceptually CD-P is more complicated than CD, it turns out that the analysis of CD-P is actually simpler, therefore we start from there.

5.1 CD-P heuristic

Unbounded reach scenario

Theorem 6. *For the CD-P heuristic in the unbounded reach scenario, assuming fair medium access, $\mathbf{RecMess} \in \Theta(k \log n)$ with high probability.*

Proof Sketch. We present the main idea of the proof here. The full proof, including an argument for the lower bound, can be found in Section 6.

Initially, all k messages are in the queue of each of the n nodes. At each iteration of the protocol, if a node i transmits a message m , it gets deleted from the queues of all the nodes to the left of i and the node i itself, i.e., after the iteration m is present in the $n - i$ nodes to the right of i (refer to Figure 5).

When a node is selected to transmit a message, it chooses one based on the distance to the closest node it heard each message from. This means that at each iteration, the message currently present in the maximum number of nodes will be retransmitted.

Let $\mathcal{R} = (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k)$, where R_i denotes the number of nodes that at the current round contain message i in their queues. For a specific round or time t , let R_i^t be the number of nodes that contain message i at round t . Initially, $R_1 = R_2 = \dots = R_k = n$.

Let, at some iteration of the protocol, message i be present in the queues of the maximum number of nodes, i.e., $R_i = \max \mathcal{R}$. Due to the assumption on the fair medium access, a

retransmitting node is chosen uniformly at random. Therefore, after the iteration, R_i is replaced with a random value uniformly distributed on $\{1, \dots, R_i - 1\}$. We are interested in the number of iterations needed until $\mathcal{R} = (0, \dots, 0)$.

An important observation is that the order in which the messages are chosen to be retransmitted does not affect the total completion time of the process. Hence we can instead analyze the process where we first repeatedly set R_1^{t+1} to be a random value in $\{0, \dots, R_1^t - 1\}$ until we reach zero; and then we do the same for R_2 and so on until R_k . This simplifies the analysis since we are now dealing with a sum of k i.i.d. random variables; and we can get upper and lower tail bounds for the time it takes for R_1^t to reach zero by relating R_1^t to the continuous random variable $nU_1 \dots U_t$ where U_1, \dots, U_t are i.i.d. uniform on $[0, 1]$. \square

Bounded reach scenario Recall that in this scenario we have $r \ll n$. We can prove that with high probability the actual number of messages received is only a constant factor larger than in the best case; that is, linear in k .

Theorem 7. *For the CD-P heuristic in the bounded reach scenario, assuming fair medium access, $\mathbf{RecMess} \in \Theta(k)$ with high probability.*

Proof. Consider the message grid, where all messages start in the leftmost r columns. Whenever a node retransmits a message, it gets deleted from all nodes to its left and added to the $r - 1$ nodes to its right. So, each message is always present in exactly r consecutive nodes (except at the end of the process), that we will refer to as a *train* of r messages.

In the CD-P protocol, when a node sends a message, it chooses it from the train that is most behind.

From this we can already see that the average speed at which the trains progresses towards the destination is greater than $r/2$ nodes per move for CD-P. If a train of messages does not overlap with the other trains, its expected progress during the next move is $r/2$ nodes. If a train does overlap with other trains, it moves by more than $r/2$ nodes.

The expected progress for a train of r messages at each move is greater than $\frac{r}{2}$. Therefore, after $\frac{2kn}{r}$ rounds, the expected number of messages left in the queues will be 0. The total number of messages sent is $O(\frac{kn}{r})$, and every node receives a fraction $O(\frac{r}{n})$ of all the messages, therefore, $\mathbf{RecMess} = O(\frac{kn}{r} \cdot \frac{r}{n}) = O(k)$. Since $\mathbf{RecMess} \geq k$ for any activation order, the theorem follows. \square

5.2 CD heuristic

Unbounded reach scenario We can show that if k is not greater than n , the number of messages depends only logarithmically on n , at the cost of a quadratic dependence on k .

Theorem 8. *For the CD heuristic in the unbounded reach scenario, assuming fair medium access, with high probability*

$$\mathbf{RecMess} \in \begin{cases} \Theta(k^2 \log(\lceil n/k \rceil + 1)), & \text{if } k \leq n, \\ \Theta(kn), & \text{if } k > n. \end{cases}$$

Proof Sketch. To prove the theorem, we argue using the message grid, refer to Section 3.3. At each round a random column is selected among those columns that are not yet completely empty. Having chosen a column, we remove the highest filled square in that column, together with all the squares to its left. We are interested in the (random) time T when all squares are empty. Note that this is the same as asking for the time when the n -th column has been hit k times.

What makes it tricky to analyze is that while initially we have chance $1/n$ of hitting the n -th column, this probability will increase as time goes on and more columns become empty.

We start with the easier case, when $k > n$. The upper bound is immediate from the above. For the lower bound, it is enough to consider the time S until there is some node that has received all k messages. Before time S , each of the n nodes is equally likely to send at every time step, which simplifies the analysis of the process. A relatively straightforward computation involving the Chernoff-Hoeffding bound shows that in fact the probability that $S < cnk$ is exponentially small, for a certain constant c . Since $\text{RecMess} \geq S$, this proves the $k > n$ case.

In the case $k \leq n$, straightforward computations show that $S = \Theta(k^2)$ with probability close to one. For an upper bound on RecMess we consider a modified process. In the modified process, we wait until some node with index $\geq n/2$ has received each of the k messages (in which case all nodes to its left have too), we then discard all nodes with index $\leq n/2$, and in the nodes with index $> n/2$ we put all k messages back, and we now repeat with the smaller set of nodes. Each of these “phases” is essentially governed by the earlier bound on S and after $\Theta(\log(n/k))$ steps we are in a situation where the number of remaining nodes is less than k so that we can apply the bounds for the other case. The proof of the lower bound in the case $k > n$ follows a very similar idea but is technically more involved. The full proof can be found in Section 7. \square

Bounded reach scenario Next we consider the bounded reach scenario.

Theorem 9. *For the CD heuristic in the bounded reach scenario, assuming fair medium access, $\text{RecMess} \in O(k^{3/2})$ with high probability.*

Proof. In CD, when a node gets to retransmit, it picks the message with the lowest id. This means that the trains of messages are always ordered by id: the lower the id, the closer the train is to the destination. Notice that the trains cannot “overtake” each other. Thus, when a node chooses a message to retransmit, it retransmits the message that corresponds to the train most ahead of the others.




Figure 6: CD vs CD-P in bounded reach scenario.

In particular, it moves by less than $r/2$ nodes. More precisely, the trains will tend to spread out, and after a while the expected number of trains in a stack that we hit is 1, which means that the average distance that is made is $r/2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So, there will be approximately $2kn/r$ steps before all trains made it to the end (in the beginning and at the end the behaviour is different, but for large enough n this is what happens).

