

A Survey on Adversarial Contention Resolution

IOANA BANICESCU, Mississippi State University, USA

TRISHA CHAKRABORTY, Mississippi State University, USA

SETH GILBERT, National University of Singapore, Singapore

MAXWELL YOUNG*, Mississippi State University, USA

Contention resolution addresses the challenge of coordinating access by multiple processes to a shared resource such as memory, disk storage, or a communication channel. Originally spurred by challenges in database systems and bus networks, contention resolution has endured as an important abstraction for resource sharing, despite decades of technological change. Here, we survey the literature on resolving worst-case contention, where the number of processes and the time at which each process may start seeking access to the resource is dictated by an adversary. We highlight the evolution of contention resolution, where new concerns—such as security, quality of service, and energy efficiency—are motivated by modern systems. These efforts have yielded insights into the limits of randomized and deterministic approaches, as well as the impact of different model assumptions such as global clock synchronization, knowledge of the number of processors, feedback from access attempts, and attacks on the availability of the shared resource.

CCS Concepts: • **Theory of computation** → **Distributed algorithms**; • **Networks** → **Network algorithms**; *Network protocols*; • **Security and privacy** → *Network security*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: survey, contention resolution, backoff, wakeup problem, selection problem, multiple access channel, broadcast, algorithms, stability, conflict resolution, Ethernet, makespan, queuing theory, adversarial queuing theory

*This work is supported by the NSF award CCF-2144410. Contact author: myoung@cse.msstate.edu.

Authors' addresses: Ioana Banicescu, ioana@cse.msstate.edu, Mississippi State University, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Mississippi State, MS, USA, 39762; Trisha Chakraborty, tc2006@msstate.edu, Mississippi State University, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Mississippi State, MS, USA, 39762; Seth Gilbert, gilbert@comp.nus.edu.sg, National University of Singapore, Department of Computer Science, School of Computing, Singapore, 119077; Maxwell Young, myoung@cse.msstate.edu, Mississippi State University, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Mississippi State, MS, USA, 39762.

1 INTRODUCTION

“I saw two New Yorkers, complete strangers, sharing a cab. One guy took the tires and the radio; the other guy took the engine.” – David Letterman

How do we share a resource? This is a common problem, not only in large cities such as New York City, but also in a wide range of computer systems such as: wireless clients in WiFi networks [36] and cellular networks [158]; processes in a shared-memory architecture [22]; nodes deciding on membership in a maximal independent set [71]; and concurrency control for databases [142, 143]. These are examples where system participants must share a resource, such as memory, disk storage, a data structure, or a wired or wireless communication channel. **Contention resolution** refers to this challenge of coordinating access to a common resource, and it arises from challenges posed by early computer systems. Over time, the problem has evolved to capture the challenges motivated by modern systems, such as wireless security, quality of service, and energy efficiency.

Scope and Goals. In this survey, we focus on contention resolution in the presence of an adversary that (1) controls when participants can begin executing their contention resolution protocol, and (2) may deny access to the shared resource for periods of time; we refer to this as **adversarial contention resolution**. This stands in contrast to the setting where participants arrival times are governed by a stochastic process, which is an area of research that has been previously surveyed by Chlebus [51]. The overall goal of our survey is to summarize the many models and performance metrics present in the literature on adversarial contention resolution, along with discussing their corresponding theoretical results.

1.1 Definitions, Terminology, Models, Metrics, and Algorithm Design

Several problems are synonymous with contention resolution: k -selection [81], all-broadcast [51], the wakeup problem [115], and conflict resolution [119]. To provide a unified presentation, we review terminology that is common to the literature, elaborate on performance metrics, and highlight those aspects used to organize the literature.

1.1.1 Multiple Access Channel. Throughout, we consider a time-slotted system with $n \geq 2$ system **participants**, each seeking access to a shared resource. In each **slot**, a participant may choose to access the shared resource and, if it is the only participant to do so, this access attempt is **successful**. Else, if two or more participants make an attempt in the same slot, the result is a **collision** and no participant succeeds in this slot. Finally, if no participant makes an access attempt, then the corresponding slot is **empty**.

In practice, the resource itself may be local to a single machine; for example, corresponding to the critical section of a program, or a common disk shared by multiple processes. This extends to networked settings where participants access, for instance, shared memory or separate machines via remote procedure calls.

In the literature, the resource is frequently treated as a shared communication channel, and this is the convention we use throughout this survey. Such a channel is typically referred to as a **multiple access channel**, which is a popular model under which several fundamental problems have been examined, such as mutual exclusion [40, 70], leader election [47, 48, 148], consensus [70], routing [55], broadcast problem [4, 4, 53, 57, 65, 66, 109, 120, 121, 130, 131], and well-known random access protocols [122]. Here, for any given slot, accessing the resource corresponds to a participant **listening** (equivalently, **receiving**) or **sending** (equivalently, **transmitting**) a **packet** on the multiple access channel. Unless stated otherwise, a packet can be transmitted within a single slot. When a packet is sent in a slot, we say this packet succeeds if no other packet is sent in the same slot; otherwise, the packet fails.

For ease of exposition, we slightly abuse terminology and often refer to packets themselves taking action (e.g., sending themselves on the channel, listening on the channel), rather than introducing “participants”/“devices”/“nodes”.

1.1.2 Models Assumptions. We discuss model assumptions that play an important role in establishing asymptotic upper and lower bounds with respect to the metrics discussed above.

Packet Arrivals. An important aspect is the timing by which new packets are generated (i.e., arrive) in the system. A simple case is where each participant has a single packet, and all participants start executing a contention-resolution algorithm at the same point in time. Equivalently, from a packet-centric view, all packets arrive simultaneously as a single **batch**; this is often referred to as the **static case** in the literature (see [120]).

In contrast, in the **dynamic** case, packets arrive over time; this arrival model is also referred to in the literature as **asynchronous** (see [120]). The literature adopts the terminology of **arrival time** or **activation time** to indicate when a participant begins executing a contention resolution protocol in order to send packets. These times may be governed by a stochastic process (see the survey by Chlebus [51]), or they may be scheduled by an adversary; in this survey, we focus on the latter setting.

Channel Characteristics. When a participant sends a packet, the multiple access channel provides feedback. The most basic feedback—assumed in all the literature we survey—occurs when, upon sending its packet, a participant learns whether or not its transmission was successful.

Another type of feedback concerns whether participants can detect collisions. Almost all of the literature on contention resolution assumes one of the following two types of feedback regarding collisions. The first is **collision detection (CD)**: in any slot, each listening participant can differentiate between the case where the number of participants transmitting is 0 (i.e., an empty slot) or greater than 1 (i.e., a collision). The second is **no collision detection (no-CD)**: in any slot, a listening device cannot differentiate between the slot being empty versus containing a collision.

In many works, participants that listen to the channel also learn whether or not a slot contains a successful transmission. In such a setting with CD, the channel provides *ternary feedback* (sometimes referred to as “trinary feedback”) indicating whether the slot is empty, contains a successful transmission, or contains a collision. Similarly, in this setting, no-CD provides *binary feedback*.¹

There are some nuances to consider. Does a sending participant obtain different feedback with CD versus no-CD? In either case, the sender immediately learns whether its packet was sent successfully. This implies that, if the sender fails, it can infer this is the result of a collision.

Another nuance is that, while a listening participant may detect a packet success in a slot, many works do not require that the corresponding message content is accessible (see [19, 26, 46, 159, 160, 162, 163]), while for other results, this is critical (see [1, 30, 31]). This content is also sometimes referred to as **control bits**, and we refer to the property of being able to access message content **snooping**.

Finally, some papers consider the case where more than one channel is available to participants; this is typically referred to as a **multi-channel setting**. Here, participants may select any one (and only one) channel to send on or listen to in any given slot.

¹Other variants of collision detection appear in the wider literature involving multiple access channels (see [47, 48]). Additionally, more exotic channel models have been considered; for example, De Marco and Kowalski [132] consider the case where channel feedback yields the number of senders.

Network Topology. A **single-hop network** is one where each participant can communicate with every other participant directly. In contrast, in a **multi-hop network**, a communication may need to pass between many participants until it reaches its intended recipient.

For the contention resolution problem, the type of topology critically impacts channel feedback. With CD in a single-hop network, all participants can detect when a collision occurs. However, in a multi-hop network, only a subset of participants may detect a collision.

Global Knowledge. What information do all packets have about the system *a priori*? Having all packets agree on certain system parameters can significantly ease the challenge of contention resolution.

- *System-Size Knowledge.* The exact number of the participants may be known *a priori*. Alternatively, an upper bound may be common knowledge. For example, in some problem formulations (see Section 3.2), only a subset of $k \leq n$ participants have a packet to send, where n acts as an upper bound that is known or tightly-estimated *a priori*.
- *Unique Identifiers.* Given n participants, each may have a unique identifier (**ID**) taken from a set of $\Theta(n)$ possible IDs. This ID may be used by an algorithm to determine when the corresponding station attempts to access the shared resource.
- *Global Clock.* In the static case, all participants obtain their respective packet in the same slot s . This offers a common point for synchronization; that is, all participants may consider s to have index 0. Thus, for the static case, there is the implicit assumption of a global clock. For dynamic arrivals, packets may be generated at participants at different times. In this case, if all participants agree on the index of the current slot, then they are said to have access to a global clock.

1.1.3 Metrics. In the static case, a natural performance measure is the number of slots until a set of packets succeeds; this number of slots is referred to as the **makespan**. The ratio of the number of successful packets to slots is known as **throughput** and is another common notion of performance; note that throughput is a value between 0 and 1. Although throughput can be differentiated from **channel utilization** (for example, see [85]), in the literature surveyed, the two are treated identically.

For the dynamic case, the above metrics remain valid when measured over periods of time during which there is at least one packet in the system. However, another metric is the number of slots it takes for a participant to successfully transmit its packet starting from its activation time; this is **latency**. In the dynamic case, we are interested in the maximum latency over all participants which is sometimes used interchangeably with makespan in the literature. Here, we use latency to be explicit about results in the dynamic setting (specifically, in Sections 3.2 and 3.3).

In much of the early literature on the dynamic case, packets are generated according to a stochastic process, and efficiency is tied to the **packet arrival rate**; that is, the number of packets that are newly generated (**arrive**) in each slot and held by (some subset) of participants. For any participant, its unsent packets are stored in a queue for eventual transmission on the multiple access channel, and this number of unsent packets is referred to as the **queue size**. Given a packet arrival rate, the goal is to guarantee that every queue has bounded size. The higher the rate that can be tolerated, the more efficiently the algorithm allows the network to digest new packets. In Section 3.1, we expand on this notion, which is generally referred to as **stability**.

Given the popularity of small, battery-powered wireless devices in modern networks, many contemporary results focus on energy efficiency. The energy consumed by a participant is typically measured as the number of slots




Fig. 1. An illustration of features used to structure our survey of the literature. Larger boxes correspond to general features, while smaller boxes indicate those that are more fine-grained.

that the participant accesses the channel, as sending and listening often dominate the operational costs of such devices [80, 157, 171, 180]. We refer to this as the *number of channel accesses*.

Robustness to malicious interference—often referred to as *jamming*—is becoming increasingly important, with several well-publicized attacks in recent years [15, 67, 149, 172]. Contention-resolution algorithms that rely on channel feedback are especially vulnerable to adversarial noise. We refer to this aspect as *attack resistance* and, for each relevant result, we describe the type of attack that can be tolerated.

1.1.4 Algorithm Design. There is some common terminology used in the literature to characterize contention resolution algorithms, which we summarize below.

- *Deterministic versus Randomized.* If the algorithm requires no random bits, then it is deterministic. Deterministic solutions are appealing from a practical standpoint in that their guarantees hold even when the number of participants and/or packets is small, admitting no error probability. In trade, they tend to provide sub-optimal asymptotic results in many settings, compared to randomized solutions.
- *Adaptive versus Non-Adaptive.* An *adaptive* algorithm knows the full history of channel feedback and can use this information to inform future actions. Each packet contains the unique ID of the sender. Additionally, a packet may contain extra bits—referred to as *control bits*—that other participants may read upon receiving the packet [107]. Additionally—abusing language slightly—a packet may send messages consisting only of control bits in order to facilitate coordination (see [61]).

In contrast, the only feedback that may alter the execution of a *non-adaptive* algorithm is a participant learning that its packet has been successfully transmitted, after which the participant terminates [133]. There is a

less-common notion of **strong non-adaptiveness**, where the execution of a participant is not even altered by the outcome of a transmission (again, see [133]).

- *Full-sensing*. Just like an adaptive algorithm, a **full-sensing** algorithm knows the full history of transmissions by all packets; this aligns with the notion in the literature that a full-sensing algorithm listens to the channel all the time [98]. Additionally, as with an adaptive algorithm, a full-sensing algorithm may use the transmission history to inform future actions, and each packet contains a unique ID. However, a full-sensing algorithm is not allowed control bits [58, 107].
- *Acknowledgement-Based*. Throughout this survey, algorithms that terminate when they receive an acknowledgement are said to be **acknowledgement-based** [135]. In contrast, a participant may continue executing an algorithm even though its own packet has been successfully transmitted; in this case, the algorithm is **non-acknowledgement-based**. We note that this terminology appears to differ slightly in the literature. For example, in the stochastic dynamic model, an **acknowledgement-based** algorithm is one that depends on the packet’s *own* (rather than the full) history of transmission attempts [98]. In the context of **adversarial queueing theory (AQT)** (see Section 3.1) have a different definition: under an acknowledgement-based algorithm, a participant sends its packet according to a schedule that can depend on its own ID and the current round (see [58, 107, 135]). The latter definition incorporates a dependency on IDs, since much of the work in the acknowledgement-based setting involves deterministic algorithms, which require unique IDs (see Section 3.2 for more discussion). These definitions do not contradict, but rather expand on, the definition we adopt here.

These classifications can be useful, since they indicate the strength of the underlying assumptions being made. For example, an algorithm that is randomized and full-sensing makes stronger assumptions than an algorithm that is deterministic and acknowledgement-based. A device running the former algorithm must have a pseudorandom number generator and be able to receive feedback on the channel. In contrast, the latter algorithm can function even when channel sensing is unavailable—either due to the nature of the channel or a participant’s hardware constraints—and the resulting protocol may be less complex in its implementation by eschewing randomness and knowledge of transmission history. We note that this classification can be complicated to apply in certain cases; for example, in a multi-channel setting, a device may not have the full history of feedback on *all* channels. In situations where this classification is clear, we present this information; otherwise, we omit it.

1.2 Survey Organization

We use the attributes illustrated in Figure 1 to structure our review of the literature. In Section 2, we begin with contention-resolution algorithms for the static setting. This provides an introduction to the important metric of makespan, as well as the use of randomization in designing contention-resolution algorithms. Next, in Section 3, we move to dynamic model of packet arrivals, focusing on the case when arrival times are dictated by an adversary. Finally, in Section 4, we address additional adversarial behavior in the form of malicious interference on the channel.

Each section that reports on major result has the following associated components:

- (1) A specific result that we feel provides some intuition for an important aspect of the results surveyed. This helps us to highlight (i) those challenges posed by the contention-resolution problem being addressed, and (ii) one way in which these challenges can be overcome, which in turn, allows us to contrast against some other surveyed solutions.




Fig. 2. Pseudocode for BEB and an illustration of the first few contention windows. Time moves from left to right.

- (2) A discussion portion, where we highlight the main themes of the literature surveyed, along with some potential directions for future work.
- (3) A table that offers a synopsis of the results in each section by organizing the results along common, pertinent attributes from Section 1.1. A brief summary of the result is also provided, which can be useful for reference purposes. Due to space constraints, these tables can be found in our electronic supplement (Section 6).

2 STATIC SETTING

We begin our survey with the static setting for packet arrivals. This motivates a well-known class of randomized, non-adaptive *backoff* algorithms, with origins in decades-old networking protocols; we explore this topic in Section 2.1. Additionally, the static setting also allows us to introduce deterministic algorithms, which are newer additions to the literature; we review these results in Section 2.2.

2.1 Backoff Algorithms

Arguably, the most well-known backoff algorithm is randomized *binary exponential backoff* (BEB), which was introduced by Metcalf and Boggs [141]. BEB proceeds in disjoint *contention windows (CWs)* consisting of consecutive slots. In each CW, a participant with a packet selects a slot uniformly at random to attempt a transmission. If successful, another packet may be processed in the same fashion, if one exists. Else, transmission is attempted in the next CW, which is double the size of the current CW. This is illustrated in Figure 2, along with pseudocode.

While originally intended for use with Ethernet over bus networks [173], BEB has since found application in a range of domains such as wireless communication [129, 170, 174, 192], transactional memory [105, 168], concurrent memory access [11, 22, 140], and congestion control [144].² Despite this widespread use, the makespan for BEB is sub-optimal (see Bender et al. [23]); specifically, for a batch of n packets that begin executing BEB at the same time, the makespan is $\Theta(n \log n)$. To understand why, we need to become familiar with the notion of contention.

Developing Intuition. In order to better understand why BEB performs poorly, we consider a class of *Bernoulli-backoff* algorithms, where each packet sends with probability $1/w$ in each slot of a window of size w . Note that this differs subtly from the approaches discussed in Section 2.1, where a single slot is chosen uniformly at random in which to send.³ For Bernoulli-backoff algorithms it is easy to analyze the useful notion of *contention* [1, 25, 26, 46, 161]. Let

²In practice, BEB may use a different constant-sized initial window size, and also be truncated at a maximum window size.

³Interestingly, the makespan of Bernoulli backoff algorithms can differ significantly, as discussed in [23], but this is not critical to our discussion here.

A Generic Backoff Algorithm

i : index of current window for $i \geq 0$.

w_i : size of window i .

$f(i)$: window-scaling function.

In current window i , a station with a packet to transmit does the following until successful:

- Attempt to transmit in a slot chosen uniformly at random from w_i .
- If the transmission failed, then wait until the end of the window and $w_{i+1} \leftarrow (1 + f(i))w_i$.

