

Minimizing the Age of Two Heterogeneous Sources With Packet Drops Via Cyclic Schedulers

Sahan Liyanaarachchi¹, Sennur Ulukus¹, and Nail Akar²

¹University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

²Bilkent University, Ankara, Türkiye

Abstract—In a communication setting where multiple sources share a single channel to provide status updates to a remote monitor, source transmissions need to be scheduled appropriately to maintain timely communication between each of the sources and the monitor. We consider age-agnostic scheduling policies which are advantageous due to their simplicity of implementation. Further, we focus on a special class of age-agnostic policies, called *cyclic schedulers*, where each source is scheduled based on a fixed cyclic pattern. We use weighted average age of information (AoI) to quantify the timeliness of communication. We develop a Markov chain formulation to compute the exact mean AoI for the case of two-source cyclic schedulers. Based on the obtained age expression, we develop an algorithm that generates near-optimal cyclic schedulers to minimize the weighted average AoI for two heterogeneous sources, in the presence of channel errors.

I. INTRODUCTION

Timely communication is necessary in many remote estimation settings, where a source is sampled and the status updates are sent to a remote monitor through a random-delay channel. The timeliness of the status updates is measured through the average AoI of the process given by $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t]$, where $\Delta_t = t - u(t)$ is the instantaneous age of the source and $u(t)$ is the time of generation of the freshest update available at time t to the remote monitor [1]. A common scenario that arises in this setting is that multiple sources may share the same channel to provide status updates to the remote monitor [2]. We consider the *generate-at-will* model introduced in [3] for status generation where each source is capable of generating a status update at any time when needed. In this multi-source setting, status updates of some sources may be more important than the others and therefore the weighted average of mean AoI values of the sources (termed as weighted AoI in this paper) is often used as the metric for quantifying the timeliness of communication. To minimize the weighted AoI, the source transmissions need to be scheduled appropriately.

Maximum age first (MAF) policy [4]–[6], where the source with highest instantaneous age is scheduled, and *maximum-age-difference drop (MAD)* policy [7], where the source which would result in the maximum drop in age is scheduled, have been extensively studied in the literature for this multi-source setting. Max-weight, Whittle-index policies [8]–[10],

This work is done when N. Akar is on sabbatical leave as a visiting professor at University of Maryland, MD, USA, which is supported in part by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (Tübitak) 2219-International Postdoctoral Research Fellowship Program.




Fig. 1: System model.

along with MAF and MAD are a few examples of age-aware scheduling policies which require the transmitter to continuously track the age of the sources and therefore can introduce a significant communication overhead, especially in channels susceptible to packet drops (or errors). Moreover, in open-loop communication systems where the feedback on packet drops is absent (i.e., only the channel service time is known), these age aware schemes are not feasible. Therefore, age-agnostic cyclic scheduling has recently become a viable solution to mitigate this communication overhead [11]–[14].

A framework named *Eywa* was introduced in [13] where the goal is to construct *almost uniform cyclic schedulers (AUS)*, which is a special class of cyclic schedulers designed to distribute the scheduling instances of a given source as uniformly as possible within the cycle. *Eywa* works in the discrete time setting and assumes that all the sources have the same deterministic service times with heterogeneous packet errors. However, in a more practical setting, the service times of different sources may be different, in which case reference [14] obtains the optimal cyclic scheduler that minimizes the weighted AoI for two heterogeneous sources in the absence of packet errors. Reference [14] shows that in the absence of packet errors, the optimal cyclic schedulers are of the form $(1, \Theta)$ which represents a cyclic schedule where one scheduling instance of one of the sources is followed by Θ scheduling instances of the other source.

