

CSMA using Statistical Physics toward Throughput and Utility Optimal CSMA

Se-Young Yun, Jinwoo Shin, and Yung Yi

Abstract

In the recent past years, CSMA (Carrier Sense Multiple Access), which resolves contentions over wireless networks in a fully distributed fashion, has gained a lot of attentions since it has been proved in several papers that appropriate control of CSMA parameters provably guarantees optimality in terms of throughput and fairness. Most algorithms rely on the famous MCMC (Markov Chain Monte Carlo) technique, which enables one to find optimal CSMA parameters through iterative loops of simulation-and-update. However, such a simulation-based approach often becomes a major cause of slow convergence, being vulnerable to flow/topology changes. In this paper, we develop distributed iterative algorithms which produce approximate solutions with fast convergence. Our motivating tools are variational methods, referred to as Bethe and Kikuchi approximations in statistical physics, allowing us to express approximate solutions via a small number of certain non-linear equations. Fast convergence comes from directly solving those non-linear equations in a distributed manner, rather than multiple loops of simulation-and-update in existing algorithms. Our simulation results verify our theoretical developments and show that our approximate solutions are highly accurate and converge much faster than prior algorithms under various scenarios.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Motivation

In wireless networks, nodes configure links (transmitter and receiver pairs) and share the air as a medium for their transmissions. The transmission signal of a link reach their neighbors, interfering other links and often generating contentions with neighbors' transmissions. Thus, link

S. Yun is with School of Electrical Engineering, KTH, Sweden (e-mail: seyoung@kth.se). Y. Yi is with Department of Electrical Engineering, KAIST, Korea (e-mail: yiyung@kaist.edu). J. Shin is with Mathematical Sciences Department, IBM T. J. Watson Research, USA (e-mail: jshin@us.ibm.com).

transmissions have to appropriately scheduled so as to avoid collisions for high efficiency. Carrier Sense Multiple Access (CSMA) has been a popular class of medium access control mechanisms due to its implementation simplicity and distributed operation to resolve the multiple access problem in wireless networks, For example, a family of IEEE 802.11 standards is based on CSMA as a medium access control.

Recently, it has been proved in theory that CSMA, albeit simple and fully distributed, can achieve high performance in terms of throughput and fairness for both scheduling for stability [1], [2], [3] and joint scheduling/congestion control for utility maximization [1], [2], [4], [5] under unsaturated and saturated situations, respectively. These advances show that even an algorithm with no or little message passing can actually be close to optimal performance, achieving a big improvement over the seminal work of Max-Weight [6] and its descendant researches, each of which often take a tradeoff point between complexity and performance, see [7], [8]. The idea is to intelligently control access intensities (i.e., access probability and channel holding time) over links so as to let the resulting long-term link service rate converge to the target rate.

However, one of the main drawbacks for such CSMA algorithms is slow convergence, which is practically problematic due to its slow adaptivity to the network and flow configuration changes. The root cause of slow convergence stems from the fact that all the above algorithms are based on the MCMC (Markov Chain Monte Carlo) technique, where even for a fixed CSMA intensity, it takes (mixing) time to reach the stationary distribution to observe how the system behaves. Note that mixing time is typically exponential with respect to the number of links. The algorithms require to update the CSMA intensities to converge to the target point, and multiple mixing times are often required before they converge. There exists algorithms updating CSMA intensities before the system is mixed, e.g., without time-scale separation between the intensity update and the time to get the system state for a given intensity update [4], [5]. But, they are not free from the slow convergence issue since their convergence analysis also requires the mixing property of the underlying network Markov process. In summary, all prior CSMA algorithms suffer from slow convergence explicitly or implicitly, when the underlying network Markov process mixes slowly. The main goal of this paper is to develop ‘mixing-independent’ CSMA algorithms to overcome the issue.

B. Overview and Background

We aim at drastically improving the convergence speed by using techniques in statistical physics (instead of the MCMC related ones) for both the stability problem under unsaturated case and the utility maximization problem under saturated case. The key common contribution of our paper for both problems lies in our message passing algorithm's ability of direct computing the required access intensity for a given target service rate in a distributed manner, rather than estimation-based approaches in the MCMC technique. For the utility maximization problem, the intermediate target service rate is iteratively updated, from which the CSMA intensities are consequently updated so as to lead the convergent service rates are the solution of the utility maximization problem. To understand how our CSMA problems are related to statistical physics, we first present some backgrounds, followed by our main contributions.

The CSMA setting can be naturally understood by a certain Markov random field (MRF) [9], which we call CSMA-MRF, in the domain of physics and probability. Service rates and access intensities over links correspond to the marginal probabilities and MRF-parameters in CSMA-MRF, respectively. The function which plays a key role in our stability problem is referred to as 'Gibbs free energy' function (or simply Gibbs function) [10] in statistical physics. The stability problem is equivalent to computing the MRF-parameters given the target marginal probabilities, and in our case finding the stationary point of the Gibbs function leads to the exact solution of the stability problem. Unfortunately, this problem is known to be computationally intractable unless the underlying graph has a bounded tree-width [11]. Due to such hardness, research efforts have been focused on developing heuristic or approximate algorithms. Variational methods in statistical physics are such approaches, whose empirical success has been widely evidenced in many areas such as computer vision, artificial intelligence and information theory [12], [13], [14]. Due to computational intractability of Gibbs function, the key idea of variational methods lies in finding a tractable, possibly non-convex approximating function. Popular examples include 'Mean-field free energy' (MFE) and 'Bethe free energy' (BFE) [12]. Their main benefits are that the zero-gradient (non-linear) equations of the BFE function, so-called the Bethe equations, provide low-complexity (approximate) consistency conditions between marginal probabilities and MRF-parameters.

C. Main Contributions and Related Work

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- (i) First, for the stability problem, we assume that each link is aware of only its *local* load, i.e., its targeted marginal probability in CSMA-MRF.¹ Given targeted marginal probabilities, we show that the Bethe equation (corresponding to the stability problem) is solvable, somewhat surprisingly, in one iteration among links. Equivalently, each link can calculate its approximate access intensity for targeted throughputs of links in one iteration of message-passings between neighbors. The result relies on the following special property of CSMA-MRF (which is not applicable for general MRFs):

(†) The higher-order marginal probabilities needed by the BFE functions are decided by the first-order marginal probabilities in CSMA-MRF.

Our algorithm, called **BAS**, for the stability problem are presented in Section III.

- (ii) Second, we provide a distributed CSMA algorithm, called **BUM**, for the utility maximization problem, which converges in a polynomial number of iterations. The **BUM** algorithm consists of two parts. We understand the problem as maximizing a BFE function and develop a distributed gradient algorithm for the purpose. This first part provides targeted marginal probabilities, and the second part recovers CSMA intensities using the **BAS** algorithm for the stability problem. We establish its convergence speed and output quality for the popular α -fairness utility functions [15]. To this end, we first show that the BFE function is concave for the utility functions. However, it is still far from being clear that a distributed gradient algorithm can achieve its maximum since its domain is a bounded polytope, i.e., the BFE function is constrained by linear inequalities. To overcome this issue, we use the following special property of the BFE function (which is not true for general BFE functions):

(‡) The maxima of the BFE function is strictly inside of its domain.

Using the property (‡), we carefully choose a (dynamic) projection scheme for the gradient algorithm so that it never hits the boundary of the BFE function after a number of iterations, say T . Then, after T iterations, the gradient algorithm is analyzable to converge similarly

¹The knowledge about the local (offered) load may be learnt by empirical estimations or provided by the admission control of the incoming flows.

as its optimizing function is unconstrained. We also characterize the error of the **BUM** algorithm in terms of that of the **BAS** algorithm, i.e., if **BAS** is accurate, **BUM** is as well. The description and analysis of **BUM** are given in Section IV.