Fig. 3. Generic backoff with monotonically-increasing windows. For LB, LLB, BEB, and PB, the initial window size is a constant, and $f(i) = 1/\lg w_i$, $1/\lg \lg w_i$, 1, and $(1 + 1/i)^c - 1$, respectively. For FB, $f(i) = 0$ and the initial window size is $\Theta(n)$.

$p_i(t)$ denote the probability that packet i attempts to broadcast in slot t . We define the contention in slot t , $C(t)$, to be $C(t) = \sum_i p_i(t)$, where the sum is taken over all packets in the system at time t .

The notion of contention characterizes the probability that some packet is successful in slot t ; denote this quantity by $p_{\text{suc}}(t)$. In particular, if $p_i(t) \leq 1/2$, which is true if we set the initial window to be size at least 2, then the following relationship holds:

$$\frac{C(t)}{e^{2C(t)}} \leq p_{\text{suc}}(t) \leq \frac{2C(t)}{e^{C(t)}}. \quad (1)$$

Like the temperature of the porridge in the Goldilocks fable, the contention can be “too high” or “too low” for packets to succeed. For example, consider the Bernoulli equivalent of BEB. Initially, the contention is high. In particular, $C(t) = \Omega(\ln n)$ which implies that $p_{\text{suc}}(t)$ is polynomially small in n until a window of size $\Theta(n/\ln n)$. We highlight that, while we use Equation 1 to gain intuition about the static case, these bounds on contention will also be useful later on when discussing the dynamic case (Section 3).

When the window size reaches $\Theta(n)$, $C(t) = \Theta(1)$ and so $p_{\text{suc}}(t) = \Theta(1)$. At this point, the contention is “just right” and many packets succeed. Unfortunately, since the window size grows aggressively under BEB, the contention rapidly decreases, and so, any remaining packets require many slots before they succeed. This behavior is what leads to suboptimal makespan, and it begs the question: is there a backoff algorithm that yields the asymptotically optimal makespan of $O(n)$ or, equivalently, $\Omega(1)$ throughput? As a first step towards answering this question, we consider backoff algorithms where the growth of contention windows differs from BEB.

General Monotonic Backoff. The makespan of a backoff algorithm depends on the amount by which successive CWs increase in size; for BEB, this is simply a factor of 2. Several results examine different values [62, 129, 153, 170, 174], presenting a mixture of empirical and analytical results when the network is *saturated*; that is, when each participant always has a packet to send [35]. In contrast, the static model of arrivals captures a type of bursty traffic, which turns out to be more challenging. In this setting, Bender et al. [23] derive makespan results for BEB and several closely-related variants: LOG-BACKOFF (LB), LOGLOG-BACKOFF (LLB), and FIXED BACKOFF (FB). These variants operate similarly to BEB: when the current CW of size w is finished, the next CW has size $(1 + f(w))w$, where $f(w) = 1/\lg(w)$, $1/\lg \lg(w)$, 1, and 0, for LB, LLB, BEB, and FB, respectively.⁴ In each CW, a participant randomly selects a single slot in which to send,

⁴We use $\lg(x)$ to denote the logarithm base 2 of x .

and other than learning of success or failure, no channel feedback is used by the algorithms; all of these algorithms are acknowledgement-based.

The pseudocode for these backoff algorithms is presented in Figure 3. To the best of our knowledge, the initial CW sizes for LB, LLB, and FB are not specified exactly in the literature; $\Theta(1)$ will suffice for *LB* and *LLB*, and $\Theta(n)$ for *FB*.

A conspicuous requirement of FB is that n must be known to within a constant multiplicative factor in order to set the CW size. A number of prior works address such requirement and achieve an estimate of n [30, 37, 42, 43, 99] as a means for improving performance, by setting an initial CW size for various contention-resolution algorithms.

In terms of performance, for a batch of n packets, the makespan for BEB, LB, FB, and LLB is $\Theta(n \log n)$, $\Theta\left(\frac{n \log n}{\log \log n}\right)$, $\Theta(n \log \log n)$, and $\Theta\left(\frac{n \log \log n}{\log \log \log n}\right)$, respectively [23, 192]. Bender et al. also analyze *polynomial* backoff (PB), where the i^{th} window has size $\Theta(i^c)$ for some constant $c > 1$. Here, the makespan is shown to be $\Theta(n/\log n)^{1+(1/c)}$.

Interestingly, all of these algorithms suffer from a throughput—the makespan divided by the number of packets n —that tends to zero. This observation is striking for a couple reasons. First, it illustrates the challenges raised by the static setting. In particular, the throughput for PB when $c = 2$, known as **quadratic backoff**, is shown by Sun and Dai [174] to be competitive with BEB under a saturated network. In contrast, under static arrivals, quadratic backoff has asymptotically inferior makespan.

Second, from a theoretical perspective, does a backoff algorithm exist that gives optimal throughput under the static setting? Bender et al. [23] show that, over the class of monotonic windowed backoff algorithms, LLB achieves the asymptotically-best makespan [23]. In other words, a non-monotonic approach is required to achieve $\Theta(n)$ makespan or, equivalently, $\Theta(1)$ throughput. While we will later revisit the first two points, it is this question of optimality that we pursue next.

Understanding Performance. To develop intuition for monotonic backoff algorithms, we start by asking: why does (the Bernoulli version of) LB fare better than BEB? Again, initially the high contention prevents packets from succeeding. Indeed, the high contention persists for longer under LB given that the window size grows far more slowly compared to BEB. However, once (near) constant contention is achieved, packets succeed. Critically, packets stay within the Goldilocks zone for longer since, again, the window size increases more slowly relative to BEB. Finally, contention drops off more gradually, allowing any straggling packets to succeed within fewer slots than under BEB.

The same qualitative behavior is true of LLB, which grows its window size faster than LB, but more slowly than BEB. This allows LLB to strike the asymptotically optimal balance between the number of wasted slots spent in either high-or-low-contention windows, and those slots with constant contention.

Why doesn't FB perform better? After all, it avoids the high-contention slots by skipping directly to a window of size $\Theta(n)$ where the probability of success is constant. Here, again, contention tells the story. While initially many packets succeed under FB, the contention quickly decreases, and this inflicts an $O(\log \log n)$ -factor over the optimal makespan.

Ultimately, for the static setting, the above algorithms fall short due to their inability to provide $\Theta(1)$ contention over $\Omega(n)$ slots. Next, we examine algorithms that do satisfy this property.

Achieving Asymptotically Optimal Makespan. Based on our observations in Section 2, any algorithm that hopes to achieve $O(n)$ makespan must incorporate a mechanism for maintaining constant contention for $\Omega(n)$ slots. SAWTOOTH-BACKOFF (STB) [90, 102] accomplishes this; it is non-monotonic algorithm that executes over a doubly-nested loop. The outer loop sets the current window size w to be double the one used in the preceding outer loop; this is like BEB. Additionally, for each such window, the inner loop executes over $\lg w$ windows of decreasing size: $w, w/2, w/4, \dots, 1$.

For each such window, a slot is chosen uniformly at random for the packet to transmit; this is the “backon” component of STB. When the outer loop achieves a window of size cn for a sufficiently large constant $c > 0$, with high probability all packets will succeed in the corresponding inner loop. Intuitively, this is because the backon component maintains constant contention in each slot of the inner-loop windows (until all packets succeed). For a single batch of n packets, the makespan of STB is $O(n)$ [23, 90, 102, 192].

A variant called TRUNCATED SAWTOOTH-BACKOFF (TSTB) [30] executes identically to STB except that, for some constant $c > 0$, the inner loop executes over $\lg(c \lg w)$ windows of decreasing size: $w, w/2, w/4, \dots, \max\{\lfloor w/c \lg n \rfloor, 1\}$. Another asymptotically-optimal result is given by Anta et al. [81, 82] with their algorithm ONE-FAIL ADAPTIVE, which succeeds with probability $1 - O(1/n)$, again for the case with no-CD and no knowledge of system size. The authors tightly analyze both ONE-FAIL ADAPTIVE and STB, yield respective makespan guarantees of $2(\delta + 1)n + O(\log^2 n)$ and $4(1 + 1/\delta)n$, where δ is a small positive constant.

Anta and Mosteiro [17] look at a static case—referred to as static k -selection (see Section 3.2)—where an unknown k out of n participants must each succeed. For an error parameter $\epsilon \leq 1/(n + 1)$, the authors give a randomized algorithm that with probability $1 - O(\epsilon)$ has makespan $O(k + \log^2(1/\epsilon))$; for consistency, we report the case for $k = n$ in Table 1 (see our Electronic Supplements in Section ??).

Wang [179] provides exact, optimal results for the special case of $n = 2$. Specifically, the authors examine the minimum: average latency until both participants succeed, the latency until the first participant succeeds, and the latency until the second (last) device succeeds; the expected values for these metrics are shown to be $\sqrt{3/2} + 3/2$, 2 and approximately 3.33641.

These results settle the question of optimal makespan for the static setting. However, an obvious question is whether this optimality holds when packets may arrive over time, and we explore this issue in Section 3.

2.2 Deterministic and Hybrid Approaches

In contrast to randomized backoff, there are a handful of results that propose deterministic approaches for what is, essentially, the case of static-arrivals. Specifically, packets may arrive over time. However, once a collision occurs, those participants whose packets collided must execute a “conflict resolution” algorithm, while all other participants learn about the collision via channel feedback and refrain from transmitting; that is, no other packets are sent until this conflict is resolved.

For these results, there are $k \geq 2$ participants, each with a unique ID in the range $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Komlos and Greenberg [119] show the existence of a non-adaptive, deterministic algorithm that, with knowledge of k and n , has a makespan of $O(k + k \log(n/k))$; their approach requires that each participant u only adapts to channel feedback during slots in which u transmits. Related to this, in the static case, Kowalski [120] proves the existence of a non-adaptive deterministic algorithm with $O(k \log(n/k))$ makespan, and also gives an *explicit* construction for a non-adaptive algorithm with $O(k \text{polylog}(n))$ makespan. These results stand in contrast to prior work by Capetanakis [45] and Tsybakov and Mikhailov [176, 177] who give deterministic algorithms with the same asymptotic makespan without needing to know k ; however, their algorithms require that stations receive feedback even in slots where they themselves are not transmitting. Related to these results, Greenberg, Flajolet, and Ladner [99, 100] give a randomized algorithm to estimate the number of stations that need to send a packet; this relies on collision detection. This is combined with prior deterministic approaches [45, 79, 104, 106, 176, 177], yielding several hybrid algorithms, and the best expected makespan is at most $2.1338n + o(n)$.

Discussion. For the static case, many randomized algorithms have been proposed, with STB providing one of the strongest with-high-probability results: asymptotically-optimal makespan with no-CD, no knowledge of n , and only $O(\log n)$ channel-access attempts.

In contrast, purely deterministic approaches cannot achieve the asymptotically-optimal makespan without some additional assumptions regarding CD, knowledge of n , or a unique labeling of participants. We see a similar discrepancy when we consider adversarial dynamic arrivals, which we explore next.

Finally, in the context of network traffic, we highlight the underlying assumption that each transmission of a packet is accommodated by a single slot. Unsurprisingly, BEB also has sub-optimal makespan for the more general case with heterogeneous packet sizes, where a packet of size k must have sole access to the channel for k consecutive slots in order to succeed [24]. Along similar lines, in the wireless domain, it has been argued that packet size should be incorporated into the definition of makespan, since collisions tend to consume time proportional to packet size [12, 13].

3 DYNAMIC ARRIVALS

What can be said about the case where packets do not arrive and succeed in disjoint batches, but rather are injected into the system over time? A large body of literature addresses contention resolution where arrival times are governed by a stochastic process, typically Bernoulli or Poisson. Informally, with a stochastic setting, the aim is to show that packets do not grow without bound at each sender, but are successfully delivered at a pace sufficient to keep up with the rate that new packets are generated. For the interested reader, we highlight the survey by Chlebus [51], which addresses in depth the literature in this area.

However, modeling of arrival times via a stochastic process may not always be justified. In particular, bursty traffic is common in practice [156, 175, 182, 183, 190], and its impact has been examined [33, 44, 91, 167]. Indeed, the static setting discussed in Section 2 illustrates the impact on makespan by bursts of packets, where the packets of each burst succeed before the next burst arrives. This has led the research community to consider more general arrival models.

Adversarial queuing theory (AQT) [14, 41, 68, 69] has been used to model packet arrivals times, and many contention-resolution results fit within the AQT framework; that is, they address adversarial models that are parameterized by rates of packet injection and burstiness. Here, a key metric is *stability*, which we discuss in Section 3.1.

Another large body of the contention-resolution literature eschews the parameterization of AQT and instead considers a completely arbitrary schedule for when packets arrive. Here, we treat separately the literature on deterministic and randomized approaches, in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, respectively.

3.1 AQT and Contention Resolution

In this setting, each participant is sometimes associated with a queue into which packets may be injected by an adversary at arbitrary times. Other results are presented in a queue-free model, where each packet has a corresponding station that “dies” (i.e., becomes irrelevant) after the packet is successfully transmitted (see discussion by Goldberg [6, 98]). In either case, packet arrival times are parameterized by an injection rate ρ , where $0 < \rho \leq 1$, and a non-negative integer, b , that denotes burstiness.

Several adversarial models appear in the AQT literature; see Borodin et al [41] for an in-depth discussion. In the context of contention resolution, there are two prominent models. The *leaky-bucket adversary* is defined such that, for any t consecutive slots, at most $\rho t + b$ packets may be placed in the queue of any participant [68]. For a contiguous segment of rounds, and any positive integer w , a *window adversary* of type (ρ, w) can inject ρw packets in each contiguous segment of w rounds into any set of stations; w is referred to as a window.




Fig. 4. Depiction of how exponential backoff is unstable for a packet arrival rate of $\Omega(\ln \ln n / \ln n)$.

Performance is typically measured by the growth of queues at each participant. As defined by Andrews et al. [14], an algorithm is **stable** on a network despite an adversary if, starting from a state where there are no packets, the total number of packets is always bounded by a constant. An algorithm is **universally stable** if it is stable against every adversary with $\rho < 1$, for any network [14]. Finally, in the contention-resolution literature, the notion of **strongly stable** arises in the context of a window adversary: an algorithm is **strongly stable** if, at any time, the total number of queued packets is $O(\rho w)$ [58, 61].

Another important metric is (packet) **latency**, which is often defined as the maximum time that any packet stays in the queue prior to being successfully transmitted. We note that, while this is described in the context of queues, this corresponds to the metric as described in Section 1.1.3.

Developing Intuition. Given the prominence of backoff algorithms, one may wonder about their performance in the AQT setting. Given the suboptimal makespan of popular algorithms like BEB in the static setting, we should be skeptical of their performance when packets arrive dynamically at a sufficiently high rate. To help solidify this intuition, we sketch an argument that shows the instability of an algorithm BEB', which is very similar to BEB. Specifically, for each slot $i \geq 1$ starting with the slot that packet u injected into the system, u sends with probability $1/i$. Note that this is similar to the Bernoulli-backoff algorithm (recall Section 2.1), where the sending probability per slot proceeds as $1/2, 1/2, 1/4, 1/4, 1/4, 1/4, 1/8, 1/8, \dots$ etc. By comparison, BEB' proceeds as $1, 1/2, 1/3, 1/4, 1/5, 1/6, \dots$, and so at any given slot since a packet is injected, the sending probabilities under the Bernoulli-backoff algorithm and BEB' differ by only a positive constant.⁵

We can now describe why BEB' is unstable for an arrival rate of $\Omega(\ln \ln n / \ln n)$; Figure 4 complements our discussion. Consider a window W of $T = \Theta(n \ln n / \ln \ln n)$ slots. In the first slot, a single burst of $n/2$ packets arrives. This drives up the contention to $\Omega(n)$ in this slot. None of these packets is likely to succeed over the next $n / \ln n$ slots; to see this, note that in the i -th slot measured from this first slot is sending with probability $1/i$, yielding a contention of $\Omega(\ln n)$ in each of these $n / \ln n$ slots, and so the probability of success is $O(1/\text{poly}(\ln n))$ by Equation 1.

⁵We highlight that this is very similar to the algorithm DECREASE SLOWLY in [114, 115]; see the proof of Theorem 8 for a formal analysis.

In addition to the burst, there is a steady stream of $n/2$ packets: a single packet is injected every $\Theta(\ln n / \ln \ln n)$ slots measured after the first slot. Given our discussion in Section 2.1, by itself, this stream poses no problem for BEB'. Specifically, by the lower bound in Equation 1, we expect each packet to succeed within a small constant number of slots prior to the next packet arriving and, therefore, contention remains low.

However, given the burst of packets, the packets in the stream face $n/\ln n$ slots where contention is $\Omega(\ln n)$. Consequently, rather than succeeding, these packets accumulate in the system and, over these $n/\ln n$ slots, their contribution to contention is $\Omega(\ln \ln n / \ln n) \sum_{i=1}^{n/\ln n} 1/i = \Omega(\ln \ln n)$ by the sum of a harmonic series. By Equation 1, the probability of success is $O(1/\text{poly}(\ln n))$, and thus the expected number of slots for a packet to succeed is $\Omega(\text{poly}(\ln n))$.

To summarize the above situation, we expect that for all n packets to succeed $\Omega(n \cdot \text{poly}(\ln n))$ slots are required, which exceeds T . Consequently, for every such interval T , more and more packets accumulate in system over time. Note that this instability occurs for a rate that is $n/T = \Omega(\ln \ln n / \ln n)$. The above argument originates with Bender et al. [23], who use it to establish bounds on the arrival rate for which several backoff algorithms are unstable.

Overview of Literature. As mentioned above, the result by Bender et al. [23] explores stability of backoff algorithms under windowed adversaries in the queue-free model. BEB is shown to be stable for $\rho = d/\log n$ for some constant $d > 0$, and unstable for $\rho = \Omega(\log \log n / \log n)$. They also show that LLB is stable for $\rho = d'/((\log n) \log \log n)$ for some constant $d' > 0$, and unstable for $\rho = \Omega(1/\log n)$. Overall, traditional backoff algorithms appear to perform sub-optimally, although this is not surprising given the corresponding makespan results for the static setting.