The expected progress for a train of r messages is trickier to calculate. In the case where all the trains overlap, it is

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{progress}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{(R_{i+1} - R_i)^2}{2(r + R_k - R_1)} + \frac{r^2}{2(r + R_k - R_1)} = f(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k),$$

where $R_1 \leq R_2 \leq \dots \leq R_k$, and R_i is the furthest node from the destination that still has

message i , or, in other words, the tail of the train. Finding the minimum of this function, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial f}{\partial R_1} &= -\frac{R_2 - R_1}{r + R_k - R_1} + \sum_1^{k-1} \frac{(R_{i+1} - R_i)^2}{2(r + R_k - R_1)^2} + \frac{r^2}{2(r + R_k - R_1)^2} = 0, \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial R_i} &= \frac{R_i - R_{i-1}}{r + R_k - R_1} - \frac{R_{i+1} - R_i}{r + R_k - R_1} = 0, \text{ for } 1 < i < k, \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial R_k} &= \frac{R_k - R_{k-1}}{r + R_k - R_1} - \sum_1^{k-1} \frac{(R_{i+1} - R_i)^2}{2(r + R_k - R_1)^2} - \frac{r^2}{2(r + R_k - R_1)^2} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

From the middle equations we get that $R_i = \frac{R_{i-1} + R_{i+1}}{2}$ when the expected shift is minimized. Thus, the expected shift is

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{progress}) \geq \sum_1^{k-1} \frac{(\frac{R_k - R_1}{k-1})^2}{2(r + R_k - R_1)} + \frac{r^2}{2(r + R_k - R_1)} = \frac{(R_k - R_1)^2}{2(k-1)(r + R_k - R_1)} + \frac{r^2}{2(r + R_k - R_1)}.$$

Let $R_k - R_1 = x$, and $\mathbb{E}(\text{progress}) = f(x)$. Again find the minimum of the function:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = \frac{x}{(k-1)(r+x)} - \frac{x^2}{2(k-1)(r+x)^2} - \frac{r^2}{2(r+x)^2} = 0.$$

We get equality

$$x^2 + 2xr + r^2 - kr^2 = 0$$

from which we get that the expected shift is minimized when $x = r(\sqrt{k} - 1)$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{progress}) > \frac{r}{\sqrt{k} + 1}.$$

If the trains of messages do not overlap, the expected progress per move is even higher. Therefore, after $\frac{(\sqrt{k}+1)kn}{r} = O(\frac{k^{3/2}n}{r})$ steps, the expected number of messages left in the queues will be 0. The total number of messages sent is $O(\frac{k^{3/2}n}{r})$, and every node receives a fraction $O(\frac{r}{n})$ of all the messages, therefore, $\text{RecMess} = O(\frac{k^{3/2}n}{r} \cdot \frac{r}{n}) = O(k^{3/2})$. \square

6 Proof of Theorem 6: CD-P, unbounded reach

Under the CD-P heuristic, nodes prioritize messages in the queue by the distance to their senders. Thus, when a node i is chosen to send a message, it will choose a message that is currently present in the maximum number of nodes. Then, all the nodes that are further away from the destination, i.e., all the nodes with index less than i , will delete this message from their queues. We will show that, with high probability, it takes $\Theta(k \log n)$ steps until all nodes have emptied their queues.

To do so we represent the number of nodes in which a message is present as random variables, and will bound them from above by continuous random variables with a simpler distribution at every iteration of the protocol.

We let $\mathcal{R}^t = (R_1^t, R_2^t, \dots, R_k^t)$, where R_i^t denotes the number of nodes that contain message i at time t . Thus, at time $t = 0$ we have $\mathcal{R}^0 = (n, \dots, n)$. One round of the CD-P protocol corresponds to the largest value in \mathcal{R} being randomly reduced. In other words, we find an index i such that $R_i^t = \max_{j=1, \dots, k} R_j^t$; we set $R_j^{t+1} := R_j^t$ for all $j \neq i$; and we choose R_i^{t+1} uniformly at random from $\{0, \dots, R_i^t - 1\}$.

We let T denote the first t for which $R_1^t = \dots = R_k^t = 0$.

We shall always assume that $n \geq 2$, because if $n = 1$ then trivially $T = n$.

6.1 Some background on stochastic domination and coupling

We say that Y *stochastically dominates* X , denoted $X \leq_{\text{st}} Y$, if

$$\mathbb{P}(X > t) \leq \mathbb{P}(Y > t), \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

A *coupling* of two random variables/vectors/objects X, Y is a joint probability space for (X, Y) on which the marginals are correct. That is, if X has probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_X(\cdot)$ and Y has probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_Y(\cdot)$, then we have a probability space $\mathcal{C} = (\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}})$ where we do a single chance experiment that determines both X and Y (formally speaking, X, Y are both measurable functions from Ω to \mathbb{R}), in such a way that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(X \in A) = \mathbb{P}_X(X \in A)$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y \in A) = \mathbb{P}_Y(Y \in A)$ for all (measurable) A . For a proof of the following standard result we refer the reader to for instance [6].

Theorem 10 (Strassen's theorem). $X \leq_{\text{st}} Y$ if and only if there is a coupling for (X, Y) in which $X \leq Y$ with probability one.

6.2 The proof of Theorem 6

We start by making the observation that the (distribution of the) completion time would be the same if we changed the process as follows: first we repeatedly keep setting R_1^{t+1} to a random value in $\{0, \dots, R_1^t - 1\}$ until we reach a situation where $R_1^t = 0$; next we do the same for R_2 , then for R_3 , and so on. The reason that this gives the same distribution of the completion time is that for every time step t of the original process, every R_i^t that is nonzero is sure to become the maximum value in some future round $t' \geq t$.

Let us thus write Z for the (random number) of rounds it takes for R_1^t to reach zero, starting from $R_1^0 = n$. Then $T \stackrel{d}{=} Z_1 + \dots + Z_k$, where Z_1, \dots, Z_k are i.i.d. distributed like Z .

Let U_1, U_2, \dots be i.i.d. uniform on $[0, 1]$ and let us denote

$$Z_{\text{upper}} := \min\{t : n \cdot U_1 \cdot \dots \cdot U_t < 1\}, \quad Z_{\text{lower}} := \min\{t : n \cdot U_1 \cdot \dots \cdot U_t < t + 1\}.$$

Then we have the following relation:

Lemma 11. $Z_{\text{lower}} \leq_{\text{st}} Z \leq_{\text{st}} Z_{\text{upper}}$.