In this paper, we extend the work done in [14] to the case of packet errors, and find the best cyclic scheduler which is resilient even in the presence of packet errors in the channel. We note that there are some similarities but significant key differences between the optimal cyclic scheduler constructed in this work and the one constructed in the absence of packet errors [14]. In the presence of packet errors, we show that a near-optimal cyclic scheduler is a mixture of $(1, \Theta)$ and $(1, \Theta + 1)$ cyclic schedulers. We emphasize the fact that even

though we start off with cyclic schedulers, due to packet drops, the actual schedule of successful transmissions will no longer behave according to the constructed schedule. Hence, AoI computation is a difficult task even for two sources.

To summarize our contributions:

- We provide a Markov chain based formulation to compute the weighted AoI for two heterogeneous sources following a cyclic schedule in the presence of packet drops, which could also be extended to any number of sources.
- We provide an algorithm to produce cyclic schedulers which we prove to be near-optimal, i.e., given any $\epsilon > 0$, we can find a cyclic schedule whose weighted AoI is within ϵ of the actual optimum.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

Consider a communication system (shown in Fig. 1) consisting of two heterogeneous sources which provide status updates to a remote monitor through a shared random delay (or random service time) channel with packet drops where the two sources are scheduled according to a cyclic pattern. Once the transmitter has finished transmitting the current sample, it will immediately sample from the next source in the schedule and start transmitting this new sample. The information on whether the transmitted packet is dropped at the channel or not, is not available to the transmitter as in [13].

Let the two sources be denoted as S_1 and S_2 with the channel service times of the two sources given by the random variables X and Y with means s_1 , s_2 and variances v_1 , v_2 , respectively. Let the packet drop probability of the two sources be p and q . Let us denote by u , the cycle length and by u_1 , the number of instances of S_1 within the cycle. Then, $u_2 = u - u_1$ is the number of scheduling instances for S_2 . Let $\mathbf{r} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{u_1}\}$ represent the placement vector of the schedule with respect to S_1 , where r_i is the number of S_2 scheduling instances between the i th and the $(i+1)$ th scheduling instances of S_1 . Then, (u, u_1, \mathbf{r}) represents any cyclic schedule of the two sources uniquely. For example, the schedule $\{S_1, S_2, S_1, S_2, S_2\}$ will be represented by the tuple $(5, 2, \{1, 2\})$. Any feasible cycle should allocate at least one scheduling instance for each source. Therefore, for a feasible schedule, $u > u_1 \geq 1$.

The first step towards realizing our goal is to analytically obtain the mean AoI (or average AoI or AoI in short) of each of the two sources of the cyclic schedule by taking into account the packet drop probabilities.

III. AOI ANALYSIS

To derive the AoI expression, we first consider S_1 and use a Markov chain formulation to characterize its AoI process. In one scheduling cycle, there are u_1 scheduling instances of S_1 . Therefore, based on where two consecutive AoI drops occur relative to the cycle, we can define u_1^2 states for the Markov chain. Let (i, j) for $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, u_1\}$ denote an AoI cycle starting from the i th scheduling instance of S_1 and ending in the j th scheduling instance of S_1 . Note (i, j) represents the i th and the j th scheduling instances of S_1 relative to one cycle




Fig. 2: Partial state transition diagram for $u_1 > 2$.

of the schedule. Each state transition occurs after successfully (without packet drop) transmitting a sample from S_1 . Fig. 2 shows a partial state transition diagram of the Markov chain.

As shown in Fig. 2, state (i, j) is only directly accessible by states of the form (k, i) and they all share the same transition probability $p_{i,j}$. Only states of the form (i, i) have self transitions. The transition probabilities are given as,

$$p_{i,j} = \frac{(1-p)p^{j-i-1}}{1-p^{u_1}}, \quad \text{if } j > i, \quad (1)$$

$$p_{i,j} = \frac{(1-p)p^{j+u_1-i-1}}{1-p^{u_1}}, \quad \text{if } i \geq j. \quad (2)$$