Our simulation results show that the proposed schemes converge fast and the approximation is accurate enough. First, we test the actual service rate of **BAS** and verify that the service rates are close to the target rates. Next, **BUM** is compared with conventional utility optimal CSMA algorithms. In the results, **BUM** is converged within 1000 iterations, whereas the conventional schemes are not converged until 10000 iterations. Moreover, the achieved network utility is almost the same with the utility by conventional algorithms.

Related work. In [1], [3], throughput- and utility-optimal algorithms were first proposed and proved, where links update their CSMA intensities based on the empirical arrival and service rates. The update interval increases with time and set to be a sufficiently large value larger than the mixing time of the underlying CSMA Markov process, which leads to time-scale separation effect between the dynamics of Markov process and the CSMA intensity update, thereby suffering from slow convergence when the mixing time is large. Liu et al. [4] provide an utility optimal CSMA algorithm with the update interval being fixed, where the decreasing step size implicitly separates the time-scale between two dynamics after some amount of time since the algorithm starts. In [5], the transmission intensities are updated by a simulated steepest ascent algorithm to achieve utility optimality. However, these algorithms also suffer from the slow convergence time. As another direction of designing CSMA algorithms for throughput optimality queue-length based approach motivated by Max-Weight were proposed in [16], [17], [18]. Related work also includes the delay analysis of CSMA algorithms [19], [20], The authors of [21] recently studied stability and utility maximization problems using the Belief Propagation (BP) algorithm. BP and BFE are connected as discussed in [12], in that the convergence point of the BP algorithm is equivalent to the maximum point of the BFE. However, the algorithm for stability in [21] often show slow convergence and that for utility maximization may not converge at all. Our work differs from [21] in that BFE is exploited not to find stationary distribution of MRF but to find MRF-parameters having target stationary distribution.

II. MODEL AND PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

A. Model

Network model. In a wireless network, each link i , which consists of a transmitter node and a receiver node, shares the wireless medium with its ‘neighboring’ links that refer to the ones that are interfering with i , i.e., the transmission over i cannot be successful if a transmission in at least one neighboring link occurs simultaneously. We assume that each link has a unit capacity. The interfere relationship among links can be represented by a graph $G = (V, E)$, popularly called the *interference graph*. Links in the wireless network are represented by the set of vertices V , and any two links i, j share an edge $(i, j) \in E$ if they interfere with each other.

Feasible rate region. We let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(t) \triangleq [\sigma_i(t) \in \{0, 1\} : i \in V]^2$ denote the *scheduling vector* at time t , i.e., link i is active or transmits packets (if exist) with rate 1 at time t if $\sigma_i(t) = 1$ (and does not otherwise). The scheduling vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(t)$ is said to be *feasible* if no interfering links are active simultaneously at time t , i.e., $\sigma_i(t) + \sigma_j(t) \leq 1, \forall (i, j) \in E$. We use $\mathcal{N}(i) \triangleq \{j : (i, j) \in E\}$ to denote the set of the neighboring links of link i , $d(i) \triangleq |\mathcal{N}(i)|$ and $d \triangleq \max_i d(i)$. Then, the set of all feasible schedules $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(G)$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{I}(G) \triangleq \{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sigma_i + \sigma_j \leq 1, \forall (i, j) \in E\}.$$

The (long-term) service rate s_i (also called link throughput) of link i is defined as

$$s_i \triangleq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \sigma_i(s) ds,$$

where without loss of generality, we assume that the limit exists. The feasible rate region $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(G)$, which is the set of all possible service rates $\mathbf{s} = [s_i]$ over the links, is simply the convex hull of $\mathcal{I}(G)$, namely,

$$\mathbf{s} \in C(G) \triangleq \left\{ \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{I}(G)} \alpha_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} : \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{I}(G)} \alpha_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = 1, \alpha_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \geq 0, \forall \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{I}(G) \right\}.$$

CSMA (Carrier Sense Multiple Access). Now we describe a CSMA algorithm which updates the scheduling vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(t)$ in a distributed fashion. Initially, the algorithm starts with the null

²Let $[x_i : i \in V]$ denote the vector whose i -th element is x_i . For notational convenience, instead of $[x_i : i \in V]$, we use $[x_i]$ in the remaining of this paper.

schedule, i.e., $\sigma(0) = \mathbf{0}$. Each link i maintains an independent Exponential clock of unit rate, and when the clock of link i ticks at time t , update its schedule $\sigma_i(t)$ as

- If the medium is busy, i.e., there exists $j \in \mathcal{N}(i)$ such that $\sigma_j(t) = 1$, then $\sigma_i(t^+) = 0$.
- Else, $\sigma_j(t^+) = 1$ with probability $\frac{\exp(r_i)}{\exp(r_i)+1}$ and $\sigma_j(t) = 0$ otherwise.

In above, $r_i > 0$ is called the *transmission intensity* (or simply *intensity*) of link i . The schedule $\sigma_i(t)$ of link i remains unchanged while its clock does not tick.

Under the algorithm, the scheduling process $\{\sigma(t) : t \geq 0\}$ becomes a time reversible Markov process. It is easy to check that its stationary distribution $\pi^r = [\pi_\sigma^r : \sigma \in \mathcal{I}(G)]$ for given $\mathbf{r} = [r_i]$ becomes:

$$\pi_\sigma^r \propto \exp\left(\sum_{i \in V} \sigma_i r_i\right). \quad (1)$$

In other words, the stationary distribution of a schedule σ is determined by a product form of transmission intensities over links. Then, due to the ergodicity of Markov process $\{\sigma(t)\}$, the long-term service rate $s_i = s_i(\mathbf{r})$ of link i , is the sum of all stationary probabilities of the schedules where i is active, i.e.,

$$s_i(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \mathcal{I}(G) \\ \sigma_i=1}} \pi_\sigma^r = \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{I}(G): \sigma_i=1} \exp(\sum_{i \in V} \sigma_i r_i)}{\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{I}(G)} \exp(\sum_{i \in V} \sigma'_i r_i)}. \quad (2)$$

B. Problem Description: P1 and P2

In this section, we describe two central problems for designing CSMA algorithms of high performances. In a wireless network where CSMA is used a MAC mechanism, suppose packets arrive with rate $\lambda_i > 0$ at link i . Then, the first-order question is about its stability, i.e., whether the total number of packets remains bounded as a function of time. Under the wireless network model considered in this paper, it is not hard to check that the necessary and sufficient condition for stability is that the service rate s_i is larger than the arrival rate λ_i . Therefore, this motivates the following question for the CSMA algorithm design.

P1. Stability. For a given rate vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_i] \in C(G)$, how can each link i find its we find its transmission intensity r_i in a distributed manner so that

$$\lambda_i = s_i(\mathbf{r}), \quad \text{for all links } i \in V?$$

For the simple presentation of our results, we consider $\lambda_i = s_i(\mathbf{r})$ instead of $\lambda_i < s_i(\mathbf{r})$ in the description of the stability problem. However, one can also obtain $\lambda_i < s_i(\mathbf{r})$ by solving **P1** with $\lambda_i \leftarrow \lambda_i + \varepsilon$ for small $\varepsilon > 0$.

The second problem arising in wireless networks is controlling congestion, i.e., how to control the CSMA's intensity \mathbf{r} so that the resulting link throughput maximizes a certain object. Formally speaking, we study the following question.