Proof. For notational convenience we write $V_i := nU_1 \dots U_i, W_i := V_i - i$. We start with the (stochastic) upper bound. It is enough to show that $R_1^i \leq_{\text{st}} V_i$ for all i , since that will prove that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z > t) = \mathbb{P}(R_1^{\lfloor t \rfloor} \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{P}(V_{\lfloor t \rfloor} \geq 1) = \mathbb{P}(Z_{\text{upper}} > t). \quad (1)$$

We will use induction to prove $R_1^i \leq_{\text{st}} V_i$ for all i . Clearly, $R_1^0 = n = V_0$ so the base case holds. Let us thus suppose that $R_1^i \leq_{\text{st}} V_i$ for some i . By Strassen's theorem, there is a coupling for (R_1^i, V_i) so that $R_1^i \leq V_i$ with probability one. If under this coupling, we condition on the event that $V_i = x, R_1^i = \ell$ (where necessarily $\ell \leq \lfloor x \rfloor$), then $V_{i+1} = V_i U_{i+1}$ is chosen uniformly at random on the interval $[0, x]$, while R_1^{i+1} is chosen uniformly from the set $\{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}$. Thus, for all $0 \leq y \leq x$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(V_{i+1} \geq y | V_i = x, R_1^i = \ell) = \frac{x - y}{x} = 1 - \frac{y}{x},$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(R_1^{i+1} \geq y | V_i = x, R_1^i = \ell) = \frac{(\ell - 1) - \lceil y \rceil}{\ell} = 1 - \frac{\lceil y \rceil + 1}{\ell} \leq 1 - \frac{y}{x}.$$

Summing over ℓ , this simplifies to

$$\mathbb{P}(V_{i+1} \geq y | V_i = x) = \sum_{\ell} \mathbb{P}(V_{i+1} \geq y | V_i = x, R_1^i = \ell) \mathbb{P}(R_1^i = \ell | V_i = x) = 1 - \frac{y}{x}, \quad (2)$$

and similarly,

$$\mathbb{P}(R_1^{i+1} \geq y | V_i = x) \leq 1 - \frac{y}{x}. \quad (3)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(V_{i+1} \geq y) &= \int_y^n \mathbb{P}(V_{i+1} \geq y | V_i = x) f_{V_i}(x) dx \\ &\geq \int_y^n \mathbb{P}(R_1^{i+1} \geq y | V_i = x) f_{V_i}(x) dx \\ &= \mathbb{P}(R_1^{i+1} \geq y), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

so that the upper bound is proved.

For the lower bound, we remark it is sufficient to show $W_i \leq_{\text{st}} R_1^i$ for all i , by an argument analogous to (1). Again we use induction, and again the base case is trivial, as $R_1^0 = n = W_0$. For the induction step, we can assume there exists a coupling such that $W_i \leq R_1^i$ with probability one, under this coupling. If we condition on the event $W_i = x, R_1^i = \ell$ (where now necessarily $x \leq \ell$), then $W_{i+1} = U_{i+1}(W_i + i) - (i + 1)$ is uniform on the interval $[-(i + 1), x - 1]$ while R_1^i is uniform on $\{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}$. Hence for $0 \leq y \leq x - 1$ we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(W_{i+1} \geq y | W_i = x, R_1^i = \ell) = \frac{x - 1 - y}{x + i} = 1 - \frac{y + i + 1}{x + i},$$

while

$$\mathbb{P}(R_1^{i+1} \geq y | W_i = x, R_1^i = \ell) = \frac{\ell - 1 - \lceil y \rceil}{\ell} = 1 - \frac{\lceil y \rceil + 1}{\ell} \geq 1 - \frac{y + i + 1}{x + i},$$

using that $\frac{\lceil y \rceil + 1}{\ell} \leq \frac{y + 1}{x} \leq \frac{y + i + 1}{x + i}$ (repeatedly applying that $a > b \geq 0$ implies that $\frac{b}{a} \leq \frac{b+1}{a+1}$). Thus, arguing completely analogously to (2), (3) and (4), the lower bound is proved. (Here we should remark it is sufficient to consider only $y \geq 0$, since $\mathbb{P}(R_1^{i+1} \geq y) = 1$ for $y < 0$.) \square

Corollary 12. $\mathbb{P}(Z_1 > t) \leq n(1/2)^t$.

Proof. This follows by Markov's inequality, since $\mathbb{E}(nU_1 \dots U_t) = n(1/2)^t$. \square

Corollary 13. *There exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(Z < c \log n) \leq \frac{1}{\log n} \quad (\text{for all } n \geq 2)$$

(Note that the distribution of Z implicitly depends on n .)

The proof of this corollary makes use of the observation that if U is uniform on $[0, 1]$ and $W := \ln(1/U)$ then $\mathbb{E}W = \text{Var } W = 1$. For completeness we spell out the straightforward computations.

Lemma 14. *Let U be uniform on $[0, 1]$ and let $W := \ln(1/U)$. Then $\mathbb{E}W = \text{Var } W = 1$.*

Proof. We have that

$$\mathbb{E}W = \int_0^1 -\ln u du = [-u \ln u + u]_0^1 = 1,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}W^2 = \int_0^1 \ln^2 u \, du = \left[u \ln^2 u - 2u \ln u + 2u \right]_0^1 = 2.$$

So indeed $\text{Var } W = \mathbb{E}W^2 - (\mathbb{E}W)^2 = 1$. \square

Proof of Corollary 13. Since $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = 0$, we can assume that $n \geq n_0$ for some sufficiently large constant n_0 (at the price of possibly having to lower the universal constant c a bit). We put $t := \lfloor \frac{\ln n}{1000} \rfloor$ and we note that

$$\mathbb{P}[nU_1 \dots U_t < t + 1] = \mathbb{P}[\ln(1/U_1) + \dots + \ln(1/U_t) > \ln n - \ln(t + 1)].$$

Writing $S := \ln(1/U_1) + \dots + \ln(1/U_t)$ for convenience, we see that $\mathbb{E}S = \text{Var } S = t$ by Lemma 14 above, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[S > \ln n - \ln(t + 1)] &= \mathbb{P}[S - \mathbb{E}S > \ln n - \ln(t + 1) - \mathbb{E}S] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}[S - \mathbb{E}S > \ln n - t - \mathbb{E}S] \\ &\leq \frac{t}{(\ln n - 2t)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\ln n}, \end{aligned}$$

having used $t \geq \ln(t + 1)$ in the second line; Chebyshev in the third line; and that n is sufficiently large in the fourth line. \square

Corollary 15. *There exist universal constants $c, C > 0$ such that, if $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $k = k(n)$ satisfies $1 \leq k = o(\log n)$ then*

$$\mathbb{P}(ck \log n < T < Ck \log n) \rightarrow 1.$$

Proof. For the upper bound, we notice that

$$\mathbb{P}(T > Ck \log n) \leq k\mathbb{P}(Z > C \log n) \leq kn(1/2)^{C \log n} \rightarrow 0,$$

using Corollary 12 and where the limit follows assuming C is sufficiently large. For the lower bound, we argue similarly noting that

$$\mathbb{P}(T < ck \log n) \leq k\mathbb{P}(Z_1 < c \log n) \leq \frac{k}{\log n} \rightarrow 0,$$

using Corollary 13 (assuming c was chosen smaller than the constant provided there) and using that $k = o(\log n)$. \square

This last corollary proves our main result in the case when $n \rightarrow \infty$ and k is either constant or does not go to infinity too fast. To complete the proof of the main result, it now suffices to consider the case when $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $n = n(k) \geq 2$ is arbitrary. Before we tackle this case we need one more observation.

Corollary 16. *There exist universal constants $c, C > 0$ such that*

$$c \log n \leq \mathbb{E}Z \leq C \log n, \quad c \log^2 n \leq \mathbb{E}Z^2 \leq C \log^2 n, \quad (\text{for all } n \geq 2)$$

(Again we remind the reader that Z depends implicitly on n .)