Since these are finite-state Markov chains with no absorbing states for $p > 0$, they are positive recurrent and irreducible. Since they contain self-loops, they are aperiodic and hence are ergodic. Let $\pi = \{\pi_{(i,j)}\}$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, u_1\}$ denote the stationary distribution and $P_{(k,l),(i,j)}$ denote the transition probability from state (k, l) to state (i, j) of the Markov chain. Then, the stationary distribution takes the following form,

$$\pi_{i,j} = \frac{p_{i,j}}{u_1}. \quad (3)$$

To compute the average AoI, we partition the AoI (or age) graph based on the states of the Markov chain. Let $A_{i,j}$ denote the area under the age curve when the two consecutive age drops are placed at the i th and j th scheduling instances of the cycle. Let $T_{i,j}$ denote the time spent for the aforementioned age drops. Since the Markov chain is ergodic, the average AoI of S_1 denoted by $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^1]$, is given by,

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^1] = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{u_1} \sum_{j=1}^{u_1} \pi_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[A_{i,j}]}{\sum_{i=1}^{u_1} \sum_{j=1}^{u_1} \pi_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[T_{i,j}]} \quad (4)$$

Therefore, to compute the average AoI, we need to find $\mathbb{E}[A_{i,j}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[T_{i,j}]$. $A_{i,j}$ consists of the segments of the age curve with consecutive age drops happening at the i th and j th scheduling instances of S_1 . Suppose an AoI drop happens at i th scheduling instance, then the next AoI drop may happen at the j th scheduling instance after going through multiple rounds of the entire cycle. This is illustrated in Fig. 3, where failed S_1 transmissions are crossed out in red. Let M denote the number of rounds of the entire cycle that have elapsed before the next successful transmission of a S_1 sample occurring at the j th scheduling instance. For example, if the next successful transmission occurs in the second round, then $M = 1$. Then, $M = \bar{M} - 1$, where $\bar{M} \sim \text{Geom}(p^{u_1})$. Let $Z_{i,j}$ denote the time duration elapsed starting from the beginning of the $(M+1)$ th round to the AoI drop occurring at the j th scheduling instance of S_1 . Let Z_m denote the time duration of the m th round.




Fig. 3: AoI graph of the schedule $\{S_1, S_2, S_1, S_2, S_2\}$ showing a realization of the area $A_{1,2}$ when $M = 1$.

Then, $\mathbb{E}[A_{i,j}]$ can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[A_{i,j}] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(2X + \sum_{m=1}^M Z_m + Z_{i,j}\right)\left(\sum_{m=1}^M Z_m + Z_{i,j}\right)\right]}{2} \\ &= \frac{\tilde{m}\hat{s}^2 + \bar{m}(2s_1\hat{s} + \hat{v}) + \tilde{z}_{i,j} + 2\bar{z}_{i,j}(\bar{m}\hat{s} + s_1)}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{s} = u_1s_1 + u_2s_2$, $\hat{v} = u_1v_1 + u_2v_2$, $\mathbb{E}[M] = \bar{m}$, $\mathbb{E}[M^2] = \tilde{m}$, $\mathbb{E}[Z_{i,j}] = \bar{z}_{i,j}$ and $\mathbb{E}[Z_{i,j}^2] = \tilde{z}_{i,j}$. Similarly, $\mathbb{E}[T_{i,j}]$ can be written as,

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{i,j}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{m=1}^M Z_m + Z_{i,j}\right] = \bar{m}\hat{s} + \bar{z}_{i,j} \quad (6)$$

Then, by substituting (5) and (6) into (4), we find the average AoI of S_1 as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^1] &= \frac{\tilde{m}\hat{s}^2 + \bar{m}(2s_1\hat{s} + \hat{v}) + \sum_{i,j} \pi_{i,j} \tilde{z}_{i,j}}{2(\bar{m}\hat{s} + \sum_{i,j} \pi_{i,j} \bar{z}_{i,j})} \\ &\quad + \frac{(\bar{m}\hat{s} + s_1) \sum_{i,j} \pi_{i,j} \bar{z}_{i,j}}{\bar{m}\hat{s} + \sum_{i,j} \pi_{i,j} \bar{z}_{i,j}} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Let $a = \frac{u_2}{u_1}$, $s = as_2 + s_1$ and $v = av_2 + v_1$. Then, based on the symmetric nature of the stationary distribution, we can further simplify the above expression using the following,

