

Bounds on Hop Distance in Greedy Routing Approach in Wireless Ad Hoc Networks

Swades De[†], Antonio Caruso^{‡,+}, Tamalika Chaira^{*},
and Stefano Chessa^{◊,+}

[†]ECE Department, NJIT, Newark, NJ, USA

[‡]Department of Mathematics, University of Lecce, Lecce, Italy

^{*}E&ECE Department, IIT Kharagpur, India

[◊]Department of Informatics, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy

⁺ISTI-CNR, Pisa, Italy

Abstract: Wireless ad hoc networks are generally characterized by random node locations and multihop routes. A quantitative knowledge of the relation between hop count and Euclidean distance could provide a better understanding of important network parameters such as end-to-end delay, power consumption along the route, and in node localization. In this paper, we present an analytic approach to capture the statistics on hop count for a given source-to-destination Euclidean distance in greedy routing approach. We also show that, for a given hop count, the bounds on Euclidean distance can be computed from the distribution characteristic of per-hop progress.

Keywords: ad hoc networks; greedy routing; probabilistic bounds.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: De, S., Caruso, A., Chaira, T., and Chessa, S. (xxxx) 'Bounds on Hop Distance in Greedy Routing Approach in Wireless Ad Hoc Networks', *International Journal of Wireless and Mobile Computing*, Vol. x, No. x, pp.xxx-xxx.

Biographical notes: Swades De received his PhD in EE from State University of New York at Buffalo in 2004. He is currently an Assistant Professor in the ECE Department, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, USA. His research interests include performance study, resource efficiency in multihop wireless and wireline networks, integrated wireless technologies, and communication and systems issues in optical networks.

Antonio Caruso received his MS and PhD degrees in Computer Science from the University of Pisa, Italy, in 1997 and 2003, respectively. During 2003-2004, he was a Post Doctoral Research Fellow at ISTI-CNR, Pisa, Italy. During November 2004 - February 2005, he was a visiting researcher in the CS Department at UCLA, USA. Since February 2005 he is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Mathematics, University of Lecce, Italy. He works in the area of wireless ad hoc and sensor networks, distributed algorithms and fault-tolerance.

Tamalika Chaira received her PhD in Electronics and Electrical Communication Engineering from Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, in 2003. Currently she is carrying out her research in the areas of signal and image processing, set theory, and fuzzy set theory.

Stefano Chessa received his MS and PhD degrees in Computer Science from the University of Pisa, Italy, in 1994 and 1999, respectively. In 1997, he was a visiting student at the Iowa State University, USA; in 1999, he was a Research Assistant at the Department of Mathematics of the University of Trento, Italy; and, in 2000, he was a Research Assistant at the Istituto di Elaborazione dell'Informazione, Pisa, Italy. In late 2000, he joined the Department of Computer Science, University of Pisa, Italy, as an Assistant Professor. His research interests are in the areas of system-level diagnosis, wireless ad hoc networks and wireless sensor networks.

1 INTRODUCTION

The need for efficient and flexible network access has led to the recent proliferation of research on multihop wireless networks. Due to the ad hoc nature of network set up, in most cases the nodes are randomly located with respect to each other. Lack of any predetermined infrastructure in such a network necessitates that any two neighbor nodes are connected via wireless communication channel, and a message has to go through several intermediate ‘peer’ nodes to reach its desired destination. Such an ad hoc multihop wireless network could be mobile or relatively static, but the random nature of node distribution prevails.

There have been numerous works on various aspects of ad hoc wireless networks in the literature, including extensive studies on ad hoc routing protocols [1],[2]. Geographic location aware greedy routing approach is one of the widely studied protocols [3],[4],[5]. Although greedy packet forwarding may not guarantee minimum energy or high capacity routes [6],[7], its importance lies in its simplicity and scalability. There also have been numerous variants to the greedy forwarding approach that attempt to circumvent the routing voids in different ways [3],[4],[8]. In this work, however, we focus on simple greedy routing approach. The randomness of node location implies that for a given source-to-destination Euclidean distance, the number of hops is non-deterministic, and similarly, for a given number of hops, the Euclidean distance between a source and a destination is non-deterministic. It is intuitive that given a source-to-destination distance and a network density, the number of hops would be within a certain range. A few recent papers (e.g., [9],[10],[11]) addressed the problem of establishing the relationship between Euclidean distance and hop distance. However, the evaluation of tight bounds relating these distances is still missing.