P2. Utility Maximization. Assume that each link i has its utility function $U_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$.

How can each link i find its transmission intensity r_i in a distributed manner so that the total utility $\sum_{i \in V} U_i(s_i(\mathbf{r}))$ is maximized?

III. STABILITY

We present two approximation algorithms for the stability problem. The problem finding a TDMA schedule (i.e., finding a repetitive scheduling pattern over frames) to generate a target service rate vector has long been studied, where the problem turns out to be NP-hard in many cases (a variation of graph coloring) or allows polynomial time complexity only for a special interference pattern such as node-exclusive interference, see Chap. 2 of [22] for a survey. Even a distributed random access based distributed algorithm requires exponentially long convergence time in terms of the number of links [23]. In the CSMA, the slow convergence of the existing iterative distribution algorithms [1] for stability is primarily due to the fact that it is hard to compute $s_i(\mathbf{r})$ given transmission intensity \mathbf{r} , i.e., it is not even clear whether the stability problem is in NP.

To overcome such a hurdle, we use a notion of free energy in statistical physics which allow to compute $s_i(\mathbf{r})$ efficiently in an approximate manner.

A. Preliminaries: Free Energies for CSMA

Free energy. We first introduce the free energy functions for CSMA Markov processes for transmission intensity \mathbf{r} .

Definition 3.1 (Gibbs and Bethe Free Energy):

Given a random variable $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = [\sigma_i]$ on space $\mathcal{I}(G)$ and its probability distribution p , *Gibbs* free energy (GFE) and *Bethe* free energy (BFE) functions denoted by $F_G^r(p)$ and $F_B^r(p)$ are defined

as:

$$F_G(p; \mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{E}(p; \mathbf{r}) - H_G(p), \quad F_B(p; \mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{E}(p; \mathbf{r}) - H_B(p),$$

where $\mathcal{E}(p; \mathbf{r}) = -E[\mathbf{r} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}]$,³ and

$$\begin{aligned} H_G(p) &= H(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \\ H_B(p) &= \sum_{i \in V} H(\sigma_i) - \sum_{(i,j) \in E} I(\sigma_i; \sigma_j). \end{aligned}$$

In above, E , H , and I are the expected value, standard entropy, and mutual information, respectively, where the distributions of random variables is defined by p . BFE can be thought as an approximate function of GFE,⁴ where H_B is called the ‘Bethe’ entropy.

How free energy meets CSMA. We start by stating the well-known Gibbs maximal principle:

Theorem 3.1 ([10]): The stationary distribution π^r of the CSMA Markov process with intensity \mathbf{r} is the unique minimizer of $F_G(p; \mathbf{r})$, i.e., $\pi^r = \arg \min_p F_G(p; \mathbf{r})$.

Theorem 3.1 provides a variational characterization of π^r (and thus the service rate vector $[s_i(\mathbf{r})]$). Furthermore, due to the convexity of $F_G(p; \mathbf{r})$ in terms of p , it implies that

$$\nabla F_G(p; \mathbf{r})|_{p=\pi^r} = 0.$$

Since BFE approximates GFE, the (non-rigorous) statistical physics method suggests that a (local) minimizer or zero-gradient point (if exists) of $F_B(p; \mathbf{r})$ can approximate π^r (and $[s_i(\mathbf{r})]$). The main advantage of studying BFE (instead of GFE) is that BFE only depends on the first-order marginal probabilities of p , i.e., its domain complexity is significantly smaller than that of GFE.

Specifically, by letting $\mathbf{y} = [y_i]$ and $y_i = E[\sigma_i]$, one can easily check that:

$$\begin{aligned} F_B(p; \mathbf{r}) &= - \sum_{i \in V} y_i r_i - \sum_{i \in V} \left[(d(i) - 1)(1 - y_i) \log(1 - y_i) - y_i \log y_i \right] + \\ &\quad \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (1 - y_i - y_j) \log(1 - y_i - y_j). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Namely, $F_B(p; \mathbf{r})$ is represented by \mathbf{y} . Thus, without loss of generality, we redefine BFE as a function of \mathbf{y} as following: $F_B(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{r}) - H_B(\mathbf{y})$, where $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{r}) = - \sum_{i \in V} y_i r_i$ and $H_B(\mathbf{y})$ is the other terms in (3). The underlying domain D_B of $F_B(\cdot; \mathbf{r})$ is

$$D_B = \{ \mathbf{y} : y_i \geq 0, y_i + y_j \leq 1, \text{ for all } (i, j) \in E \}. \quad (4)$$

³In general Bethe free energy functions, the energy term \mathcal{E} can have a (different) form other than $-E[\mathbf{r} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}]$.

⁴It is easy to check that $F_B(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{r}) = F_G(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{r})$ for all \mathbf{y} if the interference graph G is a tree.

Hence, a (local) minimizer or zero gradient point \mathbf{y} of F_B^r under the domain D_B provide a candidate to approximate $[s_i(\mathbf{r})]$, i.e., $y_i \approx s_i(\mathbf{r})$. To summarize, the advantage of studying BFE instead of GFE is that finding service rate (or marginal distribution) reduces to solving a certain non-linear system $\nabla F_B(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{r}) = 0$ or $\nabla \Lambda(\mathbf{y}, \cdot) = 0$, where Λ is the Lagrange function of $F_B(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{r})$.

We formally define the potential error for this Bethe approach as follows.

Definition 3.2 (Bethe Error): For a given transmission intensity \mathbf{r} , the Bethe error e_B is defined by:

$$e_B(\mathbf{r}) = \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}} \max_{i \in V} |y_i - s_i(\mathbf{r})|,$$

where \mathcal{A} is the set of all \mathbf{y} satisfying $\nabla F_B(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{r}) = 0$.

B. Algorithm using Bethe Free Energy

As discussed in Section III-A, an approximate solution to the stability problem can be obtained by the Bethe free energy function: given a target service rate $s_i(\mathbf{r})$, s.t. $s_i(\mathbf{r}) = \lambda_i$, find the transmission intensity \mathbf{r} such that $\nabla F_B(\boldsymbol{\lambda}; \mathbf{r}) = 0$. Motivated by it, we propose the following algorithm:

Bethe Algorithm for Stability: BAS(λ)

- Through message passing with neighbor links, each link i knows λ_j for all the neighbor links $j \in \mathcal{N}(i)$
- Each link i sets its transmission intensity r_i as:

$$r_i = \log \left(\frac{\lambda_i (1 - \lambda_i)^{d(i)-1}}{\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} (1 - \lambda_i - \lambda_j)} \right). \quad (5)$$

In **BAS**, a link set its own transmission intensity based on the its own and neighbors' arrival rates. With the closed form of equation (5), each link can easily compute the transmission intensity *without* any further iterations. We now state the main property of **BAS**.

Theorem 3.2: For the choice of $\mathbf{r} = [r_i]$ by (5), it follows that

$$\nabla F_B(\boldsymbol{\lambda}; \mathbf{r}) = 0.$$

From the form (3) of F_B , it is trivial to prove Theorem 3.2, implying that for the choice of $\mathbf{r} = [r_i]$ as per (5), a zero gradient point of $F_B(\cdot; \mathbf{r})$ always exists, which is not true in general,

i.e., there can be no local minimizer of the Bethe free energy function strictly inside of its domain.