The remaining approaches in the literature are deterministic. Chlebus et al. [59, 60] consider adversaries where $\rho = 1$; that is, one packet is injected per slot. The main positive result is a deterministic, adaptive protocol that guarantees against leaky-bucket adversaries that $O(n^2 + b)$ packets are queued in the system at any given time, where n is the number of participants. Here, n is known to all participants and each ID is unique in the range $[1, \dots, n]$; this allows participants to schedule via passing a token, such that no collisions occur (notably, the positive results in this paper do not require collision detection). This result is shown to be asymptotically optimal in the sense that a leaky-bucket adversary with burstiness 2 can force $\Omega(n^2)$ total packets to be queued.

Several impossibility results are also given—holding regardless of whether or not collision detection is available—that illustrate how even minor burstiness can prevent stability. Specifically, no full-sensing protocol can be stable (i) for at least two participants against a leaky-bucket adversary with burstiness 2, (ii) or for at least three participants against a window adversary of burstiness 2; and (iii) no acknowledgment-based algorithm is stable in a system of at least two participants against the window adversary of burstiness 2.

Additional impossibility results are made in the context of three natural properties. First, an algorithm is *fair* if each packet is transmitted successfully within $O(b/\rho)$ slots from the time it is injected. The authors show that no algorithm can be fair *and* stable for any number of at least 2 participants against a leaky-bucket adversary of burstiness 2. Second, an algorithm is *withholding* the channel if, upon successfully transmitting a packet, the station keeps sending until all of its pending packets are exhausted. No algorithm that withholds the channel can be stable for three stations against a leaky-bucket adversary of burstiness 2. Third, an algorithm is said to be *retaining* if after a participant successfully transmits a packet, and if any packets arriving subsequent to this event are injected only at other stations, the participant eventually empties its queue. No retaining protocol is stable in a system of at least four stations against a window adversary of burstiness 2. Chlebus et al. show that this implies no protocol that is fair can also be stable in a system of at least four stations against the window adversary of burstiness 2.

In contrast to the above, Chlebus et al. [58, 61] study deterministic algorithms under the same model as Chlebus et al. [59, 60], but where $\rho < 1$. They show that strong stability is impossible for a rate $\omega(1/\log n)$, with or without collision detection. When collision detection is available, the authors give a full-sensing algorithm that is fair and stable for $\rho = O(1/\log n)$, and show that fairness is not possible for rates that are $\omega(1/\log n)$. When collision detection is not available, the authors give an existence proof for a stable and fair algorithm under a much smaller rate of $O(1/n \log^2 n)$, and they give an explicit algorithm that achieves these properties for a rate of $O(1/n^2 \log n)$. Finally, it is shown that no acknowledgement-based algorithm can be stable for a rate exceeding $3/(1 + \lg n)$.

Anantharamu et al. [6] and Aldawsari et al. [2] design and analyze several deterministic algorithms that employ either a round-robin or token-passing approach for obtaining access to the channel. The authors derive bounds on latency under the leaky-bucket adversary model as a function of ρ , for $\rho < 1/(2 \log n)$ and general b . Note that this restriction on ρ is unsurprising, given the negative results on strong stability by Chlebus et al. [58, 61] and prior results on the challenges posed by burstiness [59, 60]. These algorithms are compared, both analytically and via simulations, against the randomized algorithms, BEB and Quadratic Backoff (QB), where the latter has each successive window increase as the square of the previous window. The simulation results illustrate the impact of different injection rates, burstiness values, and the number of participants. These findings generally align with the theoretical predictions and, interestingly, the deterministic algorithms compare favorably to BEB and QB, suggesting that randomized approaches may not necessarily be superior. More-recent work by Hradovich et al. [108] provides a new average-case analysis of the maximum queue size and latency for several of the same algorithms.

While many deterministic approaches require nodes to have unique IDs, Anantharamu and Chlebus [5] consider deterministic algorithms where this is not true; furthermore, n is unknown to the algorithm and may not even be finite. In trade, they focus on positive results against leaky bucket adversaries that have the additional constraint that they inject at most one packet per round. An algorithm is *activation-based* if stations that do not have any packets to send ignore any channel feedback. In terms of positive results, the authors provide a non-adaptive, activation-based algorithm that has bounded latency and is stable for an injection rate $\rho < 1/3$ with CD, a non-adaptive full-sensing algorithm that has bounded latency and is stable for $\rho \leq 3/8$ with CD, and an adaptive activation-based algorithm that has bounded latency and is stable for injection rates less than $\rho \leq 1/2$ with no-CD.

In terms of negative results, Anantharamu and Chlebus show that no deterministic algorithm can be fair against an adversary that is able to activate at most 2 stations in any round—called a 2-activating adversary—with $\lfloor \rho + b \rfloor = 1 + b \geq 2$. Additionally, the authors show that no deterministic acknowledgment-based algorithm is fair against a 1-activating adversary for $\rho < 1$ and $b \geq 3 - 2\rho$. This stands in contrast to the positive results in Chlebus et al. [58, 61] for $\rho < 1$. Finally, Anantharamu and Chlebus prove that no deterministic algorithm with CD can provide bounded packet latency against a 1-activating adversary with injection rate at least $3/4$ and $b \geq 1$. It is interesting to compare this result against the algorithm by Chlebus et al. [59, 60] discussed above, which achieves stability, having $O(n^2 + b)$ total packets queued in the system at any given time (but where there are unique IDs and the number of stations is known).

Anantharamu et al. [9, 10] consider deterministic full-sensing and acknowledgment-based algorithms for the case where each participant is subject to an individual injection rate under a window adversary, where the window w is unknown. There are n participants, each with a unique ID in $1, \dots, n$, and n is known. The authors prove a lower bound on latency of $\Omega(w \log n / \log w)$ for $w \leq n$, and $\Omega(w)$ for $w > n$. Upper bounds are established by a full-sensing algorithm with CD, and by an adaptive algorithm without CD, each of which achieve a packet latency of $O(\min(n + w, w \log n))$; Anantharamu et al. also give a full-sensing algorithm without CD that has $O(n + w)$ queue size and $O(nw)$ latency.

In contrast to the above, the remaining results address a model where participants have unique IDs in $\{1, \dots, n\}$, where n is known. Additionally, participants have access to a global clock. Hradovich et al. [107] consider a problem variant where, in any fixed round, at most k stations may access the multiple access channel; this is called a ***k-restrained channel***. The authors design and analyze deterministic algorithms for leaky bucket adversaries with $\rho \leq 1$. The first is a stable adaptive algorithm whose maximum number of queued packets is $O(n^2 + b)$, which is reminiscent of the bound in [60]. The second is a full-sensing algorithm that is stable for $\rho \leq 1 - 1/n$. Finally, the authors give an acknowledgment-based algorithm with throughput $\Theta(k/n(\log^2 n))$, which is complemented by a lower bound that no acknowledgement-based algorithm can be stable for a rate at least $\min\{k/n, 1/(3 \log n)\}$. Simulations indicate that the proposed algorithms perform favorably, with respect to queue size and number of channel accesses, relative to well-known backoff algorithms.

Bienkowski et al. [38, 39] consider a model where each participant has a queue, and messages may include control bits. The adversary considered here differs from the leaky-bucket and window adversaries discussed earlier: at any time, an arbitrary number of packets can be injected into the queue of any participant. The metrics of interest are the total packets in all queues, called ***total load***, and the maximum queue size. The authors prove that their deterministic algorithm achieves a total load that is an additive $O(n^2)$ amount larger than any other algorithm, and the maximum queue size is at most an n -factor larger.

In work by Garncarek et al. [86], participants receive no channel feedback, and they may inform their decisions using knowledge of their own local queue, or information gained about other queues. In particular, an adaptive algorithm may store bits in memory that reflect queue histories, while non-adaptive (memoryless) algorithms may not. Both types of algorithms can check whether or not their queue is empty. The authors design a deterministic, adaptive algorithm that guarantees that all stations have bounded queue size L_{\max} for any ρ and b ; that is, the algorithm is universally stable. The amount of state that each participant maintains is at most $n \log(L_{\max})$ bits. The authors also prove that there is no non-adaptive algorithm that is stable for an injection rate of $O(1/\log n)$, and they give a non-adaptive algorithm that is stable for an injection rate of $d/\log^2 n$, for some constant $d > 0$.

More recently, Garncarek et al. [87] operate in the same model, with a focus on algorithms that keep very little or no information about the previous state of the system. Here, the authors show a deterministic algorithm that is stable for $\rho = \Omega(1/\log n)$ given that only $O(1)$ bits are used as memory to store some history of events, and each participant can check its queue size (not just whether it is empty). Stability can also be achieved when the rate is increased, and with zero bits of memory; however, b must be upper bounded by some value known *a priori*.

Discussion. There are several significant messages conveyed by the literature surveyed above. Randomized backoff algorithms continue to disappoint in that they are stable only for sub-constant injection rates. Interestingly, in terms of latency, deterministic algorithms can achieve performance that rivals and even surpasses traditional randomized backoff algorithms. However, most of these results make strong assumptions about unique IDs and/or *a priori* knowledge of n . The exception is the algorithm by Anantharamu and Clebus [5], which assumes a 1-activating adversary. This leads to a more general message: while stability and fairness seem like natural qualities that we desire in algorithm design, it is often not possible to achieve both simultaneously when there is even a little (i.e., constant) burstiness. Therefore, all of this paints a fairly dismal picture of what is possible under window and leaky bucket adversaries, especially for deterministic algorithms, given the many impossibility results that apply.

What avenues are there for positive results? As we will discuss later in Section 3.3, new randomized approaches can offer better performance. However, fundamentally, perhaps the AQT model is overly pessimistic; this has been

investigated in more general settings (e.g., [32].) Here, focusing on whether queue sizes can become unbounded under a very specific injection pattern, and under an infinite stream of packets, may lead to results that are artificially bleak. In the next section, we turn our attention to work that is concerned with a finite stream of packets that arrive under an arbitrary schedule, and the makespan is an important performance metric.

3.2 Deterministic Approaches for Contention Resolution

“Anyone who attempts to generate random numbers by deterministic means is, of course, living in a state of sin.” – John von Neumann

In this section, we depart from parameterized adversaries and notions of stability, while still focusing on deterministic contention resolution algorithms. Here, our performance metric is latency (recall Section 1.1.3). Much of the contention-resolution work in this setting is referred to as *k-selection* or the *wakeup problem*. The former addresses n participants of which k , for $1 \leq k \leq n$, activate over time, each with a *single* packet to transmit. The activation times are selected by an adversary, where stations are operational from the beginning of time, and packets arrive subject to parameters ρ and b . As before, most of the literature operates in a model where each participant has a unique ID. Furthermore, n is typically assumed to be known; throughout this section, we assume this to be true unless explicitly stated otherwise. The goal is to minimize the latency (recall from Section 1.1) required for all k participants to successfully send their respective packets.

The wakeup problem also considers n participants, of which some are awake and the remainder are inactive (or “sleeping”), but monitoring the channel. Devices may awaken to begin executing an algorithm as scheduled in some worst case fashion, thus potentially causing contention on the shared channel. Each device has a packet to send, and upon the first success, all sleeping devices awaken and the execution ends.⁶ Here, minimizing the time until all devices are awake is the goal.

Developing Intuition. Many results put a spin on John von Neumann’s quote by generating deterministic results from randomized approaches. Specifically, a common technique in this area is to design a randomized algorithm, and then use the probabilistic method [3] to argue that a deterministic equivalent exists. Here, we focus on the result by De Marco and Kowalski [133]; however, related approaches are used in several other papers to give existence proofs for efficient transmission schedules [52, 54, 56, 72, 134, 135].

De Marco and Kowalski [133] consider the dynamic k -selection problem where there is a global clock, k is unknown, and no-CD. Their main result is a non-adaptive, deterministic algorithm for contention resolution with latency $O(k \log(n) \log \log(n))$. Notably, this result almost matches a previous lower bound by Greenberg and Winograd [101] in $\Omega(k \log(n)/\log k)$ for adaptive algorithms under the static case with collision detection. Therefore, this result by De Marco and Kowalski illustrates that it is possible to achieve near-optimal latency with a non-adaptive and deterministic algorithm.

A key component of the authors’ [133] approach is a *transmission matrix*, \mathcal{M} , consisting of $\lg n$ rows and $\ell = \Theta(n \log n \log \log n)$ columns. The way in which participants use \mathcal{M} to transmit on the channel is as follows. Let $\mathcal{M}_{i,j}$ denote the entry at row i and column j ; each such entry is a list of IDs. Upon activating, in each slot participant u scans left-to-right in row 1 of \mathcal{M} . In this row, there is a designated interval of slots $\mathcal{I}_{1,u}$ for u ; specifically, u rounds

⁶Note that, given that we require only a single success for the wake up problem, it does not make sense to categorize wakeup protocols as acknowledgement or non-acknowledgement-based.




Fig. 5. Depiction of a transmission matrix presented in the work by De Marco and Kowalski [133]. For two participants, u and w , we illustrate the intervals over which they respectively may transmit on the shared channel.

up the current (global) slot index to the nearest multiple of $2 \lg \lg n$ and this is the start of $\bar{I}_{1,u}$, which has length $\Theta(\log n \log \log n)$. If u belongs to the list at $\mathcal{M}_{1,j}$ for $j \in \bar{I}_{1,u}$, then u sends its packet in slot j . If at any point u succeeds in $\bar{I}_{1,u}$, then u terminates; otherwise, u immediately proceeds to row 2 and starts executing as prescribed by $\bar{I}_{2,u}$. This process through \mathcal{M} continues until all rows are exhausted. The length of interval, $\bar{I}_{i,u}$, in each row i is $\Theta(2^i \log n \log \log n)$. Figure 5 illustrates a transmission matrix.

How is membership in $\mathcal{M}_{i,j}$ determined? This is decided *randomly*: participant u belongs to $\mathcal{M}_{i,j}$ with probability approximately $\frac{1}{2^i 2^{j \bmod \lg \lg n}}$, for $1 \leq i \leq \lg n$ and $j \geq 1$. Note that the first term of the sending probability—the $1/2^i$ term—and also the interval length—the 2^i term—are reminiscent of BEB; in particular, they seem analogous to the i^{th} window of the Bernoulli version (recall Sections 2.1 and 3.1). Consequently, we should not be surprised at a latency that is $\Omega(n \log n)$.

How does contention behave under \mathcal{M} ? For illustrative purposes, consider $\Theta(k)$ participants executing the schedule in rows 1 and $\lg k$. In row 1, an active participant u may contribute significantly to contention, but only for its small interval $\bar{I}_{1,u}$. For example, if $\Theta(k)$ participants all activate simultaneously (i.e., a batch), then their contribution to contention is $\Theta(k)$ and no participant succeeds; however, this occurs only over $\Theta(\log n \log \log n)$ slots in row 1. Conversely, the $\Theta(k)$ participants may be spread out over row 1, each contributing only $O(1)$ contention in their own respective, disjoint interval of $\Theta(\log n \log \log n)$ slots; we will return to these two extremems momentarily.

In row $\lg k$, the sending probability ranges between $\Theta(1/k)$ and $\Theta(1/(k \log n))$. Thus, a batch of $\Theta(k)$ participants make a more muted contribution to contention, ranging from $\Theta(1)$ to $\Theta(1/\log n)$ over a much larger interval $\bar{I}_{\lg(k)}$ consisting of $\Theta(k \log n \log \log n)$ slots. This range of contention is “good” in the sense that, recalling Equation 1, in the absence of other major contributions to contention, we expect participants to succeed. Is this the case?

Recall the contribution to contention from participants in row 1 using the two qualitatively different cases discussed above: their contribution may be high for “small” number—specifically, $\Theta(\log n \log \log n)$ —slots of $\mathcal{I}_{\lg(k)}$, or only $O(1)$ over perhaps all of $\mathcal{I}_{\lg(k)}$. Therefore, accounting for these two cases, in row 1 there should be many disjoint periods of $\Theta(\log \log n)$ contiguous slots where contention is good. More generally, given the contribution to contention from other rows, the authors show that, w.h.p. in n , an important property holds: in every interval of length $\Theta(k \log(n) \log \log(n))$ slots, $O(k/\log n)$ participants proceed from row $\lg(k)$ to row $\lg(k) + 1$ of the transmission matrix. De Marco and Kowalski [133] show that a random transmission matrix yields the above property with strictly positive probability. Therefore, by the probabilistic method, the authors argue that there must exist a matrix with this property.

But what about these $O(k/\log n)$ participants that keep executing in row $\lg(k) + 1$? Interleaved with the execution is the deterministic result by Komlós and Greenberg [119] (recall Section 2.2), which addresses the static setting. Specifically, given a batch of m out of n participants with a packet to send, where both m and n are known, all m participants succeed in time $O(m + m \log(n/m))$. Here, in the dynamic k -selection problem, m is not known, and so the result by Komlós and Greenberg is executed for values of $m = 1, 2, \dots, \lg n$, which contributes an extra logarithmic-in- n factor to the run time. Thus, the $m = O(k/\log n)$ participants that remain after row k succeed within an additional $O(m + m \log(n/m)) \log n$, which is $O(k \log(n \log n))$ by substituting in for m .

Finally, note that by the sum of a geometric series, the number of slots in \mathcal{M} over which any participant executes prior to reaching row $\lg(k) + 1$ is $O(k \log n \log \log n)$. Adding to this the (asymptotically smaller) $O(k \log(n \log n))$ slots for the Komlós and Greenberg result yields a total latency of $O(k \log n \log \log n)$.

3.2.1 Deterministic k -Selection. Greenberg and Winograd [101] consider a multiple access channel with CD, for the two cases where k is known and unknown. The authors prove a lower bound for deterministic algorithms of $\Omega(k \log n / \log k)$ in the static case, which of course applies to the dynamic case. This is contrasted against the upper bounds, claiming that the deterministic algorithms in Capetanakis [45], Hayes [104], and Tsybakov and Mikhailov [176, 177] provide a nearly-tight latency of $\Theta(k + k \log(n/k))$.