There are several interesting areas where the knowledge of the relationship between source-to-destination Euclidean distance and hop count could be useful: (a) Given an Euclidean distance, from the hop count distribution one can determine the end-

to-end delay, and delay jitter. (b) The average and higher order moments of progress per hop can enable capture the approximate transmit power consumption and hence total power consumption along the route. (c) In a virtual coordinate based positioning and routing approach (e.g., [9],[11],[12]), approximate relative distance can be determined from the hop count information. It is also possible to derive approximate positions of other nodes by combining hop distances from the nodes whose locations are known.

In this paper, we present an analytic approach to obtain the bounds on number of hops for a given source-to-destination Euclidean distance. We consider a greedy routing approach that attempts to minimize the remaining distance to the destination in each hop, we call this approach *least remaining distance* (LRD) forwarding. In determining the bounds on hop count from Euclidean distance, or vice versa, we do not consider physical layer channel condition based link availability. Rather, if a node is within the transmission range of another node, they are considered reachable to each other. In other words, although we use the term “wireless” multihop networks – because it is only the natural way to connect the nodes in an ad hoc network, in this work we are not concerned about distance and channel interference dependent link quality/availability.

Our contributions in this paper are the following. (i) We derive the distribution characteristics of remaining Euclidean distance and forward progress in one hop, and show that the average progress per hop is a function of node density and current distance to the destination. We show that the average one-hop progress based on the initial source-to-destination distance gives us a good approximation of average hop count. (ii) The bounds on hop count are evaluated numerically from the distribution of remaining distance in one hop. (iii) We show that from the characteristic of forward progress per hop it is possible to numerically compute the bounds on Euclidean distance from a given hop count.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We review the related work in Section 2. In Section 3, we present our analytic approach to obtain the bounds on hop count. Section 4 contains the analytic, numerical, and simulation results. In Section 5, we discuss

a few potential applications of our results. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 RELATED WORK

Significant research have been carried out on the formulation and optimization of ad hoc routing protocols from energy efficiency and network capacity view point (see e.g., [1],[2] for a survey). Mathematical modeling of ad hoc networks has also been looked into by several researchers. We briefly survey the works related to our present studies.

In connection to maximizing one-hop transmission capacity, Kleinrock and Silvester [13] and Takagi and Kleinrock [14] evaluated the average of maximum progress towards the destination in one hop, called most forward within radius R (MFR), where backward movement of a packet is allowed in case no better forwarding node is available. Later, Hou and Li [15] studied MFR and a variant, called most forward with variable radius (MVR), without allowing backward progress. Again, the interest was evaluating the one-hop capacity and the influence of interference associated with different transmission range properties.

For simplifying the problem of localization and routing using low-cost sensor nodes that are equipped with only basic sensing and routing functionalities, there have been recent proposals on hop count metric based virtual positioning of nodes [9],[12],[16],[17], that attempt to get away with the global positioning system (GPS) based and other geographic localization approaches. This hop count based virtual positioning and routing approach works on the basic premise that given a hop count between two nodes, a bound on Euclidean distance between them can be found. Bischoff and Wattenhofer [11] studied positioning of field sensor nodes from the anchor nodes' location information and based on the hop counts from multiple anchors. They have proved that *one dimensional* distance can be bounded by hop count, but the exact bound was not shown. In context of road networking, Mathar and Mattfeldt [18] studied the optimal transmission range problem in *one dimension* and obtained the expected per-hop progress.

Hekmat and Mieghen [10] studied the expected hop count as a function of channel shadowing in wireless ad hoc networks. In their work, for the regular two dimensional lattice networks, an expression for obtaining the expected hop count was obtained. However, in case of an ad hoc wireless network with randomly located nodes, the evaluation was simulation based. He *et al.* [19] applied greedy routing in ad hoc networks which essentially minimizes the remaining distance to reduce the end-to-end packet delay. Performance evaluation in their work was simulation based.

In our work on analytically correlating Euclidean distance and hop count we consider the greedy forwarding approach that minimizes the remaining distance in each hop. We call this approach as least remaining distance (LRD) forwarding. LRD forwarding is different from the maximum forwarding with fixed radius (MFR) approach that was studied in [13],[14],[15], and the maximum forwarding with variable radius (MVR) approach that was studied in [15]. In particular, as observed in [14], although MFR and MVR are greedy approaches and ensure the maximum progress in the direction of the destination, they do not guarantee minimizing the remaining distance to the destination. In contrast, our LRD approach minimizes the remaining distance. The LRD forwarding captures the case for the nodes with fixed transmission radius as well as the case with variable radius, i.e., without and with transmission power control.