$$\sum_{i,j} \pi_{i,j} \bar{z}_{i,j} = s \frac{(1-p)}{(1-p^{u_1})} \sum_{i=1}^{u_1} ip^{i-1}, \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j} \pi_{i,j} \tilde{z}_{i,j} &= \frac{(1-p)}{(1-p^{u_1})} \sum_{i=1}^{u_1} [iv + i^2s^2] p^{i-1} \\ &\quad + s^2 \frac{(1-p)}{u_1(1-p^{u_1})} \sum_{i=1}^{u_1} (\tilde{r}(i) - u_1a^2i^2) p^{i-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

In (9), $\tilde{r}(i)$ is defined as follows,

$$\tilde{r}(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{u_1} \left(\sum_{k=j}^{j+i-1} \gamma_k \right)^2 \quad (10)$$

where $\gamma = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{u_1}, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{u_1}\}$. The $\tilde{r}(i)$ term is

simply the sum of squared sum of i consecutive elements in the placement vector. For example, $\tilde{r}(1)$, $\tilde{r}(2)$ and $\tilde{r}(3)$ are,

$$\tilde{r}(1) = r_1^2 + r_2^2 + \dots + r_{u_1}^2 \quad (11)$$

$$\tilde{r}(2) = (r_1 + r_2)^2 + (r_2 + r_3)^2 + \dots + (r_{u_1} + r_1)^2 \quad (12)$$

$$\tilde{r}(3) = (r_1 + r_2 + r_3)^2 + (r_2 + r_3 + r_4)^2 \dots + (r_{u_1} + r_1 + r_2)^2 \quad (13)$$

Substituting (8) and (9) into (7) yields average AoI of S_1 as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^1] &= \frac{(1+p)}{2(1-p)}s + \frac{v}{2s} + s_1 \\ &\quad + s^2 \frac{(1-p)^2}{2su_1(1-p^{u_1})} \sum_{i=1}^{u_1} (\tilde{r}(i) - u_1a^2i^2) p^{i-1} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Similarly, the average AoI of S_2 denoted by $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^2]$, can be found based on the placement vector of S_2 (by reversing the roles of S_1 and S_2).

Remark 1 When $p = 0$, (14) reduces to the AoI obtained in [14] which is a special case of the model studied here.

Remark 2 By appropriately modifying Z_m and $Z_{i,j}$ in (5), we can find the average AoI of a cyclic scheduler with arbitrary number of sources, i.e., $N > 2$.

IV. MINIMIZING THE WEIGHTED AOI

Let w_1 and w_2 be the normalized weights associated with S_1 and S_2 , respectively. Our goal is to find the best possible cyclic scheduler that minimizes the weighted AoI $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^w]$ of the sources given below,

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^w] = w_1\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^1] + w_2\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^2]. \quad (15)$$

We start by analyzing the optimization of $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^1]$ alone, and later show that independently minimizing $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^1]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^2]$ jointly minimizes both, and hence minimizes $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^w]$.

To proceed with the analysis, for fixed u_1 and u_2 , we need to find the optimal placement vector \mathbf{r} that minimizes (14). By relaxing the integer constraint on the placement vector, it follows that the minimum is achieved when all r_i are equal, i.e., $r_i = a$. Subsequently applying the integer constraints yields that r_i is either $\lceil a \rceil$ or $\lfloor a \rfloor$. The structure of the optimal placement vector is then,

$$r_i = \begin{cases} \lfloor a \rfloor, & \#u_1(\lceil a \rceil - a), \\ \lceil a \rceil, & \#u_1(1 + a - \lceil a \rceil). \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where $\#$ denotes the number of elements of each term.