With regard to upper bounds, De Marco and Kowalski [133] consider the case with a global clock, as discussed above. Subsequently, De Marco et al. [135] examine the power of acknowledgement-based versus non-acknowledgement-based deterministic non-adaptive approaches when k is known; there is neither a global clock, nor is there CD. They give a non-acknowledgement-based algorithm with latency $O(k^2 \log n)$, and show that this can be improved to $O(k^2 \log n / \log k)$ with an acknowledgment-based algorithm. These results are nearly tight; the authors also provide lower bounds on latency of $\Omega(k^2 / \log k)$ for both cases. With regards to throughput, these results by De Marco et al. [135] demonstrate an exponential separation between the case when k is known and k is unknown. For acknowledgement-based algorithms, when k is known, the throughput is $\Omega(1/(\log k \log n))$. In contrast, when k is unknown, De Marco et al. show that throughput is $\Omega(1/(k \log n))$, and the best throughput possible is $O(1/(k \log k))$.

3.2.2 Deterministic Wakeup. There are a number of results for the single-hop setting. De Marco, Pellegrini, and Sburlati [136, 137] examine the case of no global clock and where n is unknown. They give a non-adaptive, deterministic algorithm with $O(n^3 \log^3 n)$ latency. This improves over the previous best of $O(n^4 \log^5 n)$ latency by Gąsieniec, Pelc, and Peleg [88, 89].

Chlebus et al. [52] consider a multi-channel scenario with no-CD and no global clock. Here, all stations may access all $b \geq 1$ channels at once. The authors give a non-adaptive, deterministic algorithm for the cases where k is unknown that has latency $O(k \log^{1/b} k \log n)$. When $b = \Omega(\log \log n)$, a faster deterministic algorithm is possible, with delay $O((k/b) \log n \log(b \log n))$, and a lower bound of $((k/b) \log(n/k))$ is shown for deterministic algorithms.

Sticking with a model where there is no-CD and no global clock, De Marco and Kowalski [72, 134] consider non-adaptive solutions, with a focus on the time, s , until the first station awakens. The authors look at three settings: where s is known and k is unknown, when k is known and s is unknown, and when both k and s are unknown. In the first two settings, the authors give algorithms that achieve a latency of $O(k \log(n/k) + 1)$, while their solution for the third scenario has a latency of $O(k \log(n) \log \log(n))$. A lower bound of $\Omega(k \log(n/k) + 1)$ is given, which shows that their first two upper bounds are asymptotically optimal, and the third is within a $O(\log \log n)$ -factor of optimal.

When a global clock is available, Jurdziński and Stachowiak [116] show that even with a global clock, any deterministic algorithm must incur $\Omega(\log^2 n)$ latency. This may appear to be a weak lower bound; however, $O(\log^2 n)$ latency is possible with a deterministic algorithm under the SINR model (recall Section 3.3.2) as shown by Jurdziński et al. [112].

Switching to the multi-hop setting, Chrobak, Gaśieniec, and Kowalski [64] consider the wakeup problem with no global clock and no-CD. The authors present a deterministic algorithm with run time $O(n^{5/3} \log n)$. This was later improved by Chlebus and Kowalski [56], who give a non-adaptive, deterministic algorithm with $O(n^{3/2} \log n)$ time. Finally, Chlebus et al. [54] improve this further by giving an existence proof for a wakeup algorithm in that runs in $O(n \log^2 n)$, and an explicit algorithm that runs in $O(n \Delta \text{poly}(\log n))$ time, where Δ is the maximum in-degree (i.e., the number of neighbors that can communicate with a fixed node).

Discussion. Much of the theoretical territory has been mapped out with nearly-matching upper and lower asymptotic bounds on latency, and the results are less bleak than those surveyed under the AQT model. Notably, De Marco and Kowalski [72, 134] demonstrate that deterministic acknowledgement-based algorithms can provide latency that is close to the asymptotic optimal—differing only by an $O(\log n \log \log n)$ -factor—even with without CD, a global clock, knowledge of k , or the time when the first station awakens.

More generally, we see several results that deviate from an asymptotically-optimal latency by (roughly) a logarithmic factor. The presence of this term may seem puzzling at first glance, but it arises from first deriving a randomized algorithm that succeeds with high probability in n (which incurs the logarithmic factor), and then showing the existence of a deterministic algorithm via the probabilistic method. This technique is what is often providing the logarithmic-factor discrepancy between upper and lower bounds.

Despite this improvement, deterministic approaches fall short of being able to offer $O(k)$ latency in the dynamic setting; this is unsurprising given the analogous situation in the static setting (Section 2.2). A natural method to seek improvement is via randomized algorithms, which we survey next.

3.3 Randomized Approaches for Contention Resolution

As we saw in Section 2, randomized backoff algorithms provide asymptotically-optimal makespan for the static setting without requiring unique IDs, CD, or knowledge of n . In contrast to the results surveyed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, randomized approaches seem likely to perform better in the dynamic setting.

Developing Intuition. A common theme in the design of randomized algorithms for contention resolution is to decompose the dynamic case into a sequence of static cases. Here, we describe one method by which this decomposition is accomplished (for examples, see [29–31]).

When a packet u arrives, it listens to the channel to determine whether it is already in use by other packets. Any packets that have arrived ahead of u may still be attempting to succeed and, if so, they should also be emitting a “busy signal”, which we describe momentarily. If u detects this busy signal, then it listens until this signal ceases, at which point it can start attempting to transmit. In this way, there are always two groups of packets: (1) **active** packets that are

trying to transmit, while maintaining a busy signal, and (2) *idle* packets that are waiting for their turn on the channel. Given this isolation, active packets can execute a contention-resolution algorithm for the static setting in order to succeed; afterwards, any idle packets can become active and repeat this process.

The busy signal can take different forms. For example, given CD and a global clock, active packets can emit a "busy" transmission in each even-numbered slot; see Figure 6. Any idle packet that hears this signal or a collision infers that active packets are present and keeps waiting. However, having all packets send in every second slot may not be desirable, since sending consumes energy [80, 157, 171, 180]. To reduce this cost, packets may emit the busy signal probabilistically, which can greatly reduce the sending cost. Under this approach, some packets may still be active, but fail to emit a busy signal. When this happens, any idle packets will become active prematurely and interfere with the already-active packets.

This interference is mitigated differently, depending on the setting. Bender et al. [30, 31] assume CD and $O(\log n)$ control bits (recall Section 1.1.4) in each transmission on the shared channel. The busy signal occurs probabilistically every $O(1)$ slots, with each active packet sending an expected $O(1)$ times to maintain the signal. Interleaved with the busy signal are slots used to estimate the number of active packets, $m \leq n$, which allows them to execute TSTB (recall Section 2.1) starting with a window of size $\Theta(m)$. Additionally, a leader is elected from the set of active packets to broadcast how many slots remain in the execution of TSTB; this serves as a busy signal during the execution of TSTB. The leader is frequently changed so that each packet is responsible for $O(1)$ transmissions in expectation. Newly-arrived idle packets need only listen for a handful of slots to receive this information, which allows them to (i) avoid becoming active prematurely and (ii) avoid any further listening until the current execution of TSTB is finished. While the above process can fail—for example, the estimate is poor, the busy signal fails, or active packets do not succeed in the execution of TSTB—this occurs with probability at most polynomially small in the number of active packets, which allows for $O(n)$ expected latency. Additionally, the expected number of channel accesses performed per packet is $O(\log \log^* n)$. This low number of accesses translates is important to modern networks where devices are battery-powered, given that listening and sending on the channel consumes limited energy. We note that this approach makes use of snooping (recall Section 1.1.2), where that the number of control bits sent in a packet is $O(\log n)$.

3.3.1 Randomized k -Selection. We extend our discussion above by continuing to survey the results that employ randomized algorithms for the dynamic k -Selection problem. In the context of randomized algorithms, results focus the case where $k = n$. Much of the literature can be subdivided into the no-CD and CD cases, where the latter case captures more a broader range of model aspects, such as extreme energy efficiency, along with more exotic channel feedback and adversarial behavior.

No-CD. De Marco and Stachowiak [73] explore randomized solutions with no-CD. When n is known (or a known to within a constant multiplicative factor), they provide a non-adaptive algorithm with $O(n)$ latency, which is asymptotically optimal. For the case where n is unknown, a lower bound of $\Omega(n \log n / (\log \log n)^2)$ latency is shown to hold for any non-adaptive, randomized algorithm; thus, there is an asymptotic separation in latency between adaptive and non-adaptive randomized algorithms. Additionally, the authors provide a strongly non-adaptive, non-acknowledgment-based algorithm with $O(n \log^2 n)$ latency; this latency can be improved to $O(n \log n / (\log \log n)^2)$ with an acknowledgment-based algorithm, which asymptotically matches their lower bound. Finally, when n is unknown, the authors also provide an adaptive algorithm that achieves $O(n)$ latency

A more recent result by Bender et al. [29] shows that w.h.p. constant throughput can be achieved by an adaptive algorithm with no-CD. This is comparable to the adaptive algorithm by De Marco and Stachowiak [73] for the case




Fig. 6. An example of how a busy signal may be used to decompose the dynamic case into a series of static cases. Here, three packets (colored red) arrive in slot 1 and issue the busy signal in slots 2, 4, and 6. During this time, other packets (colored blue) arrive, but remain idle, since they detect the busy signal. Once all red packets succeed, slot 8 is empty, and the blue packets become active.

where n is unknown. However, the result by De Marco and Stachowiak requires that some packets remain in the system for a time even after succeeding in order to help facilitate other transmissions; in contrast, the result by Bender et al. allows packets to terminate immediately upon success. We also note that while the results of De Marco and Stachowiak and Bender et al. are efficient in terms of the number of transmission attempts made, they still require packets to listen in a constant fraction of all slots.

With CD. When CD is available, Bender et al. [30] achieve $O(n)$ latency using expected $O(\log \log^* n)$ channel accesses per packet; this is shown to be asymptotically optimal by Chang et al. [46]. This extremely low number of accesses translates to modern networks where devices are battery-powered, given that listening and sending on the channel consumes energy.

When the resource may be unavailable for D slots, Bender et al. [25, 26] show that $O(n + D)$ latency can be achieved with $O(\log^2(n + D))$ send attempts per packet; however, packets listen in each slot.

In a setting with C channels, Fineman et al. [84] give an algorithm with $O(\log n / \log C + (\log \log n)(\log \log \log n))$ latency for the general case, and $O(\log n / \log C + (\log \log n))$ in the restricted case where at most 2 participants become active; this second case matches the lower bound provided by Newport [151].

Also in the multi-channel setting, Christodoulou et al. [63] consider a game theoretic setting where participants may deviate from any prescribed protocol. The authors give protocols from which no participant will unilaterally deviate and which provide probabilistic latency guarantees.

Finally, recent work by Bender et al. [28] investigates a problem variant where at most an integer $\kappa \geq 1$ simultaneous successful transmissions are possible. This model is reminiscent of [107] (in Section 3.1), and it captures the newer radio technology that can decode a limited number of concurrent transmissions. Here, the notion of CD alters slightly, where participants can distinguish between an empty slot and a slot with multiple transmissions; however, participants do not learn whether the number of transmissions in any slot exceeds or is at most κ (unless they are one of the senders). Here, the authors show that a throughput of $1 - o(1)$ is possible.

3.3.2 The Wakeup Problem. Many randomized solutions focus on the wakeup problem (recall Section 3.2). An early result is by Willard [181], who considers the with-CD case where k out of n stations each has a packet to send, for $2 \leq k \leq n$. Here, Willard establishes a lower bound on “fair” protocols—for any fixed round, each device sends packets with the same probability⁷—showing that there is some value of Q for which the expected time to success is at least $\lfloor \lg \lg n \rfloor - c$, where $c > 0$ is a constant. A randomized algorithm is given with $\lg \lg n + O(1)$ latency, for when n is known, but k is not.

In the case of no-CD, when n is known and there is a global clock, Kushilevitz and Mansour [123, 124] prove a stronger lower bound of $\Omega(\log n)$ expected rounds in the case where all devices awake in the same round (i.e., the static case); this applies even to non-uniform algorithms. For algorithms that succeed with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, this lower bound was strengthened to $\Omega(\log n \log(1/\epsilon))$ by Farach-Colton et al. [76].⁸ We note a couple things. First, this is dramatically different from the lower bound by Willard [181], where CD is available. Second, we note nearly-matching upper bounds are given by Jurdziński and Stachowiak [114], with or without a global clock, where $O(\log n \log(1/\epsilon))$ latency is possible so long as at least one of the following is true: devices have unique labels, or n is known.

Without CD, Jurdziński and Stachowiak [114, 115] present randomized algorithms with error ϵ for solving several versions of the wakeup problem: where participants are labeled or unlabeled, where there is a global clock or not, and where n is known or unknown. We note that, while all deterministic results rely on the use of labels, this is an example where a randomized result uses labels; in this case, the labels are used to approximate system size. The authors are concerned with algorithms where, for any fixed round, each awake device sends with the same probability. A main finding is a near-exponential separation between the global and local clock settings when n is unknown and there is no labeling; the former has latency (roughly) polylogarithmic in n and $1/\epsilon$, while the latter requires $\tilde{\Omega}(n)$ latency. In the cases where n is known or the participants are labeled (or both), the run time is $O(\log n \log(1/\epsilon))$. For fair/uniform algorithms, the authors also show a nearly-tight lower bound of $\Omega\left(\frac{\log(n) \log(1/\epsilon)}{\log \log(n) + \log \log(1/\epsilon)}\right)$ for the case where n is known and the participants are labeled.

An alternative channel model makes use of the **signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR)**, and this has featured in several fundamental wireless-communication problems; for details, see [111–113, 116, 145, 146]). Informally, the ratio of (i) the power of an incoming transmission to (ii) the sum interference from other devices plus the floor noise, must exceed a threshold value in order for the transmission to succeed. Furthermore, in this setting, collision detection is not available. Jurdziński and Stachowiak [116] consider the SINR model in the absence of a global clock. They demonstrate a randomized algorithm that runs in $O(\log^2 n / \log \log n)$ slots, assuming participants know a polynomial upper bound on the system size.

Another result in the SINR model by Fineman et al. [83] shows how to solve wakeup with $O(\log n + \log R)$ latency, where R is ratio between the longest and shortest link. The authors point out that, in many practical settings, R is at most a polynomial in n , which yields an $O(\log n)$ result.⁹

For a single-hop radio network, Chlebus et al. [52] consider k devices becoming active over time, with access to a known number of b channels. There is no-CD and no global clock. Here, all stations may access all channels at once. When k is known, Chlebus et al. present a randomized algorithm with error ϵ that has latency $O(k^{1/b} \ln(1/\epsilon))$.

Chrobak, Gąsieniec, and Kowalski [64] consider the wakeup problem for n devices in a multi-hop radio network with no global clock and no collision detection. Each node has a unique label from a range of size $O(n)$. The authors

⁷Note that this is a different notion of fairness than described in Section 3.1, and it is referred to as “uniform” by Jurdziński and Stachowiak [114, 115].

⁸In multi-hop networks, for uniform/fair algorithms, this lower bound is strengthened by Farach-Colton and Mosteiro to $\Omega(\log^2 n)$ [77, 78].

⁹This ratio appears in other related results under the SINR model, such as interference scheduling or link scheduling (e.g., [75]).

present a randomized algorithm with run time $O(D \log^2 n)$, where D is the network diameter. These algorithms are used to solve leader election and clock synchronization.

Finally, we note a recent result by Gilbert et al. [96], that examines the implications of system-size “predictions”; that is, the algorithm is given access to the probability distribution defined over the possible values of n . The authors give lower and upper bounds for both deterministic and randomized solutions, for the CD and no-CD cases. Interestingly, in addition to several new bounds, this work recovers some lower bounds discussed above in this section; specifically, the $\Omega(\log n / \log \log n)$ bound by Jurdziński and Stachowiak [114], as well as the $\Omega(\log \log n)$ lower bound by Willard [181].

Discussion. For the selection problem, we can get asymptotically optimal $O(n)$ latency, and this is possible even with a high degree of energy efficiency, or if there is a powerful jamming attack. Interestingly, this latency is possible even when no-CD is available, although the result is less robust to significant jamming. For the wakeup problem, the situation is also significantly improved by randomization. Specifically, compared to the results surveyed in Section 3.2.2, we see that randomization allows for $O(\text{polylog}(n))$ latency in contrast to $\omega(n)$ latency in the single-hop scenario. In comparison to the results from the AQT and deterministic approaches, it is clear that randomization offers significant improvements.

Another aspect of randomized approaches to the selection problem is the focus on the number of access attempts, which translates to energy consumption. The $O(\log \log^* n)$ complexity achieved by Bender [30] exploits the ability to send and receive messages of $\Theta(\log n)$ bits. Under the more standard ternary feedback model, the best results achieve a polylogarithmic in n number of access attempts.

Finally, we note that while many these randomized results achieve asymptotically optimal latency, they are fragile in the sense that even a small amount of channel interference can cause the corresponding algorithm to fail. For example, the result of Bender et al. [30] estimates the number of packets contending for channel access; even a single slot with interference can cause a gross overestimate. Another instance is a result by De Marco and Stachowiak [73], which depends on coordination messages issued by a leader; such messages can be disrupted by interference. Tolerating interference is the subject we turn to in our next section.

4 JAMMING-RESISTANT CONTENTION RESOLUTION

“I bought the jammer from a local electrical store and asked the police if it was OK and they said it was - it’s great as it has stopped the problem, but some of the local shops aren’t happy.”

– Father Michele Madonna of Santa Maria di Montesanto Church [152]

A jamming attack is characterized by deliberate collisions on the multiple access channel. By deviating from a prescribed protocol, a jamming device (**jammer**) can launch a denial-of-service attack, preventing other devices from being able to communicate [164]. There have been several well-publicized instances of jamming [67, 149, 152, 172], behavior that may become more common given the trend towards wireless personal devices. For example, alluding to the quote above, Father Madonna installed a store-bought jamming device in his church to prevent attendees from disrupting his services with cellphone usage. However, this device also interfered with nearby wireless devices, with shop owners complaining that credit card payment systems were affected.