IV. UTILITY MAXIMIZATION

A. Algorithm and Analytical Result

In this section, we present an approximation algorithm for the utility maximization problem that is

$$\text{(OPT)} \quad \max_{\mathbf{r}} \sum_{i \in V} U_i(s_i(\mathbf{r})). \quad (6)$$

To design a distributed algorithm finding transmission intensity \mathbf{r} for (6), the approaches in literature [1], [4], [5], instead, considers the following variant of (6): for $\beta > 0$,

$$\max_{\mathbf{r}} \beta \cdot \sum_{i \in V} U_i(s_i(\mathbf{r})) + H_G(\pi^{\mathbf{r}}). \quad (7)$$

The proposed algorithms [1], [4], [5] converge to the transmission intensities \mathbf{r} which is the solution to (7). Since the entropy term $H_G(\pi^{\mathbf{r}})$ is bounded above and below, a solution to (7) can provide an approximate solution to (6) if β is large.

In our approach, we use a free energy concept similarly as we used for the stability problem in Section III. In particular, we consider the Bethe entropy H_B instead of the Gibbs entropy H_G in (7), which results in the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{y}} \quad & K_B(\mathbf{y}) = \beta \cdot \sum_{i \in V} U_i(y_i) + H_B(\mathbf{y}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \mathbf{y} \in D_B, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the Bethe entropy allows to replace the term $s_i(\mathbf{r})$ by a new variable y_i , and the domain constraint D_B given by (4) is necessary to evaluate $H_B(\mathbf{y})$. Once (8) is solved, one has to recover \mathbf{r} from \mathbf{y} such that $s_i(\mathbf{r}) = y_i$. We use the **BAS** algorithm in Section III-B for the purpose. To summarize, our algorithm for utility maximization consists of two phases:

1. Run a (distributed) gradient algorithm solving (8) and obtain \mathbf{y} .
2. Run the **BAS** algorithm to find a transmission intensity \mathbf{r} for the target service rate \mathbf{y} .

The algorithm is formally described in the following:

Bethe Utility Maximization: BUM

◦ Initially, set $t = 1$ and $y_i(1) = 1/4$, $i \in V$.⁵

◦ Intensity-update based on \mathbf{y} .

Obtain $(y_j, j \in \mathcal{N}(i))$ through message passing with the neighbors, and set transmission intensity $r_i(t)$ of link i for time t :

$$r_i(t) = \log \left(\frac{y_i(t)(1 - y_i(t))^{d(i)-1}}{\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} (1 - y_i(t) - y_j(t))} \right). \quad (9)$$

◦ \mathbf{y} -update based on gradient projection.

$y_i(t + 1)$ is updated for time $t + 1$ at each link i :

$$y_i(t + 1) = \left[y_i(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \frac{\partial K_B}{\partial y_i} \Big|_{\mathbf{y}(t)} \right]_*$$

where the projection $[\cdot]_*$ is defined as

$$[x]_* = \begin{cases} c_1(t) & \text{if } x < c_1(t) \\ 1 - c_2(t) & \text{if } x > 1 - c_2(t) \\ x & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$c_1(t) = (100 \cdot \log(e + t))^{-1} \quad \text{and}$$

$$c_2(t) = (1 - y_i(t) + \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} y_j(t))/2 + t^{-1/4}/10.$$

Operation. In **BUM**, the intensity-update phase corresponds to running **BAS**(\mathbf{y}) in Section III-B. In the \mathbf{y} -update phase, each link i updates y_i in a distributed manner based on a gradient-projection method. However, our projection $[\cdot]_*$ is far from a classical projection, where our projection varies over time (see $c_1(t)$ and $c_2(t)$), which our algorithm's convergence and distributed operation relies on. We delay the discussion on why and how our special projection contributes to the theoretical performance guarantee of **BUM**, and first present its feasibility of

⁵The initial point can be any feasible point in D_B . The point, $y_i = 1/4$ for all i , is just a feasible point.

distributed operation. Note that the gradient $\frac{\partial K_B}{\partial y_i}$ in the \mathbf{y} -update phase is:

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial K_B}{\partial y_i} \right|_{\mathbf{y}(t)} &= \beta \cdot U'_i(y_i(t)) - (d(i) - 1) \log(1 - y_i(t)) \\ &\quad - \log y_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \log(1 - y_i(t) - y_j(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Indeed, this gradient can be easily obtained by the link i via message passing only with its neighbors.

Performance guarantee. We now establish the theoretical performance guarantee of **BUM** for the popular class of α -fair utility functions [15], i.e., $U^\alpha = (\cdot)^{1-\alpha}/(1-\alpha)$ for $\alpha > 0, \alpha \neq 1$ and $\log(\cdot)$ for $\alpha = 1$. The parameter α represents the degree of fairness for the throughput allocation: when $\alpha = 0$, the total link throughput is maximized; $\alpha = 1$ gives the Proportional fair allocation when $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, it corresponds to the Max-min fairness.

Let $\mathbf{y}^* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{y} \in D_B} K_B(\mathbf{y})$. Theorem 4.1 shows that, for any given α , with sufficiently large β , $K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))$ by **BUM** always converges to $K_B(\mathbf{y}^*)$ in polynomially large enough time T , where the distance between $K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))$ and $K_B(\mathbf{y}^*)$ is less than $O\left(\frac{n \log T}{\sqrt{T}}\right)$.

Theorem 4.1: Let μ be a probability distribution on $\{1, \dots, T\}$, such that

$$\mu(t) = \frac{t^{-1/2}}{\sum_{s=1}^T s^{-1/2}} \quad \text{for } t \in \{1, \dots, T\}.$$

Then, for $\beta > 2d/\alpha$,

$$E[K_B(\mathbf{y}^*) - K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))] \leq O\left(\frac{n \log T}{\sqrt{T}}\right), \quad (11)$$

where the expectations are taken over the distribution μ .

Proof: The proof is given in Section IV-C ■

It is note worth that, for $\beta > 2d/\alpha$, Theorem 4.1 implies $\mathbf{y}(t)$ converges to \mathbf{y}^* , since K_B is a convex function, which is shown in Lemma 4.1. The intensity update algorithm is an approximate algorithm by which the service rate $s_i(\mathbf{r}(t))$ might be not the exact target rate $y_i(t)$ for all links. The distance between $y_i(t)$ and service rate $s_i(\mathbf{r}(t))$ by **BAS** is bounded by $e_B(\mathbf{r}(t))$ as defined in Definition 3.1. Unfortunately, the error degrades the network utility. The following theorem bounds the gap between the achieved utility of **BUM** and the maximum utility according to $e_B(\mathbf{r}(t))$.

Theorem 4.2: The transmission intensity

$$\mathbf{r}^* := \left[\log \left(\frac{y_i^* (1 - y_i^*)^{d(i)-1}}{\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} (1 - y_i^* - y_j^*)} \right) \right]$$

satisfies

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}(G)} \sum_{i \in V} U_i(x_i) - \sum_{i \in V} U_i(s_i(\mathbf{r}^*)) \leq \sum_{i \in V} \frac{e_B(\mathbf{r}^*)}{s_i(\mathbf{r}^*)^\alpha} + \frac{n \log 2}{\beta}.$$

Proof: The proof is given in Section IV-D. ■

It is noteworthy that the Bethe error $e_B(\mathbf{r})$ is small enough to be applied successfully in many application. In particular, $e_B(\mathbf{r})$ is 0 for all \mathbf{r} when the graph structure is tree.