In the following section we will analyze the distribution characteristics of the remaining distance and the distance progress in one hop in LRD forwarding.

3 ANALYSIS ON BOUNDS

We consider uniformly randomly placed nodes in a two-dimensional space. All nodes have equal, omnidirectional transmission pattern of range R . Since there is a direct dependence of geometric distance between nodes on the connectivity, the network is modeled as an undirected geometric random graph [20]. As in [15], LRD approach tries to avoid backward movement if no forwarding node closer

to the destination is found. In case of no available forwarding nodes, the data packet to be forwarded is considered to be dropped (lost). For simplicity of the analysis, we consider a node to be a potential forwarder if it is in the half circle of the transmission range of a node towards the destination (the entire shaded region in Fig. 1). Precisely, this approach does not guarantee that the remaining distance would be always lesser than the current distance. As shown in Fig. 1, in our analysis a neighbor of node S located anywhere in the total shaded region can be a potential forwarder. But, if the selected forwarding node is located in the densely shaded region, the remaining distance to the destination D would be larger than the current distance between S and D. However, as we will see in Section 3.3, with a reasonably high node density the potential of “backward movement” is very insignificant – even when the densely shaded region is included.




Figure 1: Pictorial representation of LRD forwarding

We denote the distance between a node S and the destination D by l . Referring to Fig. 1, let P be a potential forwarder of S, randomly located at a distance r and angle θ , and let the remaining distance from P to D be z . Our immediate goal is to find the characteristics of z .

In the following, unless otherwise stated, a symbol in bold denotes a random variable (RV) and a symbol in italics denotes a realization (sample value).

3.1 Least remaining distance

With respect to the node S, the random position of P is characterized by the following joint probability

density function (pdf) of the RVs r and θ :

$$f_{r\theta}(r, \theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{2r}{\pi R^2}, & 0 \leq r \leq R, \\ & -\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Let $x = r \cos \theta$ and $y = r \sin \theta$. From (1) the joint pdf of the transformed variables x and y is obtained as

$$f_{xy}(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\pi R^2}, & 0 \leq x \leq R, -R \leq y \leq R, \\ & x^2 + y^2 \leq R^2 \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

From geometry, we have $z = \sqrt{(l-x)^2 + y^2}$. Introducing an auxiliary variable $w = x$, from (2) the joint pdf of z and w is obtained as

$$f_{zw}(z, w) = \begin{cases} \frac{4z}{\pi R^2 \sqrt{z^2 - (l-w)^2}}, & \begin{aligned} & l - R \leq z \leq l \text{ and} \\ & l - z \leq w \leq \frac{l^2 + R^2 - z^2}{2l} \\ & \text{or,} \\ & l \leq z \leq \sqrt{l^2 + R^2} \text{ and} \\ & 0 \leq w \leq \frac{l^2 + R^2 - z^2}{2l} \end{aligned} \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Integrating (3) over w , we have the pdf of z as

$$f_z(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{4z}{\pi R^2} \arccos\left(\frac{l^2 + z^2 - R^2}{2lz}\right), & l - R \leq z \leq l \\ \frac{4z}{\pi R^2} \left[\arcsin\left(\frac{l}{z}\right) - \arcsin\left(\frac{l^2 + z^2 - R^2}{2lz}\right) \right], & l \leq z \leq \sqrt{l^2 + R^2} \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The corresponding cumulative distribution function (cdf) is $F_z(z) = \int_{-\infty}^z f_z(t) dt$. From (4), the remaining distance from an arbitrarily located forwarding node P to the destination D can be known probabilistically.

To find the least remaining distance (LRD) to the destination D, we have to first obtain the number of potential forwarders, i.e., the number of nodes in the shaded region in Fig. 1. Let this number be n . For a uniformly random node distribution with a given density $\rho = \frac{N}{A}$, where N is the total number of nodes distributed over a location space of area A , using Poisson approximation we have the average $n = \frac{\rho \pi R^2}{2}$. In the rest of the analysis, we proceed

with this constant average value of n . We denote the remaining distances from n potential forwarding nodes as z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n . To determine the forwarding node corresponding to the LRD to D, we have to obtain $\delta = \min\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n\}$. Since the nodes are uniformly random distributed, $z_i \forall i = 1$ to n are independent and identically distributed RVs. Therefore, the pdf of δ is given by (see [21, Chapter 6])

$$f_\delta(\cdot) = n f_z(\cdot) R_z^{n-1}(\cdot) \quad (5)$$

where $f_z(z)$ is given by (4), and $R_z \triangleq F_z^c = 1 - F_z$ is the complementary cdf of z . The expression for $R_z(z)$ is given by (6). Substituting (4) and (6) in (5), we find the pdf of the least remaining distance δ as given in (7).