Proof. It follows from Corollary 13 that

$$\mathbb{E}Z \geq c \log n \cdot \mathbb{P}(Z \geq c \log n) = \Omega(\log n),$$

if c is as in Corollary 13. The same argument also gives $\mathbb{E}Z^2 \geq (\mathbb{E}Z)^2 = \Omega(\log^2 n)$.

By a standard formula for the expectation of nonnegative random variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}Z &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Z \geq t) dt \\ &\leq C \log n + \int_{C \log n}^\infty n(1/2)^t dt \\ &= O(\log n), \end{aligned}$$

provided C is chosen sufficiently large. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}Z^2 &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Z \geq \sqrt{t}) dt \\ &\leq C \log^2 n + \int_{C \log^2 n}^\infty n(1/2)^{\sqrt{t}} dt \\ &= O(\log^2 n) + n \int_{C \log^2 n}^\infty e^{\ln(2)\sqrt{t}} dt \\ &= O(\log^2 n) + nO\left(\int_{\ln 2\sqrt{C} \log n}^\infty z e^{-z} dz\right) \\ &= O(\log^2 n) + nO\left(\int_{\ln 2\sqrt{C} \log n}^\infty e^{-z/2} dz\right) \\ &= O(\log^2 n), \end{aligned}$$

using the substitution $z := \ln(2)\sqrt{t}$ in the third line, and that $z \leq e^{z/2}$ for all sufficiently large z in the third line. \square

Corollary 17. *There exist universal constants c, C such that, if $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $n = n(k) \geq 2$ is arbitrary then*

$$\mathbb{P}(ck \log n \leq T \leq Ck \log n) \rightarrow 1.$$

Proof. Since $T = Z_1 + \dots + Z_k$, the previous corollary shows that $\mathbb{E}T = k\mathbb{E}Z = \Theta(k \log n)$ and $\text{Var } T = k \text{Var } Z = \Theta(k \log^2 n)$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(|T - \mathbb{E}T| > \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}T) \leq \frac{4 \text{Var } T}{(\mathbb{E}T)^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) = o(1),$$

using Chebyshev and Corollary 16. To conclude, we observe that, provided we chose c small enough and C large enough, we have $\{T < ck \log n\}, \{T > Ck \log n\} \subseteq \{|T - \mathbb{E}T| > \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}T\}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6. We remark that Corollaries 15 and 17 together prove the theorem, taking the minimum of the two c 's and the maximum of the two C 's provided by these corollaries for the full result. \square

7 Proof of Theorem 8: CD, unbounded reach

We model the problem with the message grid, an $n \times k$ grid of squares (n columns of height k). In this section, for ease of exposition we assume that the grid is initially empty, and that we are interested in the number of time steps (messages sent) before the grid is completely full. That is, there are discrete time steps $t = 1, 2, \dots$ and initially the grid is empty. At each time step a random column is selected among those columns that are not yet completely full; the column is chosen uniformly at random among all the non-full columns. Having chosen a column, we fill the lowest square in the column that is still not filled, together with all the squares to the left of it (insofar as those are not yet filled). So if in the first time step column i was selected, then squares $(1, 1), \dots, (i, 1)$ get filled. If in the second time step column j was selected then

there are two possibilities. If $j \leq i$ then squares $(2, 1), \dots, (2, j)$ get filled. Otherwise, squares $(1, i + 1), \dots, (1, j)$ get filled.⁴

We are interested in the (random) time T when all squares have become filled. Note that this is the same as asking for the time when the n -th column has been hit k times. What makes it a little bit tricky to analyze is that while initially we have a chance of $1/n$ of hitting the n -th column, this probability will increase as time goes on and more columns get filled. Below we consider the case where the number of columns n or the number of rows k goes to infinity (or both).

In order to prove Theorem 8, we prove the following, more specific, result.

Theorem 18. *There exist constants $0 < c_L < c_U < \infty$ such that:*

1. *If $k = k(n) \leq n/1000$ then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(c_L \cdot k^2 \log\left(\frac{n}{k}\right) \leq T \leq c_U \cdot k^2 \log\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)\right) \rightarrow 1,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$;

2. *If $k = k(n) \geq n/1000$ then*

$$\mathbb{P}(c_L \cdot kn \leq T \leq c_U \cdot kn) \rightarrow 1,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

3. *If n is constant then*

$$\mathbb{P}(c_L \cdot kn \leq T \leq c_U \cdot kn) \rightarrow 1,$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

In the following sections we prove Theorem 18.

7.1 The random variable S

We will consider the time S until at least one column becomes full. Of course, $S \leq T$. What simplifies the analysis of S as opposed to T is that until time S in each time step we are choosing a column uniformly at random from all n columns.

Lemma 19. *For all $k \leq n$ and all t we have that:*

$$\mathbb{P}(S < t) \leq \left(\frac{2e^2 t}{k^2}\right)^k.$$

Proof. Let X_1, X_2, \dots denote the indices of the columns selected in each time step. Since we are only interested in S , we can just pretend that nothing changes in the way we choose columns after one or more have filled up. In other words, from now on in this proof we suppose we are given an infinite sequence X_1, X_2, \dots of random variables (column indices) that are chosen independently and uniformly at random from $\{1, \dots, n\}$.

We now make the following crucial observation: There is a full column at time t if and only if there is a sequence $t_1 < \dots < t_k$ of length k such that $t_k \leq t$ and $X_{t_1} \geq X_{t_2} \geq \dots \geq X_{t_k}$.

⁴Clearly, this formulation is equivalent to starting with a full grid, and removing squares (messages) when a random non-empty column gets chosen.

That is, the sequence X_1, \dots, X_t must contain a non-increasing subsequence of length k .⁵ To complete the proof, we are going to give a very crude upper bound on the probability that there exists such a non-increasing subsequence in X_1, \dots, X_t . We will use the first moment method, i.e., we will just count—or rather bound—the expected number of all such subsequences.

First we choose the k time steps t_1, \dots, t_k on which a non-increasing subsequence is to occur. This can be done in

$$\binom{t}{k} \leq \left(\frac{et}{k}\right)^k,$$

ways (using a standard bound on binomial coefficients).

Assuming that we know the time steps t_1, \dots, t_k on which a non-increasing subsequence is to be formed, we wish to count the number of ways we can choose values for X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_k} to make them non-increasing. To specify a non-increasing sequence of length k with elements $\in \{1, \dots, n\}$ it is enough to specify how many times each number is hit. That is, we have $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ such that $a_1 + \dots + a_n = k$, where a_i is the number of times we use number i in the sequence. The sequence will start with a_n times the number n , followed by a_{n-1} times the number $n-1$, and so on. The number of ways of choosing values for X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_k} is thus:

$$\binom{k+n-1}{k} \leq \left(\frac{e(n+k)}{k}\right)^k \leq \left(\frac{2en}{k}\right)^k.$$

Next, we remark that for any given t_1, \dots, t_k and a_1, \dots, a_k the probability that X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_k} take the values specified (implicitly) by a_1, \dots, a_n simply equals n^{-k} .