B. Comparison with Prior Approach

In [1], [4], gradient based algorithms solve (7). In this section, we denote by **JW** and **EJW** the algorithms in [1] and [4], respectively. Technically, the algorithms use dual problem of (7) where transmission intensity r_i is Lagrangian multiplier and $U'^{-1}\left(\frac{r_i(t)}{\beta}\right) - s_i(\mathbf{r}(t))$ is gradient of the dual problem (7) for r_i . Thus, transmission intensities are commonly described as the following distributed iterative procedure:

$$r_i(t+1) = r_i(t) + \alpha_i(t) \left(U'^{-1}\left(\frac{r_i(t)}{\beta}\right) - s_i(\mathbf{r}(t)) \right), \quad (12)$$

where $\alpha_i(t) > 0$ is called the step size of link i . In both schemes, $\alpha_i(t) = 1/t$ which guarantees the convergence of $r_i(t)$. In (12), however, $s_i(\mathbf{r}(t))$ is hard to know. Therefore, to implement (12), estimated service rate $\hat{s}_i(t)$ should be used instead of $s_i(\mathbf{r}(t))$ and the main issue is about how to estimate.

To get accurate $\hat{s}_i(t)$, the authors in [1] consider large enough updating intervals for $r_i(t)$ (i.e, $r_i(t)$ is fixed during each interval) so that $s_i(\mathbf{r}(t))$ can be estimated well at the end of each interval. On the other hand, the authors in [4], without the large enough updating intervals, use the empirical estimation $\hat{s}_i(t)$ in the place of $s_i(\mathbf{r}(t))$. By stochastic approximation, with sufficiently large T ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r_i(t+T) - r_i(t) = \sum_{j=t}^{t+T} \alpha(j) \left(U'^{-1}\left(\frac{r_i(j)}{\beta}\right) - s_i(\mathbf{r}(j)) \right).$$

Both approaches, however, suffer from the slow convergence: the updating interval should be extremely large in [1] and $\alpha_i(t)$ should be extremely small in [4] for $\hat{s}_i(t) \approx s_i(\mathbf{r}(t))$.

In [5], the authors propose an algorithm called Simulated Steepest Ascent (**SCA**) algorithm converging to the same point with above two algorithms, where the algorithm is not a gradient based approach but a steepest ascent based algorithm. In **SCA** scheme, at each iteration t , link i set transmission intensity as $r_i(t) = \beta U'(\frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_i(j))$. Then, π_{σ}^r is maximized at

$$\sigma^* := \arg \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{I}(G)} \sum_{i \in V} \sigma_i U'(\frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_i(j)),$$

which is the exact steepest ascent direction. As the steepest ascent algorithms converge to the optimal service rate in many applications, the **SCA** algorithm make the service rate converge to the optimal rate quickly, compared to the gradient based algorithms. To guarantee the convergence, however, **SCA** algorithm have to spend extremely large iterations because of the stochastic selection on scheduling.

C. Proof of Theorem 4.1

an overview for the proof of Theorem 4.1. The formal complete proof will follow.

Overview of the proof of Theorem 4.1. As a first step, we prove that the function K_B is concave for large enough β , stated as follows.

Lemma 4.1: When $\beta \geq 2d/\alpha$, $K_B(\mathbf{y})$ is concave.

The proof of Lemma 4.1 is presented in Appendix. We note that K_B is not obvious to be concave (or convex) since the bethe entropy term H_B (in the expression of K_B) is neither concave nor convex. In essence, we observe that the non-concave term H_B is compensated by the concave term $\beta \cdot \sum_{i \in V} U_i(y_i)$ for large enough β .

The concavity property of K_B might allow to use known convex optimization tools solving (8), such as the interior-point method, the Newton's method, the ellipsoid method, etc. However, these algorithms are not easy to implement in a distributed manner, and it is still far from being clear whether such a simple distributed gradient algorithm as used in **BUM** can solve (8) (in a polynomial number of iterations) since the optimization is 'constrained', i.e., $y_i \geq 0$ and $y_i + y_j \leq 1$ for $(i, j) \in E$. For the issue, we establish the following lemma whose proof is presented in Appendix.

Lemma 4.2: For all time t , $\mathbf{y}(t) = [y_v(t)] \in D_B^*$, where

$$D_B^* := \{\mathbf{y} = [y_v] : y_v \in [\delta_1, 1 - \delta_2] \text{ and } y_u + y_v \leq 1 - 2\delta_3, \\ \text{for all } (u, v) \in E\}.$$

where

$$\delta_1 := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{10 \log(e + t_*)}, \frac{\beta 2^\alpha \delta_2^d}{2(1 + \beta 2^\alpha d \delta_2^{d-1})} \right\}, \\ \delta_2 := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{10 t_*^{1/4}}, \frac{1}{2(\exp(\beta 2^\alpha) + 1)} \right\}, \\ \delta_3 := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{10 t_*^{1/4}}, \frac{\delta_1}{4r_{\max}} \right\},$$

and

$$t_* := \inf \left\{ \tau : \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \left| \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))}{\partial y_i} \right| < \frac{0.05}{t^{1/4}} \quad \forall t \geq \tau \right\}.$$

The important implication of the above lemma is that the projection $[\cdot]_*$ in **BUM** is not necessary after large enough t . In other words, the projection plays a role at initial iterations, but does not involve in the gradient algorithm of **BUM** at later iterations. Once the projection is not necessary, one can analyze the gradient algorithm in the same manner to those for ‘unconstrained’ optimizations, where the error term $O\left(\frac{n \log T}{\sqrt{T}}\right)$ in (4.2) occurs in the analysis. It is noteworthy that $[\cdot]_*$ is not an unique one to guarantee the convergence of a gradient algorithm, but is one of simple and distributed projection methods for the purpose.

Completing the proof of Theorem 4.1. Now we proceed toward completing the proof of Theorem 4.1.

First, from δ_1 , δ_2 , and δ_3 in Lemma 4.2, we define δ and t_δ as following:

$$\delta := \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\} \\ t_\delta := \max \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{10\delta} \right)^4, \exp \left(\frac{1}{100\delta_1} \right) - e \right\}.$$

Then, Lemma 4.2 implies that for every time $t \geq t_\delta$,

$$y_i(t+1) = y_v(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))}{\partial y_i}.$$

Namely, the projection $[\cdot]_*$ is not necessary after time t_δ . Thus, it follows that for $t > t_\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{y}(t+1) - \mathbf{y}^*\|_2^2 &= \|\mathbf{y}(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\nabla K_B(\mathbf{y}(t)) - \mathbf{y}^*\|_2^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{y}(t) - \mathbf{y}^*\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{t}\|\nabla K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))\|_2^2 + 2\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\nabla K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))^T \cdot (\mathbf{y}(t) - \mathbf{y}^*) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \|\mathbf{y}(t) - \mathbf{y}^*\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{t}\|\nabla K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))\|_2^2 + 2\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}(K_B(\mathbf{y}(t)) - K_B(\mathbf{y}^*)),\end{aligned}$$

where (a) comes from the concavity of $K_B(\mathbf{y})$ in Lemma 4.1. By rearranging terms in the above inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}(K_B(\mathbf{y}^*) - K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))) \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\|\mathbf{y}(t) - \mathbf{y}^*\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{y}(t+1) - \mathbf{y}^*\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{t}\|\nabla K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))\|_2^2\right). \quad (13)$$

We are now ready to complete this proof. We divide $\sum_{t=1}^T \mu(t)(K_B(\mathbf{y}^*) - K_B(\mathbf{y}(t)))$ into two parts:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mu(t)(K_B(\mathbf{y}^*) - K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))) = \sum_{t=1}^{t_\delta-1} \mu(t)(K_B(\mathbf{y}^*) - K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))) + \sum_{t=t_\delta}^T \mu(t)(K_B(\mathbf{y}^*) - K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))),$$

where the first part can be bounded by some constant. We also obtain the upper bound of the second part by (13).