Now that we know the structure of the optimal placement vector, next we need to find the optimal arrangement of $\lceil a \rceil$ and $\lfloor a \rfloor$ terms within the placement vector. This is one of the key differences from the work in [14] where the ordering of the placement vector is inconsequential. Note that to minimize $\tilde{r}(i)$ we need to spread the elements such that they are as uniform as possible within every window of consecutive i terms. This is achieved by hierarchically spreading different sub-blocks of the placement vector as given by Algorithm 1.




Fig. 4: Variation of weighted AoI with packet drop probability and mean of S_1 for exponential service times ($s_2 = 3$, $w_1 = 0.2$, $w_2 = 0.8$, $q = 0.9$).

Then, $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^1] = f(a) - g(a) + h(a)$. In Algorithm 2, we fix u_1 and increase u_2 since $a^* > 1$. Since $f(a)$ is a continuous function of a , if a is sufficiently close to a^* , $f(a) \approx f(a^*)$. For sufficiently large u_1 , $\sum_{i=1}^{u_1} i^2 p^{i-1} / (1-p^{u_1})$ is approximately a constant. Therefore, when a is sufficiently close to a^* , $g(a) \approx g(a^*)$. Consider an $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_0 = \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha} < a^* < \frac{\alpha_0+1}{\alpha} = a_1$. If α is sufficiently large, for all a such that $a_0 < a < a_1$, $\lceil a \rceil = \lceil a^* \rceil$ and $\lfloor a \rfloor = \lfloor a^* \rfloor$. Thus, the placement vector for any $a \in [a_0, a_1]$ consists of either $\lceil a^* \rceil$ or $\lfloor a^* \rfloor$.

Now, consider $a = (a_0 + a_1)/2 = (2\alpha_0 + 1)/2\alpha$. The average AoI when $(u_1, u_2) = (\alpha, \alpha_0)$ is equal to the average AoI when $(u_1, u_2) = (2\alpha, 2\alpha_0)$. The placement vector of $(2\alpha, 2\alpha_0 + 1)$ would only differ in one term with the placement vector of $(2\alpha, 2\alpha_0)$, where it is increased by 1. Therefore, the difference in $\tilde{r}(i)$ of the two patterns will be bounded by $2(\lceil a^* \rceil + 1)i^2$. Therefore, the difference in the average AoI is bounded by $2C(\lceil a^* \rceil + 1) \sum_{i=1}^{u_1} i^2 p^{i-1} / u_1$, where C is a constant. Since α is large, we have made the assumption that $(1 - p^{u_1}) \approx 1$. Therefore, by approaching a^* in a bisection search, we can show that the AoI difference when $a = a^*$ and when a equals one of the end points a_0 or a_1 , will be bounded by a constant times $1/\alpha$. A similar argument holds for $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_t^2]$. Therefore, by selecting a large enough α , we can make our solution as close as desired to the optimal solution.

VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We compare the performance of our scheduler marked *optimal* with the *probabilistic generate-at-will* (P-GAW) [14] and the *Eywa* [13]. In P-GAW, the i th source is scheduled for transmission with probability p_i , with $p_1 + p_2 = 1$ and the optimal p_1 values is found through a 1-dim exhaustive search.

We first compare the performance of our scheduler against the P-GAW scheduler for exponential channel service times. For this, we fix the parameters of S_2 and vary either the packet drop probability of S_1 or the mean of S_1 . As seen in Fig. 4, our scheduler achieves significantly lower average AoI than P-GAW. This is to be expected since the average AoI of a P-GAW model is simply an expectation of all deterministic cyclic schedules and ours is the closest to the best cyclic schedule. For identical deterministic channel service times (i.e., $s_1 = s_2$ and $v_1 = v_2 = 0$), we compare the performance of our scheduler against both P-GAW and *Eywa*. We fix the parameters of S_2 and in one experiment we vary the packet




Fig. 5: Variation of weighted AoI with packet drop probability of S_1 for deterministic service times ($s_1 = s_2 = 1$, $w_1 = 0.5$, $w_2 = 0.5$, $q = 0.9$).