Putting it all together we find that

$$\mathbb{P}(S < t) \leq (et/k)^k \cdot (2en/k)^k \cdot n^{-k} = (2e^2t/k^2)^k,$$

as required. □

Lemma 20. *There exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that for all $k \geq n$ and all $t \leq cnk$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(S < t) \leq \left(\frac{16t}{nk}\right)^{k/2}.$$

Proof. The argument is similar to that in the proof of Lemma 19, except that now we do not choose the times t_1, \dots, t_k . Instead we observe that if there exists a non-increasing subsequence that corresponds to a_1, \dots, a_n (as above, with $a_1 + \dots + a_n = k$, and so) then one can construct (possibly another) such sequence by first waiting until the time t_n when we have first seen a_n occurrences of n , then waiting until the first time $t_{n-1} > t_n$ such that we have seen a_{n-1} occurrences of $n-1$ in the interval $(t_n, t_{n-1}]$, and so on. The sequence we obtain via this procedure will be the first to occur among all sequences corresponding to the same vector $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. For a given such vector \bar{a} we can therefore compute the probability that a subsequence corresponding to \bar{a} occurs before time t as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\text{there exists a subsequence corresponding to } \bar{a} \text{ in } X_1, \dots, X_t) \\ &= \\ & \mathbb{P}(Y \leq t), \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

⁵This is loosely connected to the famous longest increasing subsequence problem for random permutations. Also there we need a permutation of length $\text{const} \times n^2$ before we can expect to find an increasing subsequence of length n .

where $Y = Y_1 + \dots + Y_k$ is a sum of i.i.d. geometrically distributed random variables with common success probability $p = 1/n$. To see this, one can think of first “listening to the n -th column” until it has been selected a_n times, then “listening to the $(n-1)$ -st column”, and so on. At each time step the desired column is selected with probability $1/n$, independently of the previous history of the process.

By Lemma 26 below, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \leq t) \leq \exp[-(kt/\mathbb{E}(Y)) \cdot H(\mathbb{E}(Y)/t)] \leq \exp[-(t/n) \cdot H(nk/t)].$$

(Here $H(x) := x \ln x - x + 1$, and we have used $\mathbb{E}(Y) = nk$.) Now notice that $H(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot x \ln x$ for all x sufficiently large. That is, for all $x \geq x_0$ with x_0 a suitable constant—for instance, taking $x_0 := e^2$ is sufficient. Thus, we can choose c such that $(t/n) \cdot H(nk/t) \geq (k/2) \ln(nk/t)$ for all $t \leq cnk$.

The number of sequences \bar{a} is at most

$$\binom{n+k-1}{k} \leq \binom{2k}{k} \leq 4^k.$$

Putting these bounds together we find that, for $t \leq cnk$:

$$\mathbb{P}(S < t) \leq 4^k \left(\frac{t}{nk}\right)^{k/2} = \left(\frac{16t}{nk}\right)^{k/2},$$

as required. □

Combining Lemmas 19 and 20 we see that:

Corollary 21. *There exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(S < cnk) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any sequence $k = k(n)$ satisfying $k \geq n/100$.*

Lemma 22. *There exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that for all n, k and all $t \geq Ck^2$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(S > t) \leq e^{-t}.$$

Proof. (sketch) We can assume without loss of generality that $k < n/1000$ (otherwise, if $k \geq n/1000$ then $S \leq 1000k^2$ is deterministically true, since in every time step a square gets filled and there are $nk \leq 1000k^2$ squares in total). First we wait until the first time one of the last $\lfloor n/k \rfloor$ columns are hit, then we wait until the next time after that the next $\lfloor n/k \rfloor$ columns are hit, and so on. The probability that at time t , we have not had k successes in the above process equals the probability that $X > t$ where X is the sum of k independent $\text{geo}(p)$ random variables with $p = \lfloor n/k \rfloor / n = \Theta(1/k)$. We can thus apply Lemma 26. Note that $\mathbb{E}(X) = \Theta(k^2)$ and that $H(x) = x \ln x - x + 1 \geq x$ for all $x \geq x_0$ (where x_0 is of course a suitable constant, $x_0 := e^2$ will do). Thus, we can indeed choose $C > 0$ such that $t/\mathbb{E}(X) \geq x_0$ for all $t \geq Ck^2$, giving

$$\mathbb{P}(S > t) \leq \mathbb{P}(X > t) \leq e^{-\mathbb{E}(X) \cdot H(t/\mathbb{E}(X))} \leq e^{-t},$$

for all k, n, t satisfying the conditions of the lemma. □

7.2 Proof of parts 2 and 3 of Theorem 18

Note that in each step of the process at least one square of the grid gets filled. Thus $T \leq nk$ (with probability one). Since $T \geq S$ the lower bound in 2 follows immediately from Corollary 21 and the lower bound in 3 from Lemma 19.

7.3 Proof of the upper bound of part 1 of Theorem 18

We will consider a modification of the process that will certainly take at least as long as the original version, and is easier to analyze. We distinguish different phases of the process. In the first phase, starting from the empty $k \times n$ message grid, we throw away columns until at least one column with index $\geq n/2$ is full. While doing this, we ignore the height constraint on columns with index $\leq n/2$. That is, columns with index $\leq n/2$ are allowed to have height $\geq k$ and we will still select columns uniformly from all n columns. As soon as a column with index $> n/2$ obtains height k , the first phase ends. We now throw away the left half of the grid, and empty the right half. So we now have an empty $(k/2) \times n$ grid. We now repeat the modified process, i.e., randomly select columns and ignore the height constraints of the left half until we get some full column in the right half (which corresponds to the rightmost quarter of the original grid) and repeat. We keep going on until we start a phase starts where the number of remaining columns is $\leq 1000k$. In the last phase we simply carry out the process as usual, waiting until all the last column is filled. (Observe that there will be $\Theta(\log(n/k))$ phases in total.)

Proof of the upper bound. Let C as provided by Lemma 22. Notice that if we restrict attention to the right half of the columns that have not yet been filled at the start of the phase (i.e., in phase i these are columns with indices $n2^{-(i+1)} + 1, \dots, n$) then the number of times this set of columns is hit in a period of t time steps since the start of the phase behaves like a $\text{Bi}(t, \frac{1}{2})$ random variable (lets call it X) and the probability that the phase lasts longer than t is precisely the probability that $S_{k, n2^{-(i+1)}} > X$. We see that for all $i \leq I$ (where $I := \lceil \log(n/1000k) \rceil$ is the smallest i such that $n2^{-i} \leq 1000k$) and all $t \geq 100Ck^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{phase } i \text{ takes longer than } t) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\text{Bi}(t, \frac{1}{2}) < t/100) + \mathbb{P}(S_{k, n2^{-(i+1)}} > t/100) \\ &\leq e^{-(t/2) \cdot H(2/100)} + e^{-t/100} \\ &\leq 2e^{-t/100}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where we have applied the vanilla Chernoff bound, Lemma 22, and that $\frac{1}{2}H(2/100) > 1/100$.