3.2 Average progress in one hop

With the known characteristic of least remaining distance in one hop δ , the maximum forward progress ε can be simply obtained from the relation $\varepsilon = l - \delta$. Correspondingly, the pdf of progress in one hop towards the destination ε is given by

$$f_\varepsilon(\varepsilon) = f_\delta(l - \varepsilon), \quad (8)$$

where $f_\delta(\cdot)$ is given in (7). From (8), the average one-hop progress $\bar{\varepsilon}$ is obtained using

$$\bar{\varepsilon} = \int_{l - \sqrt{l^2 + R^2}}^R t f_\varepsilon(t) dt. \quad (9)$$

The distribution of δ in (7) (and hence that of ε in (8)) would give us the probabilistic bounds of hop count to the destination.

Before presenting the numerical results on hop bounds in LRD forwarding, we evaluate the error in approximating the forwarding region.

3.3 Effect of approximating the area

As we have stated in the beginning of Section , referring to Fig. 1, for simplicity of analysis we included the densely shaded region in the potential forwarding zone, although a selected forwarding node from that region actually increases the remaining distance

to the destination. Below we will show, given a node density, what is the chance of increased remaining distance when the nodes in the densely shaded region are also considered. The same approach will also show the effect of node density on successful greedy forwarding.

It is intuitively clear that as the destination node is approached, the area of densely shaded region and hence the chance of increased remaining distance increases. Fig. 2 shows the extreme case when S and D




Figure 2: Probability of increased remaining distance

are marginally beyond each other's range that gives us the maximum chance of increased remaining distance.

Poisson approximation of node distribution gives:

Pr[at least *one* neighbor in an area a]

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \frac{(\rho a)^k}{k!} e^{-\rho a} \approx 1 - e^{-\rho a}$$

with $N \gg 1$ and $a \ll A$, where $\rho = \frac{N}{A}$ is the node density in the network. Thus, referring to Fig. 2, if only the LRD forwarding zone, i.e., the lightly shaded region with area a_1 were considered, the probability of successful LRD forwarding p_1 would have been

$$p_1 = 1 - e^{-\rho a_1} \quad (10)$$

where, from simple geometry we have $a_1 = 2R^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{3} - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4} \right)$. When entire shaded region of area $a_2 = \frac{\pi R^2}{2}$ is considered, the probability of successful forwarding p_2 becomes

$$p_2 = 1 - e^{-\rho a_2}. \quad (11)$$

Note that, given a node density, p_1 in (10) is the least possible success probability, as the area a_1 is the

$$R_{\mathbf{z}}(z) = \begin{cases} 1, & z < l - R \\ \frac{2}{\pi R^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4l^2 R^2 - (l^2 + R^2 - z^2)^2} - z^2 \arccos \left(\frac{z^2 + l^2 - R^2}{2lz} \right) \right. \\ \quad \left. + R^2 \arcsin \left(\frac{l^2 + R^2 - z^2}{2lR} \right) \right], & l - R \leq z \leq l \\ \frac{2}{\pi R^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4l^2 R^2 - (l^2 + R^2 - z^2)^2} + z^2 \arcsin \left(\frac{z^2 + l^2 - R^2}{2lz} \right) \right. \\ \quad \left. - z^2 \arcsin \left(\frac{l}{z} \right) + R^2 \arcsin \left(\frac{l^2 + R^2 - z^2}{2lR} \right) - l\sqrt{z^2 - l^2} \right], & l \leq z \leq \sqrt{l^2 + R^2} \\ 0, & z > \sqrt{l^2 + R^2} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