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{t=t_\delta}^T \mu(t)(K_B(\mathbf{y}^*) - K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))) &\leq \frac{1}{2\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}}\left(\|\mathbf{y}(0) - \mathbf{y}^*\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{y}(T) - \mathbf{y}^*\|_2^2 + \sum_{t=t_\delta}^T \frac{1}{t}\|\nabla K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))\|_2^2\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sum_{t=t_\delta}^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}}\left(O(n) + O(n)\sum_{t=t_\delta}^T \frac{1}{t}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can conclude that

$$\sum_{t=0}^T \mu(t)(K_B(\mathbf{y}^*) - K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))) = O\left(\frac{n \log T}{\sqrt{T}}\right).$$

D. Proof of Theorem 4.2

There are two reasons for the error: the additional term of entropy in $K_B(\mathbf{y})$ and the Bethe error because of intensity updating by (9). Thus, we devide the utility gap between the optimal

value and the achieved value to represent the error due to each reason.

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\mathbf{s} \in C(G)} \sum_{i \in V} U_i(s_i) - \sum_{j \in V} U_j(s_j(\mathbf{r}^*)) &= \left(\max_{\mathbf{s} \in C(G)} \sum_{i \in V} U_i(s_i) - \sum_{j \in V} U_j(y_j^*) \right) + \\
&\quad \left(\sum_{j \in V} U_j(y_j^*) - \sum_{j \in V} U_j(s_j(\mathbf{r}^*)) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{H_B(\mathbf{y}^*)}{\beta} + \left(\sum_{j \in V} U_j(y_j^*) - \sum_{j \in V} U_j(s_j(\mathbf{r}^*)) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{n \log 2}{\beta} + \sum_{i \in V} U_i(s_i(\mathbf{r}^*) + e_B(\mathbf{r}^*)) - \sum_{j \in V} U_j(s_j(\mathbf{r}^*)) \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} e_B(\mathbf{r}^*) \sum_{i \in V} s_i(\mathbf{r}^*)^{-\alpha} + \frac{n \log 2}{\beta},
\end{aligned}$$

where for (b) we use $\beta \sum_{i \in V} U_i(s_i^*) \leq K_B(\mathbf{y}^*)$, for (c) we use the definition of Bethe error $e_B(\mathbf{r}^*)$ and $H_B(\mathbf{y}) \leq n \log 2$, and (d) hold since $U_i(\cdot)$ is an α fairness function and concave. This is the end of this proof.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we provide simulation results. First, we compute the Bethe error for various interference graphs and target service rates. Second, **BUM** are compared with the three conventional algorithms introduced in Section IV-B regarding to convergence speed and achieved network utility, where $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1$.

A. Stability

As we stated in Section III, the stability algorithm **BAS** does not get the exact target service rate when the graph is not tree. Recall that the difference between the target service rate and the actual service rate is denoted by $e_B(\mathbf{r})$ called Bethe error. Fig. 1 represents the Bethe error for 3 types of topologies: complete, ring, and random. In the graphs, we define ‘‘Load’’ as the fraction of the traffic rate over the capacity of the network and the y -axis represents the normalized Bethe error, which divided by the target service rate. In this experiment, we assume symmetric arrivals where the target service rates of all links are equal.

According to traffic load : The graphs in Fig. 1 show the normalized Bethe error on complete, ring and random interference graphs. The normalized Bethe errors grow up to at most 0.2, which




Fig. 1. Bethe error for various graphs

means that the Bethe error is within 20% of target service rate. The error is susceptible to apply stability problem. In addition, for all graph models, the Bethe error grows up as the traffic load increases. Although **BAS** get more error with higher transmission intensity, It is note worth that the mixing time also increases with higher transmission intensity. Thus, the MCMC based algorithms also need more convergence time to get accurate service rate estimation.

According to graph structure : Bethe error strongly depends on the graph structure. As stated in Section III, tree graphs do not have error, while other types of graphs has Bethe error. The definition of tree graphs is that the graph is connected and has no cycle. In general, cycles generate Bethe error. Moreover, the larger number of cycles or the smaller cycles in the graph, the larger error is there. The results of complete graphs are on the same line, where the error becomes more significant as the number of links increases because the number of cycles increases with the number of links. The results of ring graphs show the effect of the size of cycle. In Fig. 1(b), the error of 12-links is smaller than the error of others. It is because the cycle becomes similar with line topology as the number of links increases.

B. Utility Maximization

Convergence speed: Fig 2 shows the transmission intensity where the graph structure is tree. Note that in tree graphs, all of the algorithms have to converge to the same point, because $e_B(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ for all \mathbf{y} when the graph is tree. In the results, **BUM** becomes stable within only 1000 iterations, whereas the other algorithms does not converge until 10000 iterations. Although the lines of JW and EJW seems to be converged, they grow up very slowly. For the other interference graphs, the trace patterns look similar with the trace of tree graph. All of the algorithms do not converge




Fig. 2. Trace of transmission intensity

until 10000 iterations except **BUM** which converges within 1000 iterations for all graphs.

Network utility: As we stated in Theorem 4.2, **BUM** generates error due to Bethe approximation on intensity update. However, the error is not significant. By numerical analysis, we get the network utility when **BUM** is used: -19.9 (grid) and -8.1 (complete). The utility is close to the utility by the conventional algorithms based on MCMC: -20.6 (grid) and -8.05 (complete). In the results, all of the algorithms achieve similar utilities, while **BUM** is converged much faster than prior algorithms.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Recently, throughput and utility optimal CSMA algorithms are proposed. The simple and distributed MAC protocol can achieve the both throughput and utility optimal with just locally controlling of parameters. In the previous algorithms, links iteratively update their parameters by their own empirical service and arrival rates. However, their convergence speed is often slow because of the stochastic behavior of scheduling. In this paper, we firstly connect Bethe Free Energy (BFE) with CSMA so as to dramatically reduce the convergence speed. The motivation of this work is that the estimation on the service can be replaced by finding maximum point of the Bethe free energy function since the maximum point gives a good estimation on the service rate. From this motivation, we propose an algorithm by which the CSMA parameters can be nearly optimal without the investigation on service rate when links know the arrival rate of neighbor links by message exchange. In view of network utility, we propose an utility-maximizing algorithm **BUM** based on the intensity update algorithm using BFE. Since the algorithm does not use empirical values, **BUM** probably converges in polynomial time, where such a guarantee