We distinguish two cases. First, we suppose that $k \geq \sqrt{n}$. In that case (6) gives that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{phase } i \text{ takes longer than } 100Ck^2) = \exp[-\Omega(n)].$$

Hence, we see that if we write $K := 100Ck^2I + 1000k^2$ ($= \Theta(k^2 \log(n/k))$), then assuming $k \geq \sqrt{n}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{the process takes longer than } K \text{ to complete}) \leq \log n \cdot e^{-\Omega(n)} = o(1).$$

It remains to consider the case when $k \leq \sqrt{n}$. Note that in this case we have $I \rightarrow \infty$. Let L_i denote the duration of phase i . By Lemma 19 we have that

$$\mathbb{E}(L_i) \geq \frac{k^2}{4e^2} \cdot \mathbb{P}(L_i \geq \frac{k^2}{4e^2}) \geq \frac{k^2}{4e^2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \Omega(k^2). \tag{7}$$

On the other hand, applying Lemma 22 and a standard formula for the expectation of non-negative random variables we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(L_i) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(L_i > t) dt \\ &\leq 100Ck^2 + 2 \int_{100Ck^2}^\infty e^{-t/100} dt \\ &\leq 100Ck^2 + 2 \int_0^\infty e^{-t/100} dt \\ &= O(k^2). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

(Here it is important to note that the constants hidden inside the Ω, O notation in (7) and (8) are universal. That is, the same constants work for all n, k in the range considered.) Similarly to (8) we also have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(L_i^2) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(L_i^2 > t) dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(L_i > \sqrt{t}) dt \\ &\leq 10^4 C^2 k^4 + 2 \int_{10^4 C^2 k^4}^\infty e^{-\sqrt{t}/10} dt \\ &= O(k^2),\end{aligned}$$

where the multiplicative constant hidden inside the $O(k^4)$ is universal.

Writing $L := \sum_{i=1}^I L_i$, we have that $\mathbb{E}(L) = \Theta(Ik^2)$ and $\text{Var } L = O(Ik^4)$. Thus, we can apply Chebyshev's inequality to see that

$$\mathbb{P}(L \leq \mathbb{E}(L)/2) \leq \frac{4 \text{Var } L}{(\mathbb{E}(L))^2} = O(1/I) = o(1),$$

Since $I = \Theta(\log(n/k))$ tends to infinity under the assumption that $k \leq \sqrt{n}$. As L is the time until the process completes, this completes the proof of the upper bound. \square

7.4 Proof of the lower bound of part 1 of Theorem 18

Again we will modify the process, this time so as to obtain a process that will terminate quicker (and is easier to analyze). We will choose constants $0 < \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon < 1$ satisfying some additional demands (which include $\alpha \ll \beta, \beta < \gamma^2$) that will be specified as we go along with the proof.

- We divide time into “rounds” (periods) of length $t = \delta k^2$.
- We divide the columns into groups. Group i consists of $n_i := n\alpha^i$ consecutive columns. (Group 1 contains columns $1, \dots, n_1$, group two columns $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_1 + n_2$ and so on.) We shall be choosing α small enough so that in fact $\sum n_i < n$. The fact that the sum is strictly less than n will not be a problem for our argument.⁶
- At the start of each round, the columns of groups $1, \dots, i$ will already have been “filled”, while none of the columns in groups $i + 1, \dots$ will be full. (The first round is round 0.) At the end of the period we will fill one or more additional groups of columns completely, according to the following rules:
 - If at the start of the current round group i is the last filled group as above, and during the round in some group $i + j$ a non-increasing sequence of length $k\gamma^j$ gets created **only taking into account what happened in the current period to the columns in that group**, then we fill all columns up to and including that entire group, and move on to the next period. (We do not drop any more columns during the rest of the round. That is, as soon as a non-increasing sequence of length $k\gamma^j$ gets created in group $i + j$, the round ends.)
 - Otherwise, if by the end of a round no group obtained a non-increasing sequence of the desired length (among the selections in that period), then we fill up group i , and move on to the next period.
- The process terminates once a group with index $\geq I := \varepsilon \log(n/k)$ has been filled.

⁶We are ignoring rounding for now. This can be settled by noting we can assume n, k and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ are all powers of two (for n, k this can be shown using the monotonicity of T in n, k – worsening the constant c_L a bit.)

Why this works. Note that in a round when groups $1, \dots, i$ have been filled, but group $i + 1$ has not, the longest non-increasing sequence that could possibly exist in group $i + j$ (now taking into account all periods) is no longer than

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq i} k \gamma^{i+j-k} &= \sum_{\ell=j}^{i+j-1} k \gamma^\ell \\ &\leq k \gamma^j / (1 - \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, even if we are very lucky and all the longest non-increasing sequences of the groups $i + 1, i + 2, \dots$ can be combined into one non-increasing sequence, then this sequence would still have length at most

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} k \gamma^j / (1 - \gamma) = \frac{\gamma k}{(1 - \gamma)^2}.$$

This also implies that even if in the current round some group achieves the goal we have set for it (namely a sequence of length $k \gamma^j$ for group $i + j$), then the longest sequence will still be no longer than $k \gamma (1 + 1/(1 - \gamma)^2) < k$ (provided we chose the constants γ sufficiently small – which we can assume without loss of generality). In particular, we never fill columns completely, except at the end of a round when we fill one or more entire groups of columns.

Next, we need a bound on the probability that group $i + j$ obtains a non-increasing sequence of length $k \gamma^j$ in the period when groups $1, \dots, i$ have been filled but group $i + 1$ has not.

Lemma 23. *Provided $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon$ are chosen appropriately, and i, j are such that $i + j \leq I$ (the number of groups), the following holds. Consider the situation where we start a round in which groups $1, \dots, i$ have been filled and groups $i + 1, i + 2, \dots$ have not. Let $E_{i,j}$ be the event that group $i + j$ achieves a sequence of length $k \gamma^j$ during this period. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{i,j}) \leq 10^{-j}.$$

Moreover, if $k \geq \sqrt{n}$, then we even have

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{i,j}) = \exp[-\Omega(n^{1/4})],$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq I - 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq I - i$.

Proof. Note that if $E_{i,j}$ holds, then one of the following two possibilities must have occurred. Either **(a)** group j has received $\geq k^2 \beta^j$ columns (in the current period), or **(b)** it has received less than $k^2 \beta^j$ columns, but nonetheless a sequence of length $k \gamma^j$ was created. By Lemma 19 (applied with $k' = \max(k \gamma^j, 1)$, $t' := k^2 \beta^j$, $n' := n \alpha^j$) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\textbf{(b)}) &\leq \left(\frac{2e^2 t'}{k'^2} \right)^{k'} \\ &= \left(\frac{2e^2 \beta^j}{\gamma^{2j}} \right)^{\max(k \gamma^j, 1)} \\ &\leq 2e^2 (\beta / \gamma^2)^j. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

To deal with the probability that **(a)** holds we distinguish two further possibilities: **(a-1)** we have $k^2 \beta^j \geq 1$, or **(a-2)** we have $k^2 \beta^j < 1$. We find that under assumption **(a-1)** we can apply the vanilla Chernoff bound to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\textbf{(a)}) &= \mathbb{P}(\text{Bi}(\delta k^2, \alpha^j) \geq k^2 \beta^j) \\ &\leq \exp[-\delta k^2 \alpha^j H((\beta / \alpha)^j)] \\ &\leq \exp[-\delta k^2 \beta^j \ln((\beta / \alpha)^j) / 2] \\ &\leq (\alpha / \beta)^{j/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where in the third line we have used that $H(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}x \ln x$ for $x \geq x_0$ with x_0 sufficiently large, and that we can choose α, β such that $\beta/\alpha \geq x_0$. Under the assumption **(a-2)** we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{a})) &= \mathbb{P}(\text{Bi}(\delta k^2, \alpha^j) \geq 1) \\ &\leq \delta k^2 \alpha^j \\ &= (\delta k^2 \beta^j) \cdot (\alpha/\beta)^j \\ &\leq (\alpha/\beta)^j,\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

using assumption **(a-2)** for the third line.