$$f_{\delta}(\delta) = \begin{cases} 2\delta n \left(\frac{2}{\pi R^2} \right)^n \arccos \left(\frac{\delta^2 + l^2 - R^2}{2l\delta} \right) \left[\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4l^2 R^2 - (l^2 + R^2 - \delta^2)^2} \right. \\ \quad \left. - \delta^2 \arccos \left(\frac{\delta^2 + l^2 - R^2}{2l\delta} \right) + R^2 \arcsin \left(\frac{l^2 + R^2 - \delta^2}{2lR} \right) \right]^{n-1}, & l - R \leq \delta \leq l \\ 2\delta n \left(\frac{2}{\pi R^2} \right)^n \left[\arcsin \left(\frac{l}{\delta} \right) - \arcsin \left(\frac{\delta^2 + l^2 - R^2}{2l\delta} \right) \right] \\ \quad \left[\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4l^2 R^2 - (l^2 + R^2 - \delta^2)^2} + \delta^2 \arcsin \left(\frac{\delta^2 + l^2 - R^2}{2l\delta} \right) \right. \\ \quad \left. - \delta^2 \arcsin \left(\frac{l}{\delta} \right) + R^2 \arcsin \left(\frac{l^2 + R^2 - \delta^2}{2lR} \right) - l\sqrt{\delta^2 - l^2} \right]^{n-1}, & l \leq \delta \leq \sqrt{l^2 + R^2} \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

minimum when S and D are just R distance apart. Correspondingly, the probability of error in successful greedy forwarding p_e , i.e., the chance of increased remaining distance when the densely shaded region is included, is

$$p_e \leq p_2 - p_1 = e^{-\rho a_1} - e^{-\rho a_2}. \quad (12)$$

Using (10), (11), and (12), for a given node density, the chance of increased remaining distance due to approximating the area of greedy forwarding can be obtained. Also, the effect of node density on minimizing the chance of increased remaining distance p_e can be found from (10). In other words, to minimize p_e , we can determine from (10) how much node density we need such that p_1 approaches to one.

Numerical results on analytic approximation error and the effect of node density on successful greedy forwarding will be shown in the next section. Before we go on presenting the results, we must point out that similar analytic approach can be taken to com-

pute hop distance bounds associated with the nearest forward progress [15].

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we present the results from analysis, and wherever necessary, we verify the analysis with network simulations. In the simulation we consider a $400m \times 400m$ location space, where the nodes are uniformly random distributed. The transmission range of a node is fixed at $R = 10m$. The total number of nodes is varied appropriately to attain a desired node density $\rho = \frac{2n}{\pi R^2}$, i.e., to have the same average number of potential forwarding neighbors of a node n as in the analysis. To reduce the ‘‘border effect’’ [22], the source and destination nodes are considered twice the range inside the boundary.

4.1 Average number of hops

We first study the nature of the remaining distance in LRD forwarding. Fig. 3 shows the probabilistic variation of the remaining distance δ in a single hop, where $n = 10$, $l = 100m$. The corresponding pdf of




Figure 3: Pdf of remaining distance in one hop

distance progress in one hop ϵ will have the nature complementary to that of δ .

Using (7) and (8), in Table 1 we show the average progress in Euclidean metric towards the destination for different source-to-destination distance l and different node densities ρ (or, average number of forwarding neighbors n). The data in Table 1 indicate

Table 1: Average distance covered in one hop, $\bar{\epsilon}$ (in m).

l (in m)	$n = 5$	$n = 10$	$n = 15$
30	7.164	8.128	8.548
100	7.366	8.275	8.667
400	7.422	8.315	8.699

that average progress is slowly varying with respect to l and a function of ρ and R . We study the average number of hops recursively as well as via a simple approximate approach, using (7) and (8). In the numerical recursion approach, the least remaining distance δ obtained from (7) at each hop is considered as the current distance l to the destination in the next

hop, and the process is repeated until the destination is reached. The approximate approach is based on the observation in Table 1. Considering the slowly varying nature of the average progress $\bar{\epsilon}$ with respect to the source-to-destination distance l , we evaluate $\bar{\epsilon}$ only once using (9) and (8), where we substitute l with $\frac{l}{2}$. To cover a distance l , the approximate average number of hops \bar{h} is obtained as $\bar{h} = \frac{l}{\bar{\epsilon}}$. Table 2 shows that the approximate hop count matches well with the recursively obtained data. This implies that for a given source-to-destination Euclidean distance one can have an estimate of number of hops from the average progress in only one hop, obtained with a suitably set distance to the destination, which is much simpler and less time consuming than the recursive approach. As we will see in Section 4.2, these results are also corroborated via network simulation.

4.2 Bounds on number of hops

For obtaining the upper and lower limits on number of hops for a given source-to-destination distance, we conduct numerical (Monte-Carlo) simulations using (8) and verify the results via network simulations. Figs. 4 and 5 show the probability mass function (pmf) of number of hops for different node densities and source-to-destination distances. It is observed that in general, compared to the upper limit, the lower range of number of hops is characterized by sharper decay of discrete probabilities. This is because, for any node distribution and density there is a deterministic lowest possible lower limit $\lceil \frac{l}{R} \rceil$, whereas because of random distribution there is no such deterministic upper limit. In the simulation results, 'Sim:appx' corresponds to the LRD with analytic approximation of the forwarding area, and 'Sim:greedy' corresponds to the actual greedy forwarding.