There are a number of papers addressing applied security considerations with respect to jamming (for examples, see [18, 21, 125, 184, 185, 187, 188], and surveys [147, 178]). For example, spread spectrum techniques involve devices coordinating their communication over different portions of the spectrum in order to evade collisions [127, 150]. Another defense is to have devices map the areas impacted by jamming and then routing traffic around those areas [103, 186].

Specialized antenna technology (i.e., controlled reception pattern antennas) can be used to filter out a jamming signal, which is a process referred to as null steering [138, 191].

In terms of communication on a multiple access channel, there is a large body of results showing that several fundamental distributed computing challenges—such as broadcast [34, 50, 95, 97], leader election [93, 94], gossip [74, 92], node discovery [139], and simple point-to-point communication [117, 118]—can be solved despite a powerful jamming adversary; and many of these results have been surveyed previously [27, 189]. Here, we focus on prior contention-resolution results that offer provable guarantees on throughput or makespan, despite a powerful jamming adversary.

Developing Intuition. A jamming adversary poses at least two significant new challenges over the dynamic-arrivals model considered in Section 3. First, it may not be obvious that non-trivial makespan guarantees are possible; for example, if jamming occurs in every slot in perpetuity, then no participants can succeed. Therefore, we must either constrain the jamming power of the adversary (for example, by assuming a bounded adversary), or alter our measure of throughput to address this case. Second, the algorithms surveyed so far that rely on channel feedback to adjust contention—for example, by estimating n (such as in [31, 99]) or by exchanging messages between participants—are vulnerable, since jamming allows the adversary to create collisions and prevent communication.

With regard to the first challenge, Chang et al. [46] measure performance over non-jammed slots. Specifically, assuming that at least one participant is present in the system, a slot that is not jammed, but where no participant succeeds, is said to be *wasted*. Guaranteeing that only a small constant fraction of slots are wasted allows us to derive meaningful results despite an adversary that jams aggressively, perhaps even in every slot.

Tuning the contention requires care. Participants follow some simple rules for updating the sending probability in each slot: increasing if there is silence, decreasing if there is noise, and leaving it unchanged in the case of a success. The adversary may lower the sending probabilities of participants by jamming (i.e., adding noise), thus depressing contention. However, the update rule allows for contention to quickly recover once the jamming ceases (although, it may resume again later), and few slots are wasted as a result. Notably, this design allows the algorithm to achieve roughly $1/e$ throughput in the non-jammed slots, which rivals that of slotted ALOHA, despite the more-challenging adversarial setting.

Survey of the Literature. Broadly speaking, the jamming adversaries treated in the literature on contention resolution can be categorized as *bounded* or *unbounded*. The former has constraints that limit the amount of jamming; typically, this is specified by a jamming rate or by a fraction of the slots that can be jammed within any contiguous set of slots. In contrast, as the name suggests, an unbounded adversary may jam arbitrarily.

An early series of results against a bounded adversary was obtained by Awerbuch et al. [19], who consider the following model. There are n honest participants equipped with CD, and the network is saturated (recall Section 2.1). For some $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and constant $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there is an adversary that can jam at most $(1 - \epsilon)w$ of the slots in any consecutive $w \geq T$ slots. This adversary is referred to as $(T, 1 - \epsilon)$ -*bounded*, and the value of ϵ is unknown to participants.

Such bounded jamming may be well-motivated in practice, where aggressive jamming can reveal that an attack is occurring, as well as the location of the malicious device(s) (for examples, see [126, 128, 188]), or correspond to a limited power supply. The adversary is also *adaptive*, meaning that the adversary knows the full history of the actions performed by honest nodes for all the previous slots, and may use this information to inform its jamming strategy in the current slot; however, the adversary does not know what actions participants are taking in the current slot. When the adversary jams a slot, all listening participants hear that the slot is jammed; this is referred to as a *1-uniform* adversary.

Awerbuch et al. [19, 20] define an algorithm to be **constant competitive** if, for any sufficiently large number of slots, the honest nodes perform successful message transmissions in a constant fraction of the non-jammed steps. The authors provide a randomized algorithm that is constant competitive with high probability (w.h.p.) in n , when all participants know a common parameter, $\gamma = O(1/(\log T + \log \log n))$, and the algorithm is run for a sufficiently large number of slots (as a function of: T , $\text{polylog}(\max\{T, n\})$, and $1/\gamma$). Roughly speaking, in a slot, the algorithm dictates that each participant u sends a message with probability p_u . If u does not send, it listens and updates p_u via a multiplicative factor which can increase or decrease, depending on whether or not the slot is idle. Notably, this multiplicative weights update method shares common ground with the later algorithm by Chang et al. [46] described above.

Subsequently, this line of work has been extended to several challenging settings, showing constant competitiveness so long as γ is known to all the participants, and the algorithm is executed for a sufficiently large number of slots. Richa et al. [159] consider a multi-hop network modeled as a unit disk graph (UDG). A description of the UDG has been given by Schmid and Wattenhofer [169]. First, Richa et al. [159, 165] consider the setting where the adversary is 1-uniform and the UDG is connected, or each participant has at least $2/\epsilon$ neighbors. Then, against a $(T, 1 - \epsilon)$ -bounded adversary, the authors provide an algorithm, named JADE, that is w.h.p. constant competitive. Second, Richa et al. [159] prove that, if the graph is not connected, or the adversary is 2-uniform—for any slot, the adversary may choose any partition of the n participants and have the members of one partition hear jamming, while the others do not—and participants each have $o(1/\epsilon)$ neighbors, then JADE can fail to be constant competitive.

Against a **reactive** jamming adversary—who can learn whether or not the channel is idle in the current slot and can choose to jam based on this information—Richa et al. [160, 166] show that constant competitiveness is still possible. In addition to jamming, more benign noise, such as interference due to environmental factors, can present a challenge to communication.

Under the SINR model (recall Section 3.3.2), Ogierman et al. [154, 155] address jamming. The authors provide a multiplicative weights update algorithm that is $2^{-O(1/\epsilon)^{2/\alpha-2}}$ -competitive, where $\alpha > 2$ is a parameter of the SINR model known as the path-loss exponent, which corresponds to the degree of signal attenuation.

In the case where multiple networks inhabit the same terrain, bandwidth may be scarce and inter-network communication may not be possible. In this setting, Richa et al. [161] present a multiplicative weights update algorithm that allows each of the k networks to obtain $\Omega(\epsilon^2 \min\{\epsilon, 1/\text{poly}(k)\})$ -fraction of the non-jammed slots.

A different approach is taken by Bender et al. [25, 26], who address an adversary who is not constrained in its jamming. A packet starts in an “inactive” state by listening to the channel, and if a sufficient number of empty slots are heard, the packet becomes “active” in the sense of making transmission attempts. This “throttling” mechanism gives time for contention to decrease, thus allowing active packets to succeed. An active packet will make transmission attempts, but in contrast to updating based on feedback in each slot, Bender et al. [25, 26] monotonically reduce the sending probability of each packet u as roughly $1/s_u$, where s_u is the number of slots since u most recently started attempting to transmit (i.e., the age of u). Packet also listens (when not transmitting), and if a sufficient number of empty slots are heard, it resets $s_u = 1$. Here, they show expected constant throughput, with each packet making an expected number of transmission attempts that is polylogarithmic in $n + J$, where J is the total number of jammed slots during which there exists at least one packet. An analogous result is also given for the case of infinite packets, illustrating constant throughput and an expected average number of transmission attempts that is polylogarithmic in $\eta_t + J_t$, where η_t is the maximum number of concurrently sent packets in the system before slot t , and J_t is the number of jammed slots before slot t .

For the wakeup problem (recall Section 3.3.2), Chlebus et al. [52] consider a multi-channel setting where there are k out of n participants activated, each of which may access b channels simultaneously in any round. The adversary is a random jammer: each channel is jammed independently and uniformly with known probability $p < 1$ per round. The authors present two deterministic algorithms for unknown k that succeed with probability $1 - O(1/\text{poly}(n))$, the first with latency $O(k \log(n) \log^{1/b} k / \log(1/p))$, and the second with latency $O((k/b) \log(n) \log(b \log(n)) / \log(1/p))$ when $b = \Omega(\log(b \log n))$.

The AQT setting (recall Section 3.1) has been extended to incorporate jamming. Anantharamu et al. [7, 8] extends a leaky-bucket adversary (recall Section 3.1) to (λ, ρ, T) -**bounded** leaky bucket adversary who can also jam $\lambda t + b$ slots in any window of consecutive t slots; here, λ is the jamming rate, while b is the burstiness parameter (recall Section 3.1). Deterministic algorithms are presented, with and without CD, giving a range of bounds on queue size and latency parameterized by the injection rate, burstiness, and the *known* number of stations n , each of which has a unique ID in the range $[0, \dots, n - 1]$.

Similarly, Anta et al. [16] consider an adversary whose jamming capability is parameterized by both a rate *and* the number of packets it can jam. This adversary is referred to as (σ, ρ) -**bounded**, where $\rho \in [0, 1]$ and $\sigma \geq 1$. The adversary has a token bucket of size σ where it stores **error tokens**. Adversary can introduce an error in the channel and jam the packet being transmitted, consuming one token. For any time t , within interval $T = [0, t]$, there will be $\lfloor \rho T \rfloor$ created, where ρ is the rate at which they become available to the adversary. Here, the authors consider deterministic algorithms for transmitting data from a single sender to a single receiver. The adversary is assumed to know the algorithm and use this information to inform its jamming strategy. The amount of data (i.e., packet size) may be adjusted by the sender during execution. If the channel is jammed during transmission, the sender immediately becomes aware of this failure.

In contrast to the results discussed above, Jurdzinski et al. [110] consider an *unbounded* adversary. Packets of *different* sizes may arrive over time. If the adversary jams at any time during which a packet is transmitted, the transmission fails and the sender learns of this immediately. Under this model, the authors give a deterministic, constant-competitive online algorithm.

An impossibility result is given by Bender et al. [29], who show that, without CD, no algorithm can guarantee a packet success in time linear in the system size with better than constant probability in the presence of jamming; this result holds even if against a non-adaptive jamming adversary. Subsequently, Chen et al. [49] give an algorithm that achieves a trade-off between the throughput and the amount of jamming that can be tolerated. In the challenging case where a constant fraction of slots are jammed, the authors achieve $O(1/\log n)$ throughput, which aligns with the lower bound of Bender et al. [29].

Discussion. Perhaps unsurprisingly, randomization along with CD can provide constant throughput (in non-jammed slots) despite an unbounded adversary; even without CD, jamming can be tolerated, although throughput decreases slightly to $\Theta(1/\log n)$. When the adversary is bounded, a range of results exist. Under a saturated model, randomized results demonstrate constant throughput for a variety of network settings against a bounded adversary, so long as some weak information about the adversary's power and n is known. In contrast, deterministic results in the AQT setting are more nuanced, being parameterized by aspects of jamming rate and burstiness, and generally more pessimistic; however, strong online results are possible.

Existing results that tolerate jamming exhibit a sharp trade-off between the amount of listening devices perform and throughput achieved. On one hand, if each participant listens to the channel in every slot (except when sending), then constant throughput (in expectation or w.h.p. in non-jammed slots) is possible [19, 25, 26, 46, 159, 160]. Note that such

results are not energy efficient, given that listening is roughly as costly as sending in practice (recall Section 1.1.3). On the other hand, if devices never listen to the channel, only sub-constant throughput is possible, and the best result is $O(1/\log n)$ throughput w.h.p. [49]. Therefore, an open problem for jamming-resistant contention resolution is whether constant throughput can be achieved with a small amount of listening.

5 CONCLUSION

We have surveyed the vast literature on contention resolution by delineating results based on key model assumptions, metrics, and algorithm-design choices. The problem of contention resolution remains an active topic of research and here we discuss some potential directions for future research.

Machine learning (ML) may have an important role to play in the design of contention-resolution algorithms. As discussed in Section 3.3.2, Gilbert et al. [96] demonstrate the impact of system-size predictions, and a natural question is whether there are other useful predictions that give improved performance. For example, can predictions about whether a slot will be noisy (or jammed) yield improved robustness?

In many wireless systems, collisions have significant cost. For example, in WiFi networks, the entire packet must be sent before the sender learns of success or failure (due to a collision). Under code division multiple access modulation schemes (recall [28]), multiple packets may be sent simultaneously; therefore, a collision ruins what could otherwise be multiple successful transmissions in a slot. In mobile settings, failure to transmit a packet may mean incurring a significant delay before the sender is next within range of the intended receiver. Therefore, modeling collision cost is another angle that presents some interesting open problems in the area of contention resolution.

Another dimension to consider is traffic priority. Consider a packet that contains voice-over-IP data, and another packet holding old data being backed up on a remote server. Which packet should get access to the shared channel first? Intuitively, the first packet is time sensitive and should have priority; if it is delayed too long, the packet contents are useless. This prioritization will become increasingly important to wireless networks, as a combination of limited bandwidth and a growing number of devices forces a differentiated treatment of traffic. While this aspect has been explored in [1], there are several outstanding questions regarding robustness to adversarial jamming, heterogeneous packet sizes, and potential trade-offs with the amount of delay packets may suffer as a result.

Energy efficiency is likely to remain an important consideration in wireless systems. The limits of trading off between robustness to worst-case noise, energy efficiency, and latency remain unknown. For example, what is the optimal energy efficiency when the channel does not admit ternary feedback and/or participants cannot communicate information to each other via $\Theta(\log n)$ -sized messages? Can we achieve asymptotically-optimal latency against adversarial jamming using only, say, $\text{poly}(\log n)$ number of channel-access attempts per packet?

REFERENCES

- [1] Kunal Agrawal, Michael A. Bender, Jeremy T. Fineman, Seth Gilbert, and Maxwell Young. Contention resolution with message deadlines. In Christian Scheideler and Michael Spear, editors, *SPAA '20: 32nd ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures, Virtual Event, USA, July 15-17, 2020*, pages 23–35. ACM, 2020.
- [2] B. A. Aldawsari, B. S. Chlebus, and D. R. Kowalski. Broadcasting on adversarial multiple access channels. In *2019 IEEE 18th International Symposium on Network Computing and Applications (NCA)*, pages 1–4, 2019.
- [3] N. Alon and J.H. Spencer. *The Probabilistic Method*. Wiley Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. Wiley, 2016.
- [4] Noga Alon, Amotz Bar-Noy, Nathan Linial, and David Peleg. A lower bound for radio broadcast. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 43(2):290–298, 1991.
- [5] Lakshmi Anantharamu and Bogdan S Chlebus. Broadcasting in ad hoc multiple access channels. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 584:155–176, 2015.
- [6] Lakshmi Anantharamu, Bogdan S Chlebus, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Mariusz A Rokicki. Deterministic broadcast on multiple access channels. In *2010 Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2010.

- [7] Lakshmi Anantharamu, Bogdan S Chlebus, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Mariusz A Rokicki. Medium access control for adversarial channels with jamming. In *International Colloquium on Structural Information and Communication Complexity*, pages 89–100. Springer, 2011.
- [8] Lakshmi Anantharamu, Bogdan S Chlebus, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Mariusz A Rokicki. Packet latency of deterministic broadcasting in adversarial multiple access channels. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 99:27–52, 2019.
- [9] Lakshmi Anantharamu, Bogdan S Chlebus, and Mariusz A Rokicki. Adversarial multiple access channel with individual injection rates. In *International Conference On Principles Of Distributed Systems*, pages 174–188. Springer, 2009.
- [10] Lakshmi Anantharamu, Bogdan S Chlebus, and Mariusz A Rokicki. Adversarial multiple access channels with individual injection rates. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 61(3):820–850, 2017.
- [11] T. E. Anderson. The performance of spin lock alternatives for shared-memory multiprocessors. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 1(1):6–16, 1990.
- [12] William C. Anderton, Trisha Chakraborty, and Maxwell Young. Windowed backoff algorithms for wifi: Theory and performance under batched arrivals. *Distributed Computing*, 34:367–393, 2021.
- [13] William C. Anderton and Maxwell Young. Is our model for contention resolution wrong?: Confronting the cost of collisions. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures, SPAA*, pages 183–194. ACM, 2017.
- [14] Matthew Andrews, Baruch Awerbuch, Antonio Fernández, Tom Leighton, Zhiyong Liu, and Jon Kleinberg. Universal-stability results and performance bounds for greedy contention-resolution protocols. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 48(1):39–69, 2001.
- [15] Daily Mail Annabel Grossman. Interrupted service: Priest fed up with mobile phones ringing during mass installs jamming device to stop calls and texts coming through in church, 2014. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2876243/Priest-fed-mobile-phones-ringing-Mass-installs-jamming-device.html>.
- [16] Antonio Fernández Anta, Chryssis Georgiou, Dariusz R. Kowalski, and Elli Zavou. Adaptive packet scheduling over a wireless channel under constrained jamming. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 692:72–89, 2017.
- [17] Antonio Fernández Anta and Miguel A. Mosteiro. Contention resolution in multiple-access channels: k-selection in radio networks. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual International Conference on Computing and Combinatorics (COCOON)*, pages 378–388, 2010.
- [18] Nils Aschenbruck, Elmar Gerhards-Padilla, and Peter Martini. Simulative Evaluation of Adaptive Jamming Detection in Wireless Multi-hop Networks. In *International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems Workshops*, pages 213–220, 2010.
- [19] Baruch Awerbuch, Andrea Richa, and Christian Scheidele. A jamming-resistant MAC protocol for single-hop wireless networks. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 45–54, 2008.
- [20] Baruch Awerbuch, Andréa W. Richa, Christian Scheidele, Stefan Schmid, and Jin Zhang. Principles of robust medium access and an application to leader election. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 10(4):24:1–24:26, 2014.
- [21] Emrah Bayraktaroglu, Christopher King, Xin Liu, Guevara Noubir, Rajmohan Rajaraman, and Bishal Thapa. On the Performance of IEEE 802.11 Under Jamming. In *INFOCOM*, pages 1265–1273, 2008.
- [22] Naama Ben-David and Guy E. Blelloch. Analyzing contention and backoff in asynchronous shared memory. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2017, Washington, DC, USA, July 25-27, 2017*, pages 53–62, 2017.
- [23] Michael A. Bender, Martin Farach-Colton, Simai He, Bradley C. Kuszmaul, and Charles E. Leiserson. Adversarial contention resolution for simple channels. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA)*, pages 325–332, 2005.
- [24] Michael A. Bender, Jeremy T. Fineman, and Seth Gilbert. Contention resolution with heterogeneous job sizes. In *Proceedings of the 14th Conference on Annual European Symposium (ESA)*, pages 112–123, 2006.
- [25] Michael A. Bender, Jeremy T. Fineman, Seth Gilbert, and Maxwell Young. How to Scale Exponential Backoff: Constant Throughput, Polylog Access Attempts, and Robustness. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '16*, pages 636–654, 2016.
- [26] Michael A. Bender, Jeremy T. Fineman, Seth Gilbert, and Maxwell Young. Scaling exponential backoff: Constant throughput, polylogarithmic channel-access attempts, and robustness. *J. ACM*, 66(1):6:1–6:33, 2019.
- [27] Michael A. Bender, Jeremy T. Fineman, Mahnush Movahedi, Jared Saia, Varsha Dani, Seth Gilbert, Seth Pettie, and Maxwell Young. Resource-competitive algorithms. *SIGACT News*, 46(3):57–71, September 2015.
- [28] Michael A. Bender, Seth Gilbert, Fabian Kuhn, John Kuszmaul, and Muriel Médard. Contention resolution for coded radio networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA)*, pages 119–130. ACM, 2022.
- [29] Michael A. Bender, Tsvi Kopelowitz, William Kuszmaul, and Seth Pettie. Contention resolution without collision detection. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 105–118, 2020.
- [30] Michael A. Bender, Tsvi Kopelowitz, Seth Pettie, and Maxwell Young. Contention resolution with log-logstar channel accesses. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2016*, pages 499–508, 2016.
- [31] Michael A. Bender, Tsvi Kopelowitz, Seth Pettie, and Maxwell Young. Contention resolution with constant throughput and log-logstar channel accesses. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 47(5):1735–1754, 2018.
- [32] Daniel S. Berger, Martin Karsten, and Jens Schmitt. On the Relevance of Adversarial Queueing Theory in Practice. In *The 2014 ACM International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems, SIGMETRICS '14*, pages 343–354, 2014.
- [33] B. N. Bhandari, R. V. Raja Kumar, and S. L. Maskara. Performance of IEEE 802.16 MAC layer protocol under conditions of self-similar traffic. In *TENCON 2008 - 2008 IEEE Region 10 Conference*, pages 1–4, 2008.