Fig. 6: Variation of weighted AoI with weight of S_1 for deterministic service times ($s_1 = s_2 = 1$, $p = 0.9$, $q = 0.9$).

drop probability of S_1 , and in the other, we vary the weight given to the two sources. As shown in figures 5 and 6, our scheduler outperforms both *Eywa* and P-GAW.

In each of the experiments, we also adopt the insertion search (IS) algorithm introduced in [14] as a heuristic-based method for the construction of cyclic schedulers for more than two sources in the absence of packet errors. IS algorithm starts off from a RR pattern and constructs a cyclic schedule in an iterative fashion. In each iteration, the source that will result in the lowest average AoI is selected by considering all possible sources, and all possible locations in the current pattern where a new scheduling instance can be inserted. [14] shows that IS is optimal for two sources in the absence of packet errors. In the presence of packet errors, our experimental results show that the IS algorithm performs very close to the optimum solution. However, IS has a higher computational complexity than our algorithm and is not proven to be optimal in the presence of packet errors.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have presented a theoretical framework to compute the average per-source AoI for cyclic scheduling in the presence of packet errors for two heterogeneous sources, and we provided several algorithms which enable us to find a near-optimal cyclic scheduler to minimize the weighted AoI. We have shown through numerical results and simulations that our scheduler outperforms existing age-agnostic schedulers.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. D. Yates, Y. Sun, D. R. Brown, S. K. Kaul, E. Modiano, and S. Ulukus. Age of information: An introduction and survey. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communication*, 39(5):1183–1210, May 2021.
- [2] R. D. Yates and S. K. Kaul. The age of information: Real-time status updating by multiple sources. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(3):1807–1827, March 2019.
- [3] R. D. Yates. Lazy is timely: Status updates by an energy harvesting source. In *IEEE ISIT*, June 2015.
- [4] A. M. Bedewy, Y. Sun, S. Kompella, and N. B. Shroff. Optimal sampling and scheduling for timely status updates in multi-source networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(6):4019–4034, June 2021.
- [5] Y. Sun, E. Uysal-Biyikoglu, and S. Kompella. Age-optimal updates of multiple information flows. In *IEEE Infocom*, April 2018.
- [6] Y. Sun and S. Kompella. Age-optimal multi-flow status updating with errors: A sample-path approach. *Journal of Communications and Networks*, 25(5):570–584, October 2023.
- [7] H. B. Beytur and E. Uysal-Biyikoglu. Minimizing age of information for multiple flows. In *IEEE BlackSeaCom*, June 2018.
- [8] I. Kadota, A. Sinha, E. Uysal-Biyikoglu, R. Singh, and E. Modiano. Scheduling policies for minimizing age of information in broadcast wireless networks. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 26(6):2637–2650, December 2018.
- [9] A. Maatouk, S. Kriouile, M. Assad, and A. Ephremides. On the optimality of the Whittle’s index policy for minimizing the age of information. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 20(2):1263–1277, February 2021.
- [10] S. Kriouile, M. Assaad, and A. Maatouk. On the optimality of the Whittle’s index policy for minimizing the age of information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(1):572–600, January 2022.
- [11] F. Liu, W. S. Wong, Y-H Lo, Y. Zhang, C.S. Chen, and G. Xing. Age of information for periodic status updates under sequence based scheduling. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 71(10):5963–5978, October 2023.
- [12] C. Li, Q. Liu Wong, S. Li, Y. Chen, Y. T. Hou, and W. Lou. On scheduling with AoI violation tolerance. In *IEEE Infocom*, May 2021.
- [13] C. Li, S. Li, Q. Liu, Y. T. Hou, W. Lou, and S. Kompella. Eywa: A general approach for scheduler design in AoI optimization. In *IEEE Infocom*, May 2023.
- [14] E. O. Gamgam, N. Akar, and S. Ulukus. Minimizing weighted sum age of information with open-loop cyclic scheduling. Available online at arXiv:2311.18791.