The simulation results have a good match with the analysis except for a little slower decay in the probability mass on the higher side of number of hops and a little faster decay in probability mass on the lower side of number of hops. This could be mainly due to the border effects in the simulation, which is not captured in the analysis. Although the source and destination nodes are chosen well inside the boundary, the intermediate nodes along the route may hit

Table 2: Average number of hops \bar{h} required to cover a distance.

l (in m)	$n = 5$		$n = 10$		$n = 15$	
	Recursion	Approximate	Recursion	Approximate	Recursion	Approximate
30	4.37	4.434	4.042	3.839	4.006	3.622
100	13.947	13.727	12.496	12.17	12.0	11.601
400	54.504	54.031	48.684	48.185	46.559	46.042




Figure 4: Distribution of number of hops for a low node density; $n = 5$




Figure 5: Distribution of number of hops for a given higher node density; $n = 15$

the boundary and the potential forwarding region for those nodes is less than that assumed in the analysis. For the border nodes, the chance of finding the

best possible forwarding node is less than that without the border effect. Therefore, a route constituted by the border nodes may be longer. Another possi-

ble reason of minor discrepancy between the analysis and simulation results could be that in the analysis the chance of finding a forwarding node is assumed independent of previous hop. However, in reality (in the simulation), there is a one hop memory, so the chance of finding a forwarding node at one stage is partly determined by the process in the previous step.

Numerically obtained bounds on number of hops along with the mean for different source-to-destination distances and different node densities are shown in Fig. 6. Note that distinct upper and lower bounds on hop count for a given Euclidean distance can be obtained analytically. Also, the lower bound with random topology is quite tighter than the deterministic lower limit $\lceil \frac{l}{R} \rceil$, which is achievable only when the per-hop progress in Euclidean distance is exactly R .

4.3 Effect of analytic approximation

We note that greedy forwarding should ideally approach to reduce the remaining distance to the destination node. Referring to Fig. 1, this can be ensured only if the forwarding node lies within the lightly shaded region. However for simplicity in the analysis we have considered the greedy forwarding zone to be the half circle (the entire shaded region). Fig. 7




Figure 7: Effect of node density on the forwarding error captures the LRD forwarding error (cf. (12)) due to

approximating the area of greedy forwarding in the analysis. It is noted that the error becomes increasingly insignificant as the node density increases. This observation is also corroborated with the supporting result in Figs. 4 and 5, where it is found that with low node density the simulated pmf plot with the area approximation ('Sim:appx') does not match well with the pmf of actual greedy forwarding ('Sim:greedy').

4.4 Bounds on Euclidean distance from hop count

From the analytic expression in (8) one can also compute the bounds on Euclidean distance from a given hop distance. Numerically obtained results plotted in Fig. 8 shows how the tightness of bounds varies (in unit of nodal range, R) with node density for different network size. It also shows that for a given network size and a given node density, one can set a maximum limit in distance ambiguity while estimating the distance between any two nodes from the known hop count between them. For example, if the average number of forwarding neighbors is $n = 15$ (the corresponding node density is $\rho = \frac{2n}{\pi R^2}$) and the maximum hop count between any two nodes in the network is 30, the maximum ambiguity in distance estimation is bounded to *three times* the nodal range.




Figure 8: Variation of bounds with node density




Figure 6: Bounds on hop distance

5 POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS

An idea of the relation between hop count and the Euclidean distance may lead to the understanding to several networking aspects in ad hoc multihop networks. In this section we briefly outline a few such areas.

5.1 Node localization in sensor networks

In an ad hoc wireless network, the knowledge of relative positions of nodes is very useful in delivering message from one point to the other at a low network cost. As recently studied in [12], the field nodes can learn their respective virtual position in terms of hop counts from three or more elected anchors. We note that from the known relationship between hop count and the Euclidean distance, it is also possible to obtain an approximate relative geographic location of a field node with respect to the anchor nodes' positions. More precisely, if a field node knows its distance in hop count from an anchor, the corresponding Euclidean distance can be estimated analytically. The estimated average distances of the field node from the three anchors can then be used to calculate its approximate relative location via trilateration approach

[23]. Considering the bounds in Euclidean distance, the estimated relative position of the node will have a zone of ambiguity, as depicted by the shaded region in Fig. 9. In this figure, two concentric arcs corresponding to an anchor node refer to the bound in Euclidean distance of a node for a given (known) hop count. The distance between the two concentric arcs is the maximum bound for a given node density and a network size, and is approximately the same for any hop count within the network. Additionally,




Figure 9: Estimation of a field node's location

if the actual geographic locations of the anchor nodes are also known, an estimate of a field node's actual geographic location can also be derived – the estimation error being a function of the node density. As it is clear from Figs. 8 and 9, the zone of ambiguity becomes smaller with increased node density.