- [34] Vartika Bhandhari, Jonathan Katz, Chiu-Yuen Koo, and Nitin Vaidya. Reliable Broadcast in Radio Networks: The Bounded Collision Case. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 258 – 264, 2006.
- [35] Giuseppe Bianchi. Ieee 802.11-saturation throughput analysis. *IEEE communications letters*, 2(12):318–320, 1998.
- [36] Giuseppe Bianchi. Performance analysis of the ieee 802.11 distributed coordination function. *IEEE Journal on selected areas in communications*, 18(3):535–547, 2000.
- [37] Giuseppe Bianchi and Ilenia Tinnirello. Kalman filter estimation of the number of competing terminals in an IEEE 802.11 network. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies (INFOCOM)*, volume 2, pages 844–852, 2003.
- [38] Marcin Bienkowski, Tomasz Jurdzinski, Mirosław Korzeniowski, and Dariusz R. Kowalski. Distributed online and stochastic queuing on a multiple access channel. In Marcos K. Aguilera, editor, *Distributed Computing - 26th International Symposium, DISC 2012, Salvador, Brazil, October 16–18, 2012. Proceedings*, volume 7611 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 121–135. Springer, 2012.
- [39] Marcin Bienkowski, Tomasz Jurdzinski, Mirosław Korzeniowski, and Dariusz R. Kowalski. Distributed online and stochastic queuing on a multiple access channel. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 14(2), May 2018.
- [40] Marcin Bienkowski, Marek Klonowski, Mirosław Korzeniowski, and Dariusz R Kowalski. Dynamic sharing of a multiple access channel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1001.3044*, 2010.
- [41] Allan Borodin, Jon Kleinberg, Prabhakar Raghavan, Madhu Sudan, and David P Williamson. Adversarial queuing theory. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 48(1):13–38, 2001.
- [42] Federico Cali, Marco Conti, and Enrico Gregori. Dynamic tuning of the IEEE 802.11 protocol to achieve a theoretical throughput limit. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 8(6):785–799, 2000.
- [43] Federico Cali, Marco Conti, and Enrico Gregori. IEEE 802.11 protocol: Design and performance evaluation of an adaptive backoff mechanism. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 18(9):1774–1786, 2000.
- [44] B. Canberk and S. Oktug. Self similarity analysis and modeling of VoIP traffic under wireless heterogeneous network environment. In *Telecommunications, 2009. AICT '09. Fifth Advanced International Conference on*, pages 76–82, 2009.
- [45] J. Capetanakis. Generalized tdma: The multi-accessing tree protocol. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 27(10):1476–1484, 1979.
- [46] Yi-Jun Chang, Wenyu Jin, and Seth Pettie. Simple contention resolution via multiplicative weight updates. In *Proceedings of the Second Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms, SOSA@SODA 2019, January 8-9, 2019 - San Diego, CA, USA*, pages 16:1–16:16, 2019.
- [47] Yi-Jun Chang, Tsvi Kopelowitz, Seth Pettie, Ruosong Wang, and Wei Zhan. Exponential separations in the energy complexity of leader election. In *Proceedings of the Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2017.
- [48] Yi-Jun Chang, Tsvi Kopelowitz, Seth Pettie, Ruosong Wang, and Wei Zhan. Exponential separations in the energy complexity of leader election. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 15(4), October 2019.
- [49] Haimin Chen, Yonggang Jiang, and Chaodong Zheng. Tight trade-off in contention resolution without collision detection. In Avery Miller, Keren Censor-Hillel, and Janne H. Korhonen, editors, *PODC '21: ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, July 26–30, 2021*, pages 139–149. ACM, 2021.
- [50] Haimin Chen and Chaodong Zheng. Broadcasting competitively against adaptive adversary in multi-channel radio networks. In Quentin Bramas, Rotem Oshman, and Paolo Romano, editors, *24th International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems, OPODIS 2020, December 14–16, 2020, Strasbourg, France (Virtual Conference)*, volume 184 of *LIPICs*, pages 22:1–22:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [51] Bogdan S Chlebus. Randomized communication in radio networks. *Combinatorial Optimization-Dordrecht*, 9(1):401–456, 2001.
- [52] Bogdan S. Chlebus, Gianluca De Marco, and Dariusz R. Kowalski. Scalable wake-up of multi-channel single-hop radio networks. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 615(C):23 – 44, February 2016.
- [53] Bogdan S. Chlebus, Leszek Gasieniec, Alan Gibbons, Andrzej Pelc, and Wojciech Rytter. Deterministic broadcasting in unknown radio networks. In David B. Shmoys, editor, *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, January 9–11, 2000, San Francisco, CA, USA*, pages 861–870, 2000.
- [54] Bogdan S. Chlebus, Leszek Gasieniec, Dariusz R. Kowalski, and Tomasz Radzik. On the wake-up problem in radio networks. In Luís Caires, Giuseppe F. Italiano, Luís Monteiro, Catuscia Palamidessi, and Moti Yung, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming, 32nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2005, Lisbon, Portugal, July 11–15, 2005, Proceedings*, volume 3580 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 347–359. Springer, 2005.
- [55] Bogdan S Chlebus, Elijah Hradovich, Tomasz Jurdziński, Marek Klonowski, and Dariusz R Kowalski. Energy efficient adversarial routing in shared channels. In *The 31st ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, pages 191–200, 2019.
- [56] Bogdan S. Chlebus and Dariusz R. Kowalski. A better wake-up in radio networks. In Soma Chaudhuri and Shay Kutten, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2004, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada, July 25–28, 2004*, pages 266–274. ACM, 2004.
- [57] Bogdan S Chlebus and Dariusz R Kowalski. Almost optimal explicit selectors. In *International Symposium on Fundamentals of Computation Theory*, pages 270–280. Springer, 2005.
- [58] Bogdan S Chlebus, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Mariusz A Rokicki. Adversarial queuing on the multiple-access channel. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Principles of distributed computing*, pages 92–101, 2006.
- [59] Bogdan S Chlebus, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Mariusz A Rokicki. Stability of the multiple-access channel under maximum broadcast loads. In *Symposium on Self-Stabilizing Systems*, pages 124–138. Springer, 2007.

- [60] Bogdan S Chlebus, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Mariusz A Rokicki. Maximum throughput of multiple access channels in adversarial environments. *Distributed Computing*, 22(2):93–116, 2009.
- [61] Bogdan S. Chlebus, Dariusz R.Kowalski, and Mariusz A. Rokicki. Adversarial queuing on the multiple access channel. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 8(1):5:1–5:31, January 2012.
- [62] Nakjung Choi, Yongho Seok, Yanghee Choi, Sungmann Kim, and Hanwook Jung. P-DCF: Enhanced backoff scheme for the IEEE 802.11 DCF. In *2005 IEEE 61st Vehicular Technology Conference*, volume 3, 2005.
- [63] George Christodoulou, Themistoklis Melissourgous, and Paul G Spirakis. Strategic contention resolution in multiple channels. In *International Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms*, pages 165–180. Springer, 2018.
- [64] Marek Chrobak, Leszek Gasieniec, and Dariusz R. Kowalski. The wake-up problem in multihop radio networks. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36(5):1453–1471, 2007.
- [65] Marek Chrobak, Leszek Gasieniec, and Wojciech Rytter. Fast broadcasting and gossiping in radio networks. *Journal of Algorithms*, 43(2):177–189, 2002.
- [66] Andrea E. F. Clementi, Angelo Monti, and Riccardo Silvestri. Distributed broadcast in radio networks of unknown topology. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 302(1-3):337–364, 2003.
- [67] Federal Communications Commission. FCC 14-55: Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture of Illegal Operation of Signal Jamming Device, 2014. https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-14-55A1.pdf.
- [68] R.L. Cruz. A calculus for network delay. i. network elements in isolation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 37(1):114–131, 1991.
- [69] R.L. Cruz. A calculus for network delay. ii. network analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 37(1):132–141, 1991.
- [70] Jurek Czyzowicz, Leszek Gasieniec, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Andrzej Pelc. Consensus and mutual exclusion in a multiple access channel. In *International Symposium on Distributed Computing*, pages 512–526. Springer, 2009.
- [71] Sebastian Daum, Mohsen Ghaffari, Seth Gilbert, Fabian Kuhn, and Calvin Newport. Maximal independent sets in multichannel radio networks. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM symposium on Principles of distributed computing*, pages 335–344, 2013.
- [72] Gianluca De Marco and Dariusz R Kowalski. Contention resolution in a non-synchronized multiple access channel. In *2013 IEEE 27th International Symposium on Parallel and Distributed Processing*, pages 525–533. IEEE, 2013.
- [73] Gianluca De Marco and Grzegorz Stachowiak. Asynchronous shared channel. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '17, pages 391–400, 2017.
- [74] Shlomi Dolev, Seth Gilbert, Rachid Guerraoui, and Calvin Newport. Gossiping in a Multi-channel Radio Network: An Oblivious Approach to Coping with Malicious Interference. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 208–222, 2007.
- [75] Alexander Fanghänel, Thomas Kesselheim, and Berthold Vöcking. Improved algorithms for latency minimization in wireless networks. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(24):2657–2667, 2011.
- [76] Martín Farach-Colton, Rohan J. Fernandes, and Miguel A. Mosteiro. Lower bounds for clear transmissions in radio networks. In José R. Correa, Alejandro Hevia, and Marcos Kiwi, editors, *LATIN 2006: Theoretical Informatics*, pages 447–454, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [77] Martín Farach-Colton and Miguel A Mosteiro. Initializing sensor networks of non-uniform density in the weak sensor model. In *Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures*, pages 565–576. Springer, 2007.
- [78] Martín Farach-Colton and Miguel A Mosteiro. Initializing sensor networks of non-uniform density in the weak sensor model. *Algorithmica*, 73(1):87–114, 2015.
- [79] Guy Fayolle and Micha Hofri. On the capacity of a collision channel under stack-based collision resolution algorithm. Technical report, Computer Science Department, Technion, 1982.
- [80] Laura Marie Feeney and Martin Nilsson. Investigating the energy consumption of a wireless network interface in an ad hoc networking environment. In *Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM 2001*, volume 3, pages 1548–1557, 2001.
- [81] Antonio Fernández Anta, Miguel A. Mosteiro, and Jorge Ramón Muñoz. Unbounded contention resolution in multiple-access channels. *Algorithmica*, 67(3):295–314, 2013.
- [82] Antonio Fernández Anta, Miguel A. Mosteiro, and Jorge Ramón Muñoz. Unbounded contention resolution in multiple-access channels. In David Peleg, editor, *Distributed Computing - 25th International Symposium (DISC)*, pages 225–236, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [83] Jeremy T. Fineman, Seth Gilbert, Fabian Kuhn, and Calvin Newport. Contention resolution on a fading channel. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '16, pages 155–164, 2016.
- [84] Jeremy T. Fineman, Calvin Newport, and Tonghe Wang. Contention resolution on multiple channels with collision detection. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '16, pages 175–184, 2016.
- [85] INET Framework. Measuring Channel Utilization, 2023. <https://inet.omnetpp.org/docs/showcases/measurement/utilization/doc/index.html>.
- [86] Pawel Garncarek, Tomasz Jurdzinski, and Dariusz R Kowalski. Local queuing under contention. In *32nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2018)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.
- [87] Pawel Garncarek, Tomasz Jurdzinski, and Dariusz R Kowalski. Stable memoryless queuing under contention. In *33rd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- [88] Leszek Gasieniec, Andrzej Pelc, and David Peleg. The wakeup problem in synchronous broadcast systems (extended abstract). In Gil Neiger, editor, *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, July 16-19, 2000, Portland, Oregon, USA*, pages 113–121. ACM, 2000.

- [89] Leszek Gasieniec, Andrzej Pelc, and David Peleg. The wakeup problem in synchronous broadcast systems. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 14(2):207–222, 2001.
- [90] Mihály Geréb-Graus and Thanasis Tsantilas. Efficient optical communication in parallel computers. In *Proceedings 4th Annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA)*, pages 41–48, 1992.
- [91] Sayeed Ghani. The impact of self similar traffic on wireless LAN. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing Conference, IWCMC '10*, pages 52–56, 2010.
- [92] Seth Gilbert, Rachid Guerraoui, Dariusz Kowalski, and Calvin Newport. Interference-Resilient Information Exchange. In *INFOCOM*, pages 2249–2257, 2009.
- [93] Seth Gilbert, Rachid Guerraoui, and Calvin Newport. Of malicious motes and suspicious sensors: On the efficiency of malicious interference in wireless networks. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(6-7):546–569, 2009.
- [94] Seth Gilbert, Rachid Guerraoui, and Calvin C. Newport. Of Malicious Motes and Suspicious Sensors: On the Efficiency of Malicious Interference in Wireless Networks. In *International Conference On Principles Of Distributed Systems (OPODIS)*, pages 215–229, 2006.
- [95] Seth Gilbert, Valerie King, Seth Pettie, Ely Porat, Jared Saia, and Maxwell Young. (Near) Optimal Resource-competitive Broadcast with Jamming. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures, SPAA '14*, pages 257–266, 2014.
- [96] Seth Gilbert, Calvin Newport, Nitin Vaidya, and Alex Weaver. Contention resolution with predictions. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 127–137, 2021.
- [97] Seth Gilbert and Maxwell Young. Making Evildoers Pay: Resource-Competitive Broadcast in Sensor Networks. In *Proceedings of the 31th Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 145–154, 2012.
- [98] Leslie Ann Goldberg. Notes on contention resolution. 2000.
- [99] Albert G. Greenberg, Philippe Flajolet, and Richard E. Ladner. Estimating the multiplicities of conflicts to speed their resolution in multiple access channels. *J. ACM*, 34(2):289–325, 1987.
- [100] Albert G. Greenberg and Richard E. Ladner. Estimating the multiplicities of conflicts in multiple access channels (preliminary report). In *24th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Tucson, Arizona, USA, 7-9 November 1983*, pages 383–392. IEEE Computer Society, 1983.
- [101] Albert G Greenberg and Schmuel Winograd. A lower bound on the time needed in the worst case to resolve conflicts deterministically in multiple access channels. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 32(3):589–596, 1985.
- [102] Ronald I. Greenberg and Charles E. Leiserson. Randomized routing on fat-trees. In *Proc. of the Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 241–249, 1985.
- [103] Guangjie Han, Li Liu, Wenbo Zhang, and Sammy Chan. A hierarchical jammed-area mapping service for ubiquitous communication in smart communities. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 56(1):92–98, 2018.
- [104] J. Hayes. An adaptive technique for local distribution. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 26(8):1178–1186, 1978.
- [105] Maurice Herlihy and J. Eliot B. Moss. Transactional memory: Architectural support for lock-free data structures. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, page 289?300, New York, NY, USA, 1993. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [106] Micha Hofri. Stack algorithms for collision-detecting channels and their analysis: A limited survey. In *Modelling and Performance Evaluation Methodology*, pages 69–88. Springer, 1984.
- [107] Elijah Hradovich, Marek Klonowski, and Dariusz R Kowalski. Contention resolution on a restrained channel. In *2020 IEEE 26th International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Systems (ICPADS)*, pages 89–98. IEEE, 2020.
- [108] Elijah Hradovich, Marek Klonowski, and Dariusz R. Kowalski. New view on adversarial queueing on MAC. *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, 25(4):1144–1148, 2021.
- [109] Piotr Indyk. Explicit constructions of selectors and related combinatorial structures, with applications. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '02*, page 697–704, USA, 2002. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [110] Tomasz Jurdzinski, Dariusz R. Kowalski, and Krzysztof Lorys. Online packet scheduling under adversarial jamming. In *Approximation and Online Algorithms - 12th International Workshop, WAOA 2014, Wrocław, Poland, September 11-12, 2014, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 8952 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 193–206. Springer, 2014.
- [111] Tomasz Jurdzinski, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Grzegorz Stachowiak. Distributed deterministic broadcasting in wireless networks of weak devices under the SINR model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.1804*, 2012.
- [112] Tomasz Jurdzinski, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Grzegorz Stachowiak. Distributed deterministic broadcasting in wireless networks of weak devices. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 632–644. Springer, 2013.
- [113] Tomasz Jurdzinski and Michal Rózanski. Deterministic oblivious local broadcast in the SINR model. In Ralf Klasing and Marc Zeitoun, editors, *Fundamentals of Computation Theory - 21st International Symposium, FCT 2017, Bordeaux, France, September 11-13, 2017, Proceedings*, volume 10472 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 312–325. Springer, 2017.
- [114] Tomasz Jurdziński and Grzegorz Stachowiak. Probabilistic algorithms for the wakeup problem in single-hop radio networks. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 535–549. Springer, 2002.
- [115] Tomasz Jurdzinski and Grzegorz Stachowiak. Probabilistic algorithms for the wake-up problem in single-hop radio networks. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 38(3):347–367, 2005.
- [116] Tomasz Jurdzinski and Grzegorz Stachowiak. The cost of synchronizing multiple-access channels. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 421–430, 2015.