cannot be achievable via prior known schemes.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Jiang, D. Shah, J. Shin, and J. Walrand, “Distributed random access algorithm: Scheduling and congestion control,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 12, pp. 6182–6207, dec. 2010.
- [2] L. Jiang and J. Walrand, “A distributed CSMA algorithm for throughput and utility maximization in wireless networks,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 960–972, June 2010.
- [3] —, “Approaching throughput-optimality in distributed csma scheduling algorithms with collisions,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 816–829, June 2011.
- [4] J. Liu, Y. Yi, A. Proutiere, M. Chiang, and H. V. Poor, “Towards utility-optimal random access without message passing,” *Wiley Journal of Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 115–128, Jan. 2010.
- [5] N. Hegde and A. Proutiere, “Simulation-based optimization algorithms with applications to dynamic spectrum access,” in *Proceedings of CISS*, 2012.
- [6] L. Tassiulas and A. Ephremides, “Stability properties of constrained queueing systems and scheduling for maximum throughput in multihop radio networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 37, no. 12, pp. 1936–1949, December 1992.
- [7] X. Lin, N. B. Shroff, and R. Srikant, “A tutorial on cross-layer design in wireless networks,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 24, pp. 1452–1463, 2006.
- [8] Y. Yi and M. Chiang, *Next-Generation Internet Architectures and Protocols*. Cambridge University Press, 2011, chapter 9: Stochastic network utility maximization and wireless scheduling.
- [9] R. Kindermann, J. Snell, and A. M. Society, *Markov random fields and their applications*, ser. Contemporary mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 1980. [Online]. Available: <http://books.google.com/books?id=NeVQAAAAMAAJ>
- [10] H. Georgii, *Gibbs Measures and Phase Transitions*, ser. De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics. W. de Gruyter, 1988, no. V. 9. [Online]. Available: <http://books.google.com/books?id=3YdI0yww12QC>
- [11] V. Chandrasekaran, N. Srebro, and P. Harsha, “Complexity of inference in graphical models,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Conference Annual Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI-08)*. Corvallis, Oregon: AUAI Press, 2008, pp. 70–78.
- [12] J. S. Yedidia, W. T. Freeman, and Y. Weiss, “Constructing free energy approximations and generalized belief propagation algorithms,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 51, pp. 2282–2312, 2005.
- [13] J. G. David Forney, “Codes on graphs: News and views,” in *Conference on Information Sciences and Systems*, 2001.
- [14] Y. W. K. P. Murphy and M. Jordan, “Loopy belief propagation for approximate inference: an empirical study,” in *In Proceedings of Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 1999.
- [15] J. Mo and J. Walrand, “Fair end-to-end window-based congestion control,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 556–567, 2000.
- [16] J. Ni, B. Tan, and R. Srikant, “Q-csma: Queue-length based CSMA/CA algorithms for achieving maximum throughput and low delay in wireless networks,” in *Proceedings of Infocom*, 2010.
- [17] D. Shah, J. Shin, and P. Tetali, “Medium access using queues,” in *Proceedings of Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 698–707.
- [18] D. Shah and J. Shin, “Randomized scheduling algorithm for queueing networks,” *Annals of Applied Probability*, vol. 22, pp. 128–171, 2012.

- [19] C.-H. Lee, D. Y. Eun, S.-Y. Yun, and Y. Yi, "From Glauber dynamics to Metropolis algorithm: Smaller delay in optimal CSMA," in *Proceedings of ISIT*, June 2012.
- [20] M. Lotfinezhad and P. Marbach, "Throughput-optimal random access with order-optimal delay," in *Proceedings of Infocom*, 2011.
- [21] C. H. Kai and S. C. Liew, "Applications of belief propagation in csma wireless networks," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 1276–1289, 2012.
- [22] P. Djukic, "Scheduling algorithms for tdma wireless multihop networks," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 2008.
- [23] Y. Yi, G. de Veciana, and S. Shakkottai, "Learning contention patterns and adapting to load/topology changes in a MAC scheduling algorithm," in *Proceedings of IEEE WiMesh*, 2006.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Lemma 4.1

Let $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})$ denote the Hessian matrix of $K_B(\mathbf{y})$ and $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{ij}$ denote the element of $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})$ on i th row and j th column. When the Hessian matrix $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})$ is negative definite matrix (*i.e.* $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{x} \leq 0$ for all \mathbf{x}) for all feasible \mathbf{y} , $K_B(\mathbf{y})$ is concave. Now, therefore, we will show the concaveness of $K_B(\mathbf{y})$ by showing that $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})$ is negative definite.

The diagonal elements $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{ij}$ are computed as followings:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{ii} &= \beta \cdot U_i''(y_i) + (d(i) - 1) \frac{1}{1 - y_i} \frac{1}{y_i} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{1}{1 - y_i - y_j} \\ &= -\alpha\beta \cdot y_i^{-\alpha-1} - \frac{1}{y_i} - \frac{1}{1 - y_i} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \left(\frac{1}{1 - y_i - y_j} - \frac{1}{1 - y_i} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is upper bounded as followings :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{ii} &< - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \left(\frac{1}{1 - y_i - y_j} - \frac{1}{1 - y_i} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \left(\frac{y_j}{1 - y_i} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - y_i - y_j} \right), \end{aligned}$$

since $-\alpha\beta \cdot y_i^{-\alpha-1} - \frac{1}{y_i} - \frac{1}{1 - y_i} < 0$. Moreover, when $y_i < 1/2$, we can get more tight upper

bound as followings:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{ii} &< -2d \cdot y_i^{-\alpha-1} + (d(i) - 1) \frac{1}{1-y_i} - \frac{1}{y_i} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{<} -d \cdot y_i^{-\alpha-1} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{<} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \left(\frac{1}{y_i} + \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} \right) \\
&= - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \left(\frac{1-y_j}{y_i} \cdot \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where for (a) we use $y_i^{-\alpha-1} > \frac{1}{1-y_i}$ when $y_i < 1/2$ and (b) follows from $y_i^{-\alpha-1} > 1/y_i$.

The non-diagonal elements are computed as following:

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{ij} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{ji} = -\frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} < 0 \text{ if } (i, j) \in E,$$

and 0 otherwise.

Without loss of generality, let $y_u \leq y_v$ when the edge is denoted by (u, v) . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{x}^T \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y}) \mathbf{x} &= \sum_{i \in V} x_i^2 \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{ii} + \sum_{(i,j) \in E} 2x_i x_j \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{ij} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{<} - \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \left(\frac{1-y_j}{y_i} \cdot \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} x_i^2 + \frac{2}{1-y_i-y_j} x_i x_j + \frac{y_i}{1-y_j} \cdot \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} x_j^2 \right) \\
&= - \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1-y_j}{y_i}} x_i + \sqrt{\frac{y_i}{1-y_j}} x_j \right)^2 \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we will show that (c) is hold.

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \left(\frac{1-y_j}{y_i} \cdot \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} x_i^2 + \frac{2}{1-y_i-y_j} x_i x_j + \frac{y_i}{1-y_j} \cdot \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} x_j^2 \right) - \sum_{(i,j) \in E} 2x_i x_j \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{ij} \\
&= - \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \left(\frac{1-y_j}{y_i} \cdot \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} x_i^2 + \frac{y_i}{1-y_j} \cdot \frac{1}{1-y_i-y_j} x_j^2 \right) \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\geq} - \sum_{y_u < 1/2, u \in V} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(u)} \frac{1-y_v}{y_u} \cdot \frac{1}{1-y_u-y_v} x_u^2 - \sum_{y_u \geq 1/2, u \in V} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(u)} \frac{y_v}{1-y_u} \cdot \frac{1}{1-y_u-y_v} x_u^2 \\
&> \sum_{u \in V} x_u^2 \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{y})_{uu},
\end{aligned}$$

where for (d) we use $y_i < 1/2$ and $\frac{1-y_j}{y_i} > \frac{y_i}{1-y_i-y_j}$ from the definition $y_i < y_j$ when $(i, j) \in E$. Thus, (c) is hold.

Therefore, \mathcal{H} is negative definite matrix. This is the end of the proof.

B. Proof of Lemma 4.2

We start by stating three key lemmas which play key roles in the proof of Lemma 4.2. First, by Lemma A.1, the gradient of $K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))$ is upper-bounded with $\delta(t)$ after time t^* . Next, we show that $\mathbf{y}(t+1)$ goes away from the boundary of D_B^* when $\mathbf{y}(t)$ is within $2\delta(t)$ away from the boundary, by Lemma A.2, Lemma A.3, and Lemma A.4. Then, the update of $\mathbf{y}(t)$ does not hit the boundary of D_B^* always.