5.2 Power consumption

Another important parameter determining the network lifetime in wireless ad hoc networks is the power consumption along a route. Without any transmission power control, end-to-end total power consumption \mathbf{P}_{tr} along a multihop route is a linear function of number of hops \mathbf{h} . Thus, the known distribution of \mathbf{h} will directly give the distribution of \mathbf{P}_{tr} from $\mathbf{P}_{tr} = (P_t + P_r)\mathbf{h}$, where we have assumed that any node within a node's transmission range is reachable without error, and P_t and P_r are transmit and receive power consumptions (constants), respectively, of a node.

With transmit power control on the other hand, for a given signal-to-interference-and-noise ratio (SINR) at the receiver, the transmit power consumption \mathbf{P}_t is a function of transmitter electronics power consumption K (a system-specific constant), transmitter-to-receiver distance, path loss factor, and activity of the neighboring nodes. The distribution of per-hop progress in greedy routing gives the variation of distance between two communicating neighbors. Based on the transmit-receive neighbor distance ε (a RV), power decay factor α (a channel-specific constant), and channel condition (white noise N and interference from the neighboring transmissions I), power consumption at the transmitter is a RV: $\mathbf{P}_t = SINR(N + I)\varepsilon^\alpha + K$. From the known distributions of ε (in (8)), the distribution of \mathbf{P}_t is obtained by standard method of transformation of random variables. Considering the constant receiver electronics power consumption P_r , the distribution of end-to-end total power consumption \mathbf{P}_{tr} along an \mathbf{h} hop route can be numerically obtained using the relation: $\mathbf{P}_{tr} = (\mathbf{P}_t + P_r)\mathbf{h}$.

5.3 Delay and delay jitter

End-to-end delay is an important parameter in quality-of-service applications like multimedia traffic, and lowering the delay is one of the motivating factors in adapting greedy routing. Likewise, delay jitter is also a critical parameter in real-time applications. If internodal propagation delay and per-hop trans-receive latency (known from the device speci-

fications) at all nodes are assumed constant, end-to-end delay and delay variation is a linear function of hop count. Thus, for a given source-destination Euclidean distance, hop count distribution will directly give the delay distribution, from which average end-to-end delay and delay jitter can be estimated. In practical cases, the effects of network congestion and node failure rate can be added on top of this basic estimate. Depending on the nature of applications, the delay jitter can be controlled as desired by suitably adjusting the network density.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented an analytical approach to compute the bounds on number of hops between two nodes at a given Euclidean distance in a greedy forwarding approach that minimizes the remaining distance to the destination in ad hoc wireless networks. We obtained the characteristics of least remaining distance and showed that the average distance progress per hop is a function of node density and slowly varies with respect to current distance to the destination node. From this observation, a simple approximate approach was provided to obtain the average hop count. From the distribution characteristics of per-hop progress towards the destination, lower and upper bounds on hop count were obtained via numerical simulation. We further demonstrated that one can numerically compute the bounds on Euclidean distance from a given hop count. Our observations from analysis and numerical simulations were verified through network simulations. We anticipate that our approach to evaluating bounds on hop count from Euclidean distance and vice versa would be useful in estimating important multihop network parameters like end-to-end delay, delay jitter, power consumption, etc., and in virtual coordinate based node localization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work was partly supported by the European Commission in the framework of the "SatNEX"

NoE project (contract N. 507052), and by MIUR in the framework of the Italian project named "IS-MANET".