- [117] Valerie King, Seth Pettie, Jared Saia, and Maxwell Young. A resource-competitive jamming defense. *Distributed Comput.*, 31(6):419–439, 2018.
- [118] Valerie King, Jared Saia, and Maxwell Young. Conflict on a Communication Channel. In *Proceedings of the 30th Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 277–286, 2011.
- [119] J. Komlos and A. Greenberg. An asymptotically fast nonadaptive algorithm for conflict resolution in multiple-access channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 31(2):302–306, September 2006.
- [120] Dariusz R. Kowalski. On selection problem in radio networks. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2005, Las Vegas, NV, USA, July 17-20, 2005*, pages 158–166, 2005.
- [121] Dariusz R Kowalski and Andrzej Pelc. Time complexity of radio broadcasting: adaptiveness vs. obliviousness and randomization vs. determinism. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 333(3):355–371, 2005.
- [122] James F. Kurose and Keith Ross. *Computer Networking: A Top-Down Approach Featuring the Internet*. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Boston, MA, USA, 2nd edition, 2002.
- [123] Eyal Kushilevitz and Yishay Mansour. An $\Omega(\text{Dlog}(N/D))$ lower bound for broadcast in radio networks. In *Proceedings of the twelfth annual ACM symposium on Principles of distributed computing*, pages 65–74, 1993.
- [124] Eyal Kushilevitz and Yishay Mansour. An $\Omega(\text{Dlog}(N/D))$ lower bound for broadcast in radio networks. *SIAM journal on Computing*, 27(3):702–712, 1998.
- [125] Guolong Lin and Guevara Noubir. On Link Layer Denial of Service in Data Wireless LANs. *Wireless Communications & Mobile Computing*, 5(3):273–284, 2005.
- [126] Hongbo Liu, X Wenyuan, Yingying Chen, and Zhenhua Liu. Localizing jammers in wireless networks. In *2009 IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2009.
- [127] Xin Liu, Guevara Noubir, Ravi Sundaram, and San Tan. SPREAD: Foiling Smart Jammers using Multi-layer Agility. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, pages 2536–2540, 2007.
- [128] Zhenhua Liu, Hongbo Liu, Wenyuan Xu, and Yingying Chen. An error-minimizing framework for localizing jammers in wireless networks. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 25(2):508–517, 2013.
- [129] Saher S. Manaseer, Mohamed Ould-Khaoua, and Lewis M. Mackenzie. On the logarithmic backoff algorithm for MAC protocol in MANETs. In *Integrated Approaches in Information Technology and Web Engineering: Advancing Organizational Knowledge Sharing*, chapter 12, pages 174–184. IGI Global, 2009.
- [130] Gianluca De Marco. Distributed broadcast in unknown radio networks. In Shang-Hua Teng, editor, *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2008, San Francisco, California, USA, January 20-22, 2008*, pages 208–217. SIAM, 2008.
- [131] Gianluca De Marco. Distributed broadcast in unknown radio networks. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(6):2162–2175, 2010.
- [132] Gianluca De Marco and Dariusz R. Kowalski. Towards power-sensitive communication on a multiple-access channel. In *2010 International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems, ICDCS 2010, Genova, Italy, June 21-25, 2010*, pages 728–735. IEEE Computer Society, 2010.
- [133] Gianluca De Marco and Dariusz R. Kowalski. Fast nonadaptive deterministic algorithm for conflict resolution in a dynamic multiple-access channel. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 44(3):868–888, 2015.
- [134] Gianluca De Marco and Dariusz R. Kowalski. Contention resolution in a non-synchronized multiple access channel. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 689:1 – 13, 2017.
- [135] Gianluca De Marco, Dariusz R. Kowalski, and Grzegorz Stachowiak. Deterministic contention resolution on a shared channel. In *Proceedings of the 39th IEEE International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems, ICDCS*, pages 472–482, 2019.
- [136] Gianluca De Marco, Marco Pellegrini, and Giovanni Sbrulati. Faster deterministic wakeup in multiple access channels. In Mario Coppo, Elena Lodi, and G. Michele Pinna, editors, *Theoretical Computer Science, 9th Italian Conference, ICTCS 2005, Siena, Italy, October 12-14, 2005, Proceedings*, volume 3701 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 196–204.
- [137] Gianluca De Marco, Marco Pellegrini, and Giovanni Sbrulati. Faster deterministic wakeup in multiple access channels. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 155(8):898–903, 2007.
- [138] Emily McMilin, David S De Lorenzo, Thomas Lee, Per Enge, Dennis Akos, Stefano Caizzzone, and Andriy Konovaltsev. Gps anti-jam: A simple method of single antenna null-steering for aerial applications. In *Proceedings of the ION 2015 Pacific PNT Meeting*, pages 470–483, 2015.
- [139] Dominic Meier, Yvonne Anne Pignolet, Stefan Schmid, and Roger Wattenhofer. Speed Dating Despite Jammers. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Distributed Computing in Sensor Systems (DCOSS)*, pages 1–14, 2009.
- [140] John M. Mellor-Crummey and Michael L. Scott. Algorithms for scalable synchronization on shared-memory multiprocessors. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 9(1):21–65, February 1991.
- [141] Robert M. Metcalfe and David R. Boggs. Ethernet: Distributed packet switching for local computer networks. *CACM*, 19(7):395–404, July 1976.
- [142] Debasis Mitra. Probabilistic models and asymptotic results for concurrent processing with exclusive and non-exclusive locks. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 14(4):1030–1051, 1985.
- [143] Debasis Mitra and P. J. Weinberger. Probabilistic models of database locking: Solutions, computational algorithms, and asymptotics. *J. ACM*, 31(4):855–878, September 1984.
- [144] Amit Mondal and Aleksandar Kuzmanovic. Removing Exponential Backoff from TCP. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, 38(5):17–28, September 2008.
- [145] Thomas Moscibroda and Roger Wattenhofer. The complexity of connectivity in wireless networks. In *Infocom*, pages 1–13, 2006.

- [146] William K Moses Jr and Shailesh Vaya. Deterministic protocols in the sinr model without knowledge of coordinates. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 2020.
- [147] A. Mpitziopoulos, D. Gavalas, C. Konstantopoulos, and G. Pantziou. A survey on jamming attacks and countermeasures in wsns. *Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, 11(4):42–56, October 2009.
- [148] K. Nakano and S. Olariu. Uniform leader election protocols for radio networks. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 13(5):516–526, May 2002.
- [149] USA Today Nancy Trejos. FCC fines Marriott \$600,000 for Wi-Fi blocking, 2014. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2014/10/03/marriott-fcc-nashville-fined-wifi-blocking/16648695/>.
- [150] Vishnu Navda, Aniruddha Bohra, Samrat Ganguly, and Dan Rubenstein. Using Channel Hopping to Increase 802.11 Resilience to Jamming Attacks. In *INFOCOM*, pages 2526–2530, 2007.
- [151] Calvin Newport. Radio network lower bounds made easy. In *International Symposium on Distributed Computing*, pages 258–272. Springer, 2014.
- [152] Pulse News. Angry priest installs phone jamming device in church to stop calls, 2014. <https://www.pulse.ng/communities/religion/enough-is-enough-angry-priest-installs-phone-jamming-device-in-church-to-stop-calls/xq02ts1>.
- [153] Qiang Ni, Lamia Romdhani, and Thierry Turletti. A survey of QoS enhancements for IEEE 802.11 wireless LAN: Research articles. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, 4(5):547–566, August 2004.
- [154] Adrian Ogierman, Andrea Richa, Christian Scheideler, Stefan Schmid, and Jin Zhang. Competitive MAC under adversarial SINR. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, pages 2751–2759, 2014.
- [155] Adrian Ogierman, Andrea Richa, Christian Scheideler, Stefan Schmid, and Jin Zhang. Sade: competitive MAC under adversarial SINR. *Distributed Computing*, 31(3):241–254, 2018.
- [156] V. Paxson and S. Floyd. Wide area traffic: the failure of Poisson modeling. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 3(3):226–244, 1995.
- [157] Joseph Polastre, Robert Szewczyk, and David Culler. Telos: Enabling Ultra-Low Power Wireless Research. In *IPSN*, 2005.
- [158] V. Ramaiyan and J. Vaishakh. An information theoretic point of view to contention resolution. In *2014 Sixth International Conference on Communication Systems and Networks (COMSNETS)*, pages 1–8, 2014.
- [159] Andrea Richa, Christian Scheideler, Stefan Schmid, and Jin Zhang. A jamming-resistant MAC protocol for multi-hop wireless networks. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, pages 179–193, 2010.
- [160] Andrea Richa, Christian Scheideler, Stefan Schmid, and Jin Zhang. Competitive and fair medium access despite reactive jamming. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*, pages 507–516, 2011.
- [161] Andrea Richa, Christian Scheideler, Stefan Schmid, and Jin Zhang. Competitive and fair throughput for co-existing networks under adversarial interference. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, 2012.
- [162] Andrea Richa, Christian Scheideler, Stefan Schmid, and Jin Zhang. An Efficient and Fair MAC Protocol Robust to Reactive Interference. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 21(1):760–771, 2013.
- [163] Andrea Richa, Christian Scheideler, Stefan Schmid, and Jin Zhang. Competitive Throughput in Multi-Hop Wireless Networks Despite Adaptive Jamming. *Distributed Computing*, 26(3):159–171, 2013.
- [164] Andréa W. Richa and Christian Scheideler. Jamming-resistant MAC protocols for wireless networks. In *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, pages 999–1002, 2016.
- [165] Andréa W. Richa, Christian Scheideler, Stefan Schmid, and Jin Zhang. Competitive throughput in multi-hop wireless networks despite adaptive jamming. *Distributed Comput.*, 26(3):159–171, 2013.
- [166] Andréa W. Richa, Christian Scheideler, Stefan Schmid, and Jin Zhang. An efficient and fair MAC protocol robust to reactive interference. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, 21(3):760–771, 2013.
- [167] N. I. Sarkar and K. W. Sowerby. The effect of traffic distribution and transport protocol on WLAN performance. In *Telecommunication Networks and Applications Conference (ATNAC), 2009 Australasian*, pages 1–6, 2009.
- [168] William N. Scherer and Michael L. Scott. Advanced contention management for dynamic software transactional memory. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 240–248, New York, NY, USA, 2005. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [169] Stefan Schmid and Roger Wattenhofer. Algorithmic models for sensor networks. In *Proceedings 20th IEEE International Parallel & Distributed Processing Symposium*, pages 11–pp. IEEE, 2006.
- [170] M. Shurman, B. Al-Shua’b, M. Alsaadeen, M. F. Al-Mistarihi, and K. A. Darabkh. N-BEB: New backoff algorithm for IEEE 802.11 MAC protocol. In *2014 37th International Convention on Information and Communication Technology, Electronics and Microelectronics (MIPRO)*, pages 540–544, 2014.
- [171] Rashmi Sharan Sinha, Yiqiao Wei, and Seung-Hoon Hwang. A survey on LPWA technology: LoRa and NB-IoT. *ICT Express*, 3(1):14 – 21, 2017.
- [172] Chicago Tribune Steve Schmadeke. Lawyer: Man accused of jamming calls on Red Line ‘disturbed by people talking around him’, 2016. <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/breaking/ct-cell-phone-jamming-red-line-20160309-story.html>.
- [173] B Stuck. An introduction to traffic handling characteristics of bus local area network distributed access methods. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 22(8):46–56, 1984.
- [174] X. Sun and L. Dai. Backoff design for IEEE 802.11 DCF networks: Fundamental tradeoff and design criterion. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 23(1):300–316, 2015.

- [175] Shahram Teymori and Weihua Zhuang. *Queue Analysis for Wireless Packet Data Traffic*, pages 217–227. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005.
- [176] Boris Solomonovich Tsybakov and Viktor Alexandrovich Mikhailov. Free synchronous packet access in a broadcast channel with feedback. *Problemy peredachi informatsii*, 14(4):32–59, 1978.
- [177] Boris Solomonovich Tsybakov and Viktor Alexandrovich Mikhailov. Free synchronous packet access in a broadcast channel with feedback. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 14(4):259–280, 1979.
- [178] Satish Vadlamani, Burak Eksioğlu, Hugh Medal, and Apurba Nandi. Jamming attacks on wireless networks: A taxonomic survey. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 172:76–94, 2016.
- [179] Dingyu Wang. Optimal protocols for 2-party contention resolution. In Colette Johnen, Elad Michael Schiller, and Stefan Schmid, editors, *Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems (SSS)*, pages 456–468, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing.
- [180] Qin Wang, Mark Hempstead, and Woodward Yang. A realistic power consumption model for wireless sensor network devices. In *2006 3rd annual IEEE communications society on sensor and ad hoc communications and networks*, volume 1, pages 286–295. IEEE, 2006.
- [181] Dan E. Willard. Log-logarithmic selection resolution protocols in a multiple access channel. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 15(2):468–477, May 1986.
- [182] C. Williamson. Internet traffic measurement. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 5(6):70–74, 2001.
- [183] Will E Leland Daniel V Wilson. High time-resolution measurement and analysis of LAN traffic: Implications for LAN interconnection. In *Proceedings of IEEE Infocom*, pages 1360–1366, 1991.
- [184] A. D. Wood, J. A. Stankovic, and G. Zhou. Deejam: Defeating energy-efficient jamming in ieee 802.15.4-based wireless networks. In *2007 4th Annual IEEE Communications Society Conference on Sensor, Mesh and Ad Hoc Communications and Networks*, pages 60–69, 2007.
- [185] Anthony D. Wood and John A. Stankovic. Denial of Service in Sensor Networks. *Computer*, 35(10):54–62, 2002.
- [186] Anthony D Wood, John A Stankovic, and Sang Hyuk Son. Jam: A jammed-area mapping service for sensor networks. In *RTSS 2003. 24th IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium, 2003*, pages 286–297. IEEE, 2003.
- [187] Wenyuan Xu, Ke Ma, Wade Trappe, and Yanyong Zhang. Jamming Sensor Networks: Attack and Defense Strategies. *IEEE Networks*, 20(3):41–47, 2006.
- [188] Wenyuan Xu, Wade Trappe, Yanyong Zhang, and Timothy Wood. The Feasibility of Launching and Detecting Jamming Attacks in Wireless Networks. In *MobiHoc*, pages 46–57, 2005.
- [189] Maxwell Young and Raouf Boutaba. Overcoming Adversaries in Sensor Networks: A Survey of Theoretical Models and Algorithmic Approaches for Tolerating Malicious Interference. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 13(4):617–641, 2011.
- [190] J. Yu and A. P. Petropulu. Study of the effect of the wireless gateway on incoming self-similar traffic. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 54(10):3741–3758, 2006.
- [191] Yue Zheng, Yikun Huang, and Yuanxun E Wang. Design of small gps anti-jam antenna. In *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Antennas and Propagation & USNC/URSI National Radio Science Meeting*, pages 1289–1290. IEEE, 2018.
- [192] Qian M Zhou, Aiden Calvert, and Maxwell Young. Singletons for simpletons: Revisiting windowed backoff using chernoff bounds. In *Accepted to the Tenth International Conference on Fun With Algorithms (FUN)*, 2020.

6 ELECTRONIC SUPPLEMENT

Our electronic supplement contains our tables, each of which serves as a quick reference for the results presented in major sections of our survey. For each such section, in addition to a brief summary, we select aspects from Section 1.1 that give context for the corresponding result. For results where an algorithm is not explicitly specified as adaptive, full-sensing, or acknowledgement-based (or where some ambiguity may be present), we mark the corresponding "algorithm type" with a dash in our tables.

Table for Section 2: The Static Case

Algorithm	Makespan
BINARY EXPONENTIAL BACKOFF	$\Theta(n \log n)$
LOG-BACKOFF	$\Theta\left(\frac{n \log n}{\log \log n}\right)$
LOGLOG-BACKOFF	$\Theta\left(\frac{n \log \log n}{\log \log \log n}\right)$
FIXED BACKOFF	$\Theta(n \log \log n)$
POLYNOMIAL BACKOFF	$\Theta\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right)^{1+(1/c)}$
SAWTOOTH-BACKOFF	$\Theta(n)$
TRUNCATED SAWTOOTH-BACKOFF	$\Theta(n)$
ONE-FAIL ADAPTIVE	$O(n)$
Algorithm of [17]	$O(n + \log^2(1/\epsilon))$

Table 1. Makespan results under the static model with n packets for randomized algorithm. For POLYNOMIAL BACKOFF, c is a constant strictly greater than 1. Makespan results hold with high probability in n ; in the case of [17], the makespan holds with probability $1 - O(\epsilon)$, where $\epsilon \leq 1/(n + 1)$.