Combining the above bounds we see that, provided α, β, γ were chosen appropriately, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{i,j}) \leq 2e^2(\beta/\gamma^2)^j + (\alpha/\beta)^{j/2} < 10^{-j},$$

the last inequality again holding if we chose—as we may assume we have— α, β, γ appropriately.

We now consider the situation where $k \geq \sqrt{n}$. Note that in this case, having chosen the constants appropriately,

$$k\gamma^j \geq \sqrt{n\gamma^{2I}} \geq \sqrt{n\gamma^{4\varepsilon \log(n)}} = \Omega(n^{1/4}).$$

Thus, the second line of (9) gives in fact that

$$\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{b})) = \exp \left[-\Omega \left(n^{1/4} \right) \right]$$

Similarly, having chosen the constants correctly, we have

$$k^2\beta^j > n\beta^I \geq n^{1+\varepsilon \log(\beta)} = \Omega(\sqrt{n}).$$

Thus, the case **(a-2)** does not apply, and the third line of (10) gives that

$$\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{a})) = \exp[-\Omega(\sqrt{n})].$$

This shows that indeed $\mathbb{P}(E_{i,j}) = \exp[-\Omega(n^{1/4})]$ in the case when $k \geq \sqrt{n}$. \square

This last lemma is all we need to prove part 1 of Theorem 18, for the case when $k \geq \sqrt{n}$.

Proof of part 1 of Theorem 18, assuming $k \geq \sqrt{n}$. By the previous lemma, the probability that during any round of the process some group obtains a non-increasing sequence of length $k\gamma^j$ is at most

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{desired sequence is obtained}) \leq \sum_{i+j \leq I} \mathbb{P}(E_{i,j}) = O \left((\log n)^2 \right) \cdot \exp[-\Omega(n^{1/4})] = o(1).$$

This means that, with probability $1 - o(1)$, there will be a total of $I = \Theta(\log(n/k))$ rounds and in each round we spend the full amount of time δk^2 . So indeed, with probability $1 - o(1)$, the process does not complete before $\delta k^2 I = \Omega(k^2 \log(n/k))$. \square

In the rest of the section we will thus be assuming that $k \leq \sqrt{n}$. Note that this in particular implies that $I = \Theta(\log(n/k)) \rightarrow \infty$. We will let J_i be the number of groups that get filled in in round i .

Proof of part 1 of Theorem 18, assuming that $k \leq \sqrt{n}$. Appealing to Lemma 23, we see that sequence J_1, J_2, \dots is stochastically dominated by an i.i.d. sequence J'_1, J'_2, \dots where

$\mathbb{P}(J'_1 = j) = 10^{-j}$ for $j \geq 2$ and $\mathbb{P}(J'_1 = 1) = \frac{89}{90}$. It is easily checked that $\mathbb{E}(J'_1)^2 < \infty$. Let us set $I' := \varepsilon I$ for some suitable chosen $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. By the law of large number (which holds for i.i.d. sequences with a finite second moment) we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(J'_1 + \dots + J'_{I'} > 2I'\mathbb{E}(J'_1)) = o(1).$$

Thus, choosing ε appropriately (namely, so that $2\varepsilon\mathbb{E}(J'_1) < 1$), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(J_1 + \dots + J_{I'} > I) \leq \mathbb{P}(J'_1 + \dots + J'_{I'} > I) = o(1).$$

In other words, with probability $1 - o(1)$, there are at least I' rounds.

Now let Y_i be a $\{0, 1\}$ -valued variable that equals one if in round i no group obtained a non-increasing sequence of length $k\gamma^j$. Observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_i = 1) \geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{I-i} \mathbb{P}(E_{i,j}) \geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 10^{-j} = \frac{8}{9}.$$

Observe that Y_1, Y_2, \dots stochastically dominates an i.i.d sequence Y'_1, Y'_2, \dots of Bernoulli($\frac{8}{9}$) random variables. Again by the law of large numbers, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_1 + \dots + Y_{I'} > \frac{4}{9}I') \geq \mathbb{P}(Y'_1 + \dots + Y'_{I'} > \frac{4}{9}I') = 1 - o(1).$$

So this shows that with probability $1 - o(1)$ there were at least $\frac{4}{9}I' = \Omega(\log(n/k))$ rounds in which no group obtains a non-increasing sequence of length $k\gamma^j$, which means that the round lasted the full amount of δk^2 time. Hence, with probability $1 - o(1)$, at time $\delta k^2 I' = \Omega(k^2 \log(n/k))$ the process has not yet completed. \square

7.5 A version of the Chernoff bound for sums of independent binomials and sums of independent geometrics

We first briefly recall the version of the Chernoff bound for binomials and Poisson-distributed random variables that we use above. A proof can be found, for instance, in [9].

Lemma 24 (Chernoff bound). *Let X be a binomial random variable.*

1. *For all $t \geq \mathbb{E}(X)$ we have $\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) \leq e^{-\mathbb{E}(X) \cdot H(t/\mathbb{E}(X))}$,*
2. *For all $t \leq \mathbb{E}(X)$ we have $\mathbb{P}(X \leq t) \leq e^{-\mathbb{E}(X) \cdot H(t/\mathbb{E}(X))}$,*

where $H(x) := x \ln x - x + 1$.

A variation of the proof of this last lemma gives:

Lemma 25. *Suppose that $X = X_1 + \dots + X_k$ is a sum of independent binomials. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) \leq e^{-\mathbb{E}(X) \cdot H(t/\mathbb{E}(X))},$$

for all $t \geq \mathbb{E}(X)$, where $H(x) := x \ln x - x + 1$.

Proof Sketch. Note that $\mathbb{E}(z^X) = \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}(z^{X_i})$ by independence, and that

$$\mathbb{E}(z_i^X) = (1 + p_i(z - 1))^{n_i} \leq e^{(z-1)n_i p_i} = e^{(z-1)\mathbb{E}(X_i)},$$

so we find that $\mathbb{E}(z^X) \leq e^{(z-1)\mathbb{E}(X)}$. We can thus proceed as in the proof of Lemma 1.2 in Penrose's book [9]. \square

Lemma 26. *Suppose that $X = X_1 + \dots + X_k$ is a sum of i.i.d. geometrically distributed random variables.*

1. *For all $t \geq \mathbb{E}(X)$ we have $\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) \leq e^{-(kt/\mathbb{E}(X)) \cdot H(\mathbb{E}(X)/t)}$,*
2. *For all $t \leq \mathbb{E}(X)$ we have $\mathbb{P}(X \leq t) \leq e^{-(kt/\mathbb{E}(X)) \cdot H(\mathbb{E}(X)/t)}$.*

Proof. We first consider $\mathbb{P}(X \geq t)$. Let $Y \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Bi}(t, p)$, where p is of course the common success probability of the X_i -s. We observe that $\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) = \mathbb{P}(Y \leq k)$ (the probability one has to make t or more tries to get k successes equals the probability that in a sequence of t coin flips k or fewer successes occur). Now we apply the plain vanilla Chernoff bound to obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) \leq \exp[-\mathbb{E}(Y) \cdot H(k/\mathbb{E}(Y))] = \exp[-tp \cdot H(k/tp)].$$

Observing that $\mathbb{E}(X) = k\mathbb{E}(X_1) = k/p$, we see that $tp = kt/\mathbb{E}(X)$ and $k/tp = \mathbb{E}(X)/t$.