REFERENCES

- 1 <http://www.ietf.org/html.charters/manet-charters.html>.
- 2 Royer, E.M. and Toh, C.-K. (1999) 'A review of current routing protocols for ad hoc mobile wireless networks', *IEEE Personal Communications Magazine*, pp. 46–55.
- 3 Karp, B. and Kung, H.T. (2000) 'GPSR: Greedy perimeter stateless routing for wireless networks', in *Proc. ACM/IEEE MobiCom*, Boston, MA, Aug. 2000, pp. 243–254.
- 4 Bose, P., Morin, P., Stojmenovic, I., and Urrutia, J. (2001) 'Routing with guaranteed delivery in ad hoc networks', *Wireless Networks*, Vol. 7, No. 6, pp. 609–616.
- 5 Mauve, M., Widmer, J., and Hartenstein, H. (2001) 'A survey on position-based routing in mobile ad hoc networks', *IEEE Network Magazine*, Vol. 15, No. 6, pp. 30–39.
- 6 Xu, Y., Heidemann, J., and Estrin, D. (2001) 'Geography-informed energy conservation for ad hoc routing', in *Proc. ACM/IEEE MobiCom*, Rome, Italy, July 2001, pp. 70–84.
- 7 De Couto, D.S.J., Aguayo, D., Chambers, B.A., and Morris, R. (2002) 'Performance of multihop wireless networks: Shortest path is not enough', in *Proc. Workshop on Hot Topics in Networking (HotNets-I)*, Princeton, NJ, October 2002.
- 8 Kuhn, F., Wattenhofer, R., and Zollinger, A. (2003) 'Worst-case optimal and average-case efficient geometric ad hoc routing', in *Proc. ACM MobiHoc*, Annapolis, MD, June 2003, pp. 267–278.
- 9 Nagpal, R., Shrobe, H., and Bachrach, J. (2003) 'Organizing a global coordinate system from local information on an ad hoc sensor network', in *Proc. Workshop on Information Processing in Sensor Networks (IPSN '03)*, Palo Alto, April 2003, Springer LNCS, vol. 2634, pp.333–348.
- 10 Hekmat, R. and Miegheem, P.V. (2003) 'Degree distribution and hop count in wireless ad hoc networks', in *Proc. IEEE ICON*, Sydney, Australia, September 2003, pp. 603–609.
- 11 Bischoff, R. and Wattenhofer, R. (2004) 'Analyzing connectivity-based multi-hop ad hoc positioning' in *Proc. IEEE PerCom*, Orlando, FL, March 2004, pp. 165–176.
- 12 Caruso, A., Chessa, S., De, S., and Urpi, A. (2005) 'GPS-free coordinate assignment and routing in wireless sensor networks', in *Proc. IEEE Infocom*, Miami, FL, March 2005.
- 13 Kleinrock, L. and Silvester, J. (1978) 'Optimum transmission radii for packet radio networks or why six is a magic number', in *Proc. IEEE National Telecomm. Conf.*, December 1978, pp. 4.3.1–4.3.5.
- 14 Takagi, H. and Kleinrock, L. (1984) 'Optimal transmission ranges for randomly distributed packet radio terminals', *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 246–257.
- 15 Hou, T.-C. and Li, V.O.K. (1986) 'Transmission range control in multihop packet radio networks', *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 38–44.
- 16 Niculescu, D. and Nath, B. (2003) 'DV based positioning in ad hoc networks', *Telecommun. Sys.*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 267–280.
- 17 Rao, A., Papadimitrou, C., Ratnasamy, S., Shenker, S., and Stoica, I. (2003) 'Geographic routing without location information', in *Proc. ACM/IEEE MOBI-COM*, San Diego, CA, September 2003, pp. 96–108.
- 18 Mathar, R. and Mattfeldt, J. (1996) 'Optimal transmission ranges for mobile communication in linear multihop packet radio networks', *Kluwer Wireless Networks*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 329–342.
- 19 He, T., Stankovic, J.A., Lu, C., and Abdelzaher, T. (2003) 'SPEED: A stateless protocol for real-time communication in sensor networks', in *Proc. Intl. Conf. Distributed Computing Systems*, Providence, RI, May 2003.
- 20 Nemeth, G. and Vattay, G. (2003) 'Giant clusters in random ad hoc networks', <http://arxiv.org/pdf/cond-mat/0211325>, v3, February 2003.
- 21 Papoulis, A. (1991) *Probability, Random Variables, and Stochastic Processes*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., 3rd Ed.
- 22 Bettstetter, C. (2002) 'On the minimum node degree and connectivity of a wireless multihop network', in *Proc. ACM MobiHoc*, Lausanne, Switzerland, June 2002, pp. 80–91.
- 23 Enge, P. and Misra, P. (1999) 'Special Issue on GPS: The Global Positioning System', *Proc. of the IEEE*, Vol. 87, No. 1, pp. 3-172.