Table for Section 3.1: Adversarial Queuing Theory and Contention Resolution

Paper	Algorithm Type	Channel Feedback	Adversary Type	Summary of Result
Bender et al. [23]	—	No-CD	Leaky bucket	BEB is stable for $\rho = d/\log n$, where $d > 0$ is a constant, and unstable for $\rho = \Omega(\log \log n/\log n)$. LLB is stable for $\rho = d'/((\log n) \log \log n)$, when $d' > 0$ is a constant, and instability for $\rho = \Omega(1/\log n)$.
Chlebus et al. [59, 60] ¹⁰	Ack-based	No-CD	Window, where $\rho = 1$	For $n = 2$ station, stability impossible for burstiness $b \geq 2$.
	Full sensing	No-CD	Window, where $\rho = 1$	For $n = 2$ stations, fair latency possible. For $n = 3$ stations, stability impossible for burstiness $b \geq 2$.
	—	No-CD	Window, where $\rho = 1$	For $n = 3$ stations, fair latency possible. For $n \geq 4$ stations, stability possible. For $n \geq 4$ stations, stability and fair latency impossible.
	Ack-based	No-CD	Leaky bucket, where $\rho = 1$	Stable and fair latency impossible, except $n = 1$ station case.
	Full sensing	No-CD	Leaky bucket, where $\rho = 1$	For $n \geq 2$ stations, stability impossible for burstiness $b \geq 2$.
	—	No-CD	Leaky bucket, where $\rho = 1$	For $n \geq 2$ stations, stability possible and $O(n^2 + b)$ packets queued at any given time, but both stability and fair latency impossible.
Anantharamu and Chlebus [5]	Non adaptive & activation-based	CD	1-activating	For $\rho < 1/3$ and $b \geq 3$, the latency is bounded by $(3b - 3)/(1 - 3\rho)$, and the maximum queue size is $(3b - 3)/2$.
	Non adaptive & full sensing	CD	1-activating	Stable and bounded latency of $2b + 4$ and there are at most $b + O(1)$ packets queued, for $\rho \leq 3/8$.
	Adaptive & activation-based	CD and No-CD	1-activating	Stable and bounded latency of at most $4b - 4$ and at most $2b - 3$ packets in the queued, for $\rho \leq 1/2$.
	Adaptive & full sensing	CD and No-CD	1-activating	Stability and bounded latency not possible.

Table 2. Classification of the literature on adversarial queuing theory on contention resolution algorithm (Section 3.1).

Paper	Algorithm Type	Channel Feedback	Adversary Type	Summary of Result
Chlebus et al. [58, 61]	Full sensing	CD	Window, where $\rho < 1$	Fair latency and stability possible for $\rho = O(1/\log n)$.
	Full sensing	No-CD	Window, where $\rho < 1$	Fair latency and universal stability possible for $\rho = O(1/c \log^2 n)$, where c is sufficiently large. Explicit algorithm proposed for $\rho = O(1/\text{poly}(\log n))$.
	Ack-based	CD	Window, where $\rho < 1$	Stability impossible for $\rho > 3/(1 + \log n)$, for $n \geq 4$.
Anantharamu et al. [9, 10] ¹¹	Full sensing & ack-based	No-CD	Window	Stable with lower bound latency $\Omega(w \log n / \log w)$ for $w \leq n$ and $\Omega(w)$ for $w < n$.
	Full sensing & adaptive	No-CD	Window	Stability achieved with upper bound latency $O(\min n + w, w \log n)$.
Hradovich et al. [107]	Adaptive	No-CD	Leaky bucket	Stable for $\rho \leq 1$ with $O(n^2 + b)$ queued packets.
	Full sensing and ack-based	CD	Leaky bucket	Stability for $\rho \geq 1 - 1/n$ with throughput $\Theta(k/n \log^2 n)$.
	Ack-based	No-CD	Leaky bucket	Stability is not possible for $\rho = \min(k/n, 1/(3 \log n))$.
Bienkowski et al. [38, 39]	—	No-CD	Unrestricted	Total load is additive $O(n^2)$ larger and maximum queue size is n times bigger with additive $O(n)$ larger than any algorithm in distributed queue setting.
Garncarek et al. [86]	Adaptive	No-CD	Leaky bucket	With $O(n \log(L_{max}))$ bits (small memory), stability is possible with bounded queue size L_{max} , for $\rho < 1$ and $b \geq 0$.
	Non-adaptive	No-CD	Leaky bucket	Without memory, stability is possible for $\rho = O(1/\log n)$.
	Non-adaptive	No-CD	Leaky bucket	Without memory and with ultra strong selectors, stability is possible for $\rho = O(c/\log^2 n)$, where $c > 0$.
Garncarek et al. [87]	—	No-CD	Leaky bucket	Stable for $\rho = O(1/\log n)$ with $O(1)$ memory and b is unknown.
	—	No-CD	Leaky bucket	Stable for $\rho = O(1)$ with no memory and bounded b .

Table 3. Continuation: Classification of the literature on adversarial queuing theory on contention resolution algorithm (Section 3.1).

Table for Section 3.2: Deterministic Approaches for Contention Resolution

Paper	Algorithm Type	Channel Feedback	Global Clock	k Known	Summary of Result
Results for k-Selection Problem					
Greenberg and Winograd [101]	Adaptive	CD	Yes	Yes	Lower bound on latency of $\Omega(k \log n / \log k)$.
De Marco and Kowalski [133]	Non-adaptive	No-CD	Yes	No	Dynamic channel guarantees $O(k \log n \log \log n)$ latency and $\Omega(1/(\log n \log \log n))$ channel utilization.
De Marco et al. [135]	Ack-based & non-adaptive	No-CD	No	Yes	Upper bound latency is $O(k \log k \log n)$ and lower bound latency is $\Omega(k \log(n/k))$.
	Ack-based & non-adaptive	No-CD	No	No	Upper bound latency is $O(k^2 \log n / \log k)$ and lower bound latency is $\Omega(\min\{k^2 \log kn, n\} + k^2 / \log k)$.
	Non-ack-based & non-adaptive	No-CD	No	Yes	Upper bound latency is $O(k^2 \log n)$ and lower bound latency is $\Omega(\min\{k^2 \log kn, n\})$.
	Non-ack-based & non-adaptive	No-CD	No	No	Upper bound latency is $O(k^2 \log n)$ and lower bound latency is $\Omega(k^2 / \log k)$.
Results for Wakeup Problem					
De Marco, Pellegrini, and Sburlati [136, 137]	Non-adaptive	No-CD	No	N/A ¹²	For single-hop radio network with upper bound latency $O(n^3 \log^3 n)$, when n is unknown.
Chlebus et al. [52]	Non-adaptive	No-CD	No	No	For single-hop radio network with upper bound latency $O(k \log^{1/b} k \log n)$. For $b = \Omega(\log \log n)$ channels, faster algorithm attained with latency $O((k/b) \log n \log(b \log n))$ and lower bound latency $((k/b) \log(n/k))$.
Chlebus et al. [54]	Non-adaptive	No-CD	Yes	N/A ¹³	Multi-hop ad-hoc network with latency $O(n \log^2 n)$. Explicit algorithm provides latency $O(n \Delta \text{poly}(\log n))$, where Δ is the maximum in-degree neighbors.
Jurziński and Stachowiak [116]	Adaptive	CD	Yes	No	Single-hop SINR channel with lower bound latency $O(\log^2 n)$.

Table 4. Classification of the literature on deterministic results on contention resolution (Section 3.2).

Paper	Algorithm Type	Channel Feedback	Global Clock	k Known	Summary of Result
Results for Wakeup Problem					
Chrobak, Gąsieniec, and Kowalski [64]	Non-adaptive	No-CD	No	N/A ¹⁴	Multi-hop ad-hoc network with upper bound latency is $O(n^{5/3} \log n)$ and lower bound latency is $\Omega(n \log n)$.
Chlebus et al. [56]	Non-adaptive	No-CD	No	N/A ¹⁵	Multi-hop ad-hoc network with upper bound latency is $O(n^{3/2} \log n)$.
De Marco and Kowalski [72, 134]	Non-adaptive	No-CD	No	No	Single-hop network with upper bound latency $O(k \log(n/k) + 1)$ and lower bound latency $\Omega(k \log(n/k) + 1)$.
	Non-adaptive	No-CD	No	Yes	Single-hop network with upper bound latency $O(k \log(n/k) + 1)$ and lower bound latency $\Omega(k \log(n/k) + 1)$ latency.
	Non-adaptive	No-CD	No	No	Single-hop network with upper bound latency $O(k \log(n) \log \log(n))$ and lower bound latency $\Omega(k \log(n/k) + 1)$.

Table 5. Continuation: Classification of the literature on deterministic results on contention resolution (Section 3.2).

Table for Section 3.3: Randomized Approaches for Contention Resolution

Paper	Algorithm Type	Channel Feedback	System Size Knowledge	Summary of Result
Results for k-Selection Problem				
Bender et al. [30, 31]	Adaptive	CD	No	Focuses on energy efficiency where the main result shows expected $O(\log(\log^* n))$ channel accesses (sending and listening) per packet and expected $O(n)$ latency.
De Marco et al. [73]	Non-adaptive	No-CD	No	$\Omega(n \log n / (\log \log n)^2)$ latency, $O(\log^2 n)$ channel access (sending and listening) w.h.p., and $\omega((\log \log n)^2 / \log n)$ channel utilization w.h.p., in the presence of global clock.
	Strongly non-adaptive, Non-ack-based	No-CD	No	$O(n \log^2 n)$ latency, $O(\log^2 n)$ channel access (sending and listening) w.h.p., and $\Omega(1/\log^2 n)$ channel utilization w.h.p., in the presence of global clock.
	Non-adaptive, Ack-based	No-CD	No	$O(n \log^2 n / \log \log n)$ latency, $O(\log^2 n)$ channel access (sending and listening) w.h.p., and $\Omega(\log \log n / \log^2 n)$ channel utilization w.h.p., in the presence of global clock.
	Adaptive	No-CD	Yes	$O(n)$ latency, $O(\log n)$ channel access (sending and listening) w.h.p., and $O(1)$ channel utilization w.h.p., in the presence of global clock.
Bender et al. [29]	Adaptive	No-CD	No	n_t packets achieve $\Omega(1)$ in first t steps, where the packets make a total of $O(n_t \log^2 n_t)$ channel access (sending and listening).
Bender et al. [25, 26]	Adaptive	CD	No	n packets set <i>a priori</i> (but not known), expected constant throughput and expected $O(\log^2(n + D))$ send attempts per packet, where D denotes the unavailable slots due to adversary. For the case of infinite packet arrivals, expected $O(\log^2(\eta_t + D_t))$ send attempts per packet, where η represents the maximum number of packets ever in the system concurrently and t is time instance.
Fineman et al. [84]	—	CD	No	Two algorithm for successful transmission of first packet in multichannel setting (i.e. $C > 1$): (1) $O(\log n / \log C + (\log \log n))$ steps for $n = 2$ packets are activated, and (2) $O(\log n / \log C + (\log \log n)(\log \log \log n))$ steps for unrestricted n packets are activated.

Table 6. Classification of the literature on randomized contention resolution algorithm (Section 3.3).

Paper	Algorithm Type	Channel Feedback	System Size Knowledge	Summary of Result
Results for Wakeup Problem				
Willard [181]	Adaptive	CD	Yes	Expected latency is at least $\log \log k$, and upper bound is $\log \log k + O(1)$, for $2 \leq k \leq n$.
Kushilevitz and Mansour [123, 124]	—	No-CD	Yes	When global clock present, expected latency is $O(D \log n)$ for non-uniform algorithm, where D is the diameter of the radio network.
Jurdziński and Stachowiak [116]	—	No-CD	$O(\text{poly}(n))$ known	No global clock with SINR channel, latency is $O(\log^2 n / \log \log n)$.
Jurdziński and Stachowiak [114, 115]	—	No-CD	No	No global clock present, $O(n \log(1/\epsilon) / \log n)$ latency, where ϵ is the error.
	Non-adaptive	No-CD	Yes	Packets may or may not be labeled with global clock, latency is $O(\log n \log(1/\epsilon))$.
	Non-adaptive	No-CD	Yes	Fair algorithm with packets labeled, latency is $\Omega(\log n \log(1/\epsilon) / \log \log n + \log \log(1/\epsilon))$.
Chrobak, Gąsieniec, and Kowalski [64]	—	No-CD	Yes	Multi-hop radio network with no global clock and packets are labeled, latency is $O(D \log^2 n)$, where D is the diameter of the network.
Chlebus et al. [52]	—	No-CD	Yes	In single hop radio network with no global clock, latency is $O(n^{1/b} \ln(1/\epsilon))$, where b is number of channel and ϵ is the error.
Fineman et al. [83]	—	No-CD	No	Packets in radio network with fading channel resolves contention in $(\log n + \log R)$ steps where R is $O(\text{poly}(n))$.
Bender et al. [28]	Non-adaptive	CD	No	In radio coded network, for window size $w \geq 16\kappa^2$, there are at most $1 - \frac{5}{\ln \kappa} w$ packets: (1) at any given time, the number of packets in the system is at most $2w$, w.h.p., and (2) latency achieved $O(\sqrt{\kappa} w \ln^3 w)$ time slots, w.h.p..
Gilbert et al. [96]	Adaptive	CD	Not applicable	Expected number of rounds required for X (random variable) participants is lower bounded by $\frac{H(c(X))}{2} - O(\log \log \log \log n)$ and upper bound by $O(H^2(c(X)))$, where $H(c(X))$ represents the entropy of the condensed probability distribution over the possible network sizes.
	Adaptive	No-CD	Not applicable	Expected number of rounds required for X (random variable) participants is lower bounded by $\Omega\left(\frac{2^{H(c(X))}}{\log \log n}\right)$ and upper bounded by $O\left(2^{2H(c(X))}\right)$.

Table 7. Continuation: Classification of the literature on randomized contention resolution algorithm (Section 3.3).

Table for Section 4: Jamming-Resistant Contention Resolution

Paper	Jamming Type	Channel Feedback	Deterministic or Randomized	System-Size Knowledge	Summary of Result
Awerbuch et al. [19, 20]	$(T, 1 - \epsilon)$ -bounded, adaptive	CD	Randomized	Upper bound	Proposed algorithm shows constant competitive in single-hop networks.
Richa et al. [159, 165]	$(T, 1 - \epsilon)$ -bounded, adaptive	CD	Randomized	Upper bound	In multi-hop connected unit disk graph (UDG) network, constant competitiveness achieved in $\Omega((T \log n)/\epsilon + (\log n)^4/(\gamma\epsilon)^2)$ slots when the adversary is 1-uniform and at least $2/\epsilon$ nodes within the transmission range. Constant competitiveness not achieved if UDG is disconnected or there are nodes with $o(1/\epsilon)$ nodes within transmission range.
Richa et al. [160, 166]	$(T, 1 - \epsilon)$ -bounded, reactive	CD	Randomized	Upper bound	Nodes communicate via single frequency, constant competitiveness and fairness achieved in at least $\Theta(1/\epsilon \log N \max\{T, (e^{\delta/\epsilon^2}/\epsilon\gamma^2) \log^3 N\})$ slots.
Richa et al. [161]	$(T, 1 - \epsilon)$ -bounded, adaptive	CD	Randomized	Upper bound	In K co-existing network, constant competitive achieved in $\Omega(\epsilon^2 \min\{\epsilon, 1/\text{poly}(K)\})$ slot.
Ogierman et al. [154, 155]	$(T, 1 - \epsilon)$ -bounded, adaptive	CD	Randomized	Upper bound	In SINR network, $2^{-O(1/\epsilon)^{2/\alpha-2}}$ -competitiveness achieved in $\Omega((T \log N)/+(\log N)^4/(\gamma\epsilon)^2)$ slots for uniform adversary and transmission range contains at least one node or at least $2/\epsilon$ nodes within the transmission range. No MAC protocol can achieve any throughput against a (B, T) -bounded adversary, where B is the energy budget.
Chang et al. [46]	Unbounded, adaptive	No-CD	Randomized	None	Channel utilization of $1/e - O(\epsilon)$ in non-jammed slots, where ϵ is step size.
Anta et al. [16]	(σ, ρ) -bounded, adaptive	CD	Deterministic	Exact	Optimal goodput $(1 - \sqrt{f/T})^2$ under cases where packet length is fixed, when f is error tokens and T is length of time interval.

Table 8. Classification of the literature on jamming-resistant contention resolution (Section 4).

Paper	Jamming Type	Channel Feedback	Deterministic or Randomized	System-Size Knowledge	Summary of Result
Jurdzinski et al. [110]	Unbounded, adaptive	CD	Deterministic	Exact	Optimal scheduling packets of arbitrary lengths, relative throughput in $(1/3, 1/2]$. Relative throughput of 1 possible with resource augmentation.
Anantharamu et al. [7, 8]	(ρ, λ, b) -leaky bucket-bounded	No-CD	Deterministic	Exact	Full-sensing algorithm achieves latency $O\left(\frac{bn}{(1-\lambda)(1-\rho-\lambda)}\right)$ where stability is impossible and adaptive algorithm achieves latency $O\left(\frac{n+b}{1-\rho-\lambda}\right)$ where stability is bounded, when $\rho + \lambda < 1$.
Chlebus et al. [52]	Random	No-CD	Deterministic	Upper bound	Two algorithms in multi-channel with b channels achieves: (1) latency $O\left(\log^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)k \log n \log^{1/b} k\right)$, (2) latency $O\left(\log^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)kb \log n \log(b \log n)\right)$ for $b > \log(128b \log n)$, where p is a known probability of jamming in any slot.
Bender et al. [29]	Unbounded	No-CD	Randomized	None	without CD, no algorithm can guarantee a packet success in time linear in the system size with better than constant probability in the presence of jamming.
Chen et al. [49]	Unbounded	No-CD	Deterministic	None	Throughput achieved $O(1/\log n)$.

Table 9. Continuation: Classification of the literature on jamming-resistant contention resolution (Section 4).