The case of $\mathbb{P}(X \leq t)$ is proved completely analogously. \square

8 Delay-based activation orders

In order to be able to include delay-based protocols in our study, we abstract away from the low-level implementation details, and view them as existing protocols (local decision rules) enhanced with delay functions.

All protocols described in Section 2.4 include local decision rules that state what to do if a node receives a message already in its queue. One option, is to always cancel the transmission of a message received twice. This is what is done, for instance, in BLR. Note that, disregarding the delay, this would be equivalent to the M heuristic with $M = 2$. Another option considered is to cancel only if the sender of the duplicate message is closer to the destination than the current node. Both GeRaF and Greedy routing apply rules of this type. Again, disregarding the delay, this would be similar to the CD heuristic.

In heuristics where the lower bound and upper bounds on **RecMess** are tight regardless of the activation order, such as simple flooding, the M and T heuristics, the choice of a delay function will not influence **RecMess** by more than a factor two.

In heuristics where these bounds are not right, such as CD and CD-P, the delay function can make a significant difference. For instance, consider a delay-based protocol where the nodes delete messages from their queues only when they receive a duplicate from a node that is closer to the destination, combined with delay function $\text{delay}_2 = \text{MD} \frac{d}{r}$ (recall that MD is a constant representing the maximum delay). For simplicity of analysis, we assume without loss of generality $\text{MD} = r$, which implies that the delay increases by exactly one time step per node. Then, the bounds for **RecMess** in the unbounded scenario become:

$$\mathbf{RecMess} = \begin{cases} 2^k & \text{if } k < \log n, \\ n + n(k - \log n) & \text{if } k \geq \log n. \end{cases}$$

Analyzing all combinations of local decisions rules and delay functions would be interesting, although it falls outside the scope of this work.

9 Discussion

Beaconless geocast protocols are used in practice in 2D scenarios. They differ from the 1D ones in a few but important characteristics, most notably that obstacles (like buildings, which cannot be traversed by the transmission signal) need to be surrounded, and that local optimization




Figure 7: Scenarios of increasing complexity. (i) 1D scenario. (ii) 2D scenario; non-uniform ranges. (iii) Regular obstacles; visibility. (iv) Irregular obstacles; combining visibility and non-uniform ranges.

strategies fail to guarantee delivery. Therefore, combinations of different strategies need to be used in order to achieve delivery guarantees and, at the same time, keep the network load within reasonable bounds. The network load analysis in this cases is difficult, and almost only experimental results exist. This motivated studying the 1D case. We have shown that the rigorous analysis of geocast protocols even in simple 1D scenarios can be interesting—and challenging. Indeed, all protocols give rise to different load bounds, with CD and CD-P being particularly subtle to analyze due to the fact that an involved probabilistic analysis is required.

Our theoretical analysis confirms behaviors that had been observed before only through simulations. The different expression for **RecMess**, summarized in Tables 1 and 2, make evident the differences between flooding and the restricted flooding (M- and T-heuristics) and delay-based protocols, as well as the advantage of CD over them for small values of k . Moreover, our analysis gives theoretical support to the performance claims of CD-P: Hall [2] showed through simulations that CD-P scales better and improves its efficiency over CD considerably. Our results indeed corroborate this. In the unbounded reach scenario, CD has serious scalability problems when the number of messages (k) approaches the number of nodes (n), making it behave like flooding, while CD-P’s dependence on k remains always linear, and, more importantly, only logarithmic on n . For the bounded reach scenario, CD again shows an overhead in k (this time of only $O(\sqrt{k})$), while CD-P achieves the optimal asymptotic performance of $\Theta(k)$.

The results in this paper are a first step towards analyzing geocast protocols in generic geometric settings. This paper has focused on two relatively simple scenarios. Between these basic scenarios and the final intricacies of real-world situations, several abstractions of the geocast problem of varying complexity can be imagined, which are definitely worth studying in the future (see Figure 7).

References

- [1] J. Gudmundsson, I. Kostitsyna, M. Löffler, T. Müller, V. Sacristán, and R. I. Silveira. Theoretical analysis of beaconless geocast protocols in 1D. In M. E. Nebel and S. G. Wagner, editors, *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Workshop on Analytic Algorithmics and Combinatorics, ANALCO 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 8-9, 2018*, pages 62–76. SIAM, 2018.
- [2] R. J. Hall. An improved geocast for mobile ad hoc networks. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 10(2):254–266, 2011.
- [3] R. J. Hall and J. Auzins. A tiered geocast protocol for long range mobile ad hoc networking. In *IEEE Military Communications conference (MILCOM)*, pages 1–8, 2006.
- [4] M. Heissenbüttel, T. Braun, T. Bernoulli, and M. Wälchli. BLR: Beacon-less routing algorithm for mobile ad-hoc networks. *Computer Communications*, 27(11):1076–1086, 2004.

- [5] Y. Ko and N. H. Vaidya. Geocasting in mobile ad hoc networks: Location-based multicast algorithms. In *2nd Workshop on Mobile Computing Systems and Applications (WMCSA)*, pages 101–110, 1999.
- [6] T. Lindvall. *Lectures on the coupling method*. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2002. Corrected reprint of the 1992 original.
- [7] C. Maihöfer. A survey of geocast routing protocols. *IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials*, 6(1-4):32–42, 2004.
- [8] T. Ozugur, M. Naghshineh, P. Kermani, and J. A. Copeland. Fair media access for wireless lans. In *Seamless Interconnection for Universal Services. Global Telecommunications Conference. GLOBECOM'99. (Cat. No.99CH37042)*, volume 1B, pages 570–579 vol.1b, 1999.
- [9] M. Penrose. *Random geometric graphs*, volume 5 of *Oxford Studies in Probability*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.
- [10] S. Rührup. Theory and practice of geographic routing. In *Ad Hoc and Sensor Wireless Networks: Architectures, Algorithms and Protocols*. Bentham Science, 2009.
- [11] I. Stojmenovic and X. Lin. Loop-free hybrid single-path/flooding routing algorithms with guaranteed delivery for wireless networks. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 12(10):1023–1032, 2001.
- [12] M. Zorzi. A new contention-based mac protocol for geographic forwarding in ad hoc and sensor networks. In *IEEE Int. Conference on Communications (ICC)*, pages 3481–3485, 2004.