Lemma A.1: There exists t_* such that , for all link i

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \left| \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))}{\partial y_i} \right| < \frac{\delta(t)}{2} \leq \frac{\delta_U}{2} \leq \frac{\delta_L}{2}, \quad \forall t \geq t_*,$$

where, $\delta_U := \frac{1}{10t_*^{1/4}}$, $\delta_L := \frac{1}{10 \log(e+t_*)}$, and $\delta(t) := \frac{0.1}{t^{1/4}}$.

Proof: The proof starts from the range of first derivative function at time t :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))}{\partial y_i} &= U'_i(y_i(t)) - (d(i) - 1) \log(1 - y_i(t)) - \log y_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \log(1 - y_i(t) - y_j(t)) \\ &\leq \beta y_i(t)^{-\alpha} - \log \frac{y_i(t)}{1 - y_i(t)} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \log \frac{1 - y_i(t) - y_j(t)}{1 - y_i(t)} \\ &\leq \beta y_i(t)^{-\alpha} - \log \frac{y_i(t)}{1 - y_i(t)} \\ &\leq (10\beta \log(e + t))^\alpha + \log(100 \log(e + t)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\delta(t)\sqrt{t}} \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))}{\partial y_i} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{10}{t^{1/4}} \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))}{\partial y_i} \leq 0.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))}{\partial y_i} &= U'_i(y_i(t)) - (d(i) - 1) \log(1 - y_i(t)) - \log y_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \log(1 - y_i(t) - y_j(t)) \\ &\geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \log(1 - y_i(t) - y_j(t)) \geq -\frac{d(i)}{4} \log(10t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\delta(t)\sqrt{t}} \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))}{\partial y_i} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{10}{t^{1/4}} \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y}(t))}{\partial y_i} \geq 0.$$

This is the end of proof. ■

Lemma A.2: Let $\varepsilon_2 := \frac{1}{2(\exp(\beta 2^\alpha) + 1)}$. Then,

$$\frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} < 0 \quad \text{if } y_i \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon_2 \text{ and } \mathbf{y} \in D_B^*.$$

Proof: We first provide a proof of this lemma as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} &= \beta y_i^{-\alpha} - (d(i) - 1) \log(1 - y_i) - \log y_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \log(1 - y_i - y_j) \\ &= \beta y_i^{-\alpha} - \log \frac{y_i}{1 - y_i} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \log \frac{1 - y_i - y_j}{1 - y_i} \\ &< \beta y_i^{-\alpha} - \log \frac{y_i}{1 - y_i} \\ &\leq \beta \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{-\alpha} - \log \frac{1 - 2\varepsilon_2}{2\varepsilon_2} \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is from our choice of

$$\varepsilon_2 = \frac{1}{2(\exp(\beta 2^\alpha) + 1)}.$$

Lemma A.3: Let $\delta_2 = \min\{\delta_U, \varepsilon_2\}$ and $\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\beta 2^\alpha \delta_2^d}{2(1 + \beta 2^\alpha d \delta_2^{d-1})}$. Then,

$$\frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} > 0 \quad \text{if } y_i \leq 2\varepsilon_1 \text{ and } \mathbf{y} \in D_B^*.$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} &= \beta y_i^{-\alpha} - (d(i) - 1) \log(1 - y_i) - \log y_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \log(1 - y_i - y_j) \\ &> \beta y_i^{-\alpha} - \log y_i + d \log(\delta_2 - y_i) \\ &= \log \frac{\exp(\beta y_i^{-\alpha}) (\delta_2 - y_i)^d}{y_i} \\ &= \log \frac{\exp(\beta y_i^{-\alpha}) \delta_2^d \left(1 - \frac{y_i}{\delta_2}\right)^d}{y_i} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to $y_i \leq 2\varepsilon_1$ with our choice of $\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\beta 2^\alpha \delta_2^d}{2(1 + \beta 2^\alpha d \delta_2^{d-1})}$ as

$$\frac{\beta y_i^{-\alpha} \delta_2^d \left(1 - \frac{y_i}{\delta_2}\right)^d}{y_i} \geq \frac{\beta y_i^{-\alpha} \delta_2^d \left(1 - d \frac{y_i}{\delta_2}\right)}{y_i} \geq \frac{\beta 2^\alpha \delta_2^d \left(1 - d \frac{y_i}{\delta_2}\right)}{y_i} \geq 1.$$

Lemma A.4: Let $\delta_1 = \min\{\delta_L, \varepsilon_1\}$ and $\varepsilon_3 = \frac{\delta_1}{4 \exp(\beta \delta_1^{-\alpha})}$. Then, for all $(i, j) \in E$,

$$\frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} < 0 \quad \text{if } y_i + y_j \geq 1 - 4\varepsilon_3 \quad \text{and } \mathbf{y} \in D_B^*.$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} &= \beta y_i^{-\alpha} - (d(i) - 1) \log(1 - y_i) - \log y_i + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \log(1 - y_k - y_i) \\ &= \beta y_i^{-\alpha} - \log y_i + \log(1 - y_i - y_j) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(i) \setminus j} \log \frac{1 - y_k - y_i}{1 - y_i} \\ &< \beta y_i^{-\alpha} - \log y_i + \log(1 - y_i - y_j) \\ &\leq \beta y_i^{-\alpha} - \log \delta_1 + \log 4\varepsilon_3 \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is from our choice of $\varepsilon_4 = \frac{\delta_1}{4 \exp(\beta \delta_1^{-\alpha})}$. ■

Completing the proof of Lemma 4.2. For proving $\mathbf{y}(t) \in D_B^*$, we need the following three inequalities:

$$y_i(t) < 1 - \delta_2 \tag{14}$$

$$y_i(t) > \delta_1 \tag{15}$$

$$y_i(t) + y_j(t) < 1 - 2\delta_3. \tag{16}$$

Proof of (14). Let $t_2 := (\frac{0.1}{\delta_2})^4$. Then, for time $t < t_2$, $y_i(t) < 1 - 2\delta_2$ from the dynamic bound. For time $t \geq t_2$, $y_i(t) < 1 - \delta_2$, since $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \left| \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} \right| < \frac{\delta(t)}{2} \leq \frac{\delta_2}{2}$ from Lemma A.1 and $\frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} < 0$ if $y_i > 1 - 2\delta_2$, from Lemma A.2.

Proof of (15). Similarly, let $t_1 := \exp(\frac{1}{100\delta_1}) - e$. Then, for time $t < t_1$, $y_i(t) > \delta_1$ from the dynamic bound. For time $t \geq t_1$, $y_i(t) > \delta_1$, since $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \left| \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} \right| < \frac{\delta_1}{2}$ from Lemma A.1 and $\frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} > 0$ if $y_i < 2\delta_1$, from Lemma A.3.

Proof of (16). Let $t_3 := (\frac{0.1}{\delta_3})^2$. Then, for time $t < t_3$, $y_i(t) + y_j(t) < 1 - 2\delta_3$ from the dynamic bound. For time $t \geq t_3$, $y_i(t) < 1 - 2\delta_3$, since $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \left(\left| \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_j} \right| \right) < \delta_3$ from Lemma A.1 and $\max\{\frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_i}, \frac{\partial K_B(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_j}\} < 0$ if $y_i + y_j > 1 - 4\delta_3$, from Lemma A.3.

By combining (14), (15) and (16), it follows that $\mathbf{y}(t) \in D_B^*$ for all t . This completes the proof of Lemma 4.2.