

# SIC-based Random Multiple Access Protocol: Fixed or Adaptive Approach

Asmad Razzaque\* and Andrea Baiocchi \*

\*Dept. of Information Engineering, Electronics and Telecommunications (DIET), University of Rome Sapienza, Italy  
{asmadbin.razzaque, andrea.baiocchi}@uniroma1.it

**Abstract**—Efficient data collection from a multitude of Internet of Things (IoT) devices is crucial for various applications, yet existing solutions often struggle with minimizing access delay and Age of Information (AoI), especially when managing multiple simultaneous transmissions and access strategies. This challenge becomes increasingly critical as IoT deployments continue to expand, demanding robust mechanisms for handling diverse traffic scenarios. In this study, we propose a novel approach leveraging Successive Interference Cancellation (SIC) based on adaptive and fixed parameter schemes to address these limitations. By analyzing both throughput and AoI along with access delay, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our adaptive approach compared to the fixed approach, particularly in scenarios featuring heavy and light traffic. Our findings highlight the pivotal role of adaptive approaches in optimizing data collection processes in IoT ecosystems, with a particular focus on minimizing access delay, AoI, and spectral efficiency.

**Index Terms**—Massive data collection, Multiple access, SIC, Age of Information, Access Delay.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The rise of the Internet of Things (IoT) has sparked a big change in how we use technology. It is affecting everything from healthcare and education to industry and transportation [1]. As IoT applications evolve towards unprecedented realms, the concept of massive access emerges as a crucial paradigm aimed at facilitating efficient and dependable communication for a wide range of IoT devices. Characterized by low power consumption, massive connectivity, short packet transmission, and minimal signaling overhead, the requirements of massive access herald the vision of a data-driven society envisaged by 6G, wherein instantaneous and boundless connectivity is extended to a multitude of entities, ranging from static sensors to autonomous devices, irrespective of time and location.

Within the context of massive multiple access in IoT, the challenge lies in ensuring accurate and efficient data transmission from a vast number of devices, especially considering their sporadic activity across the network. Addressing these challenges necessitates innovative multiple-access techniques that offer massive connectivity and low latency to future IoT systems. One promising solution is grant-free random access, wherein each active device directly transmits data to the base station without contention using orthogonal resources, which reduces the signaling overhead significantly [2].

However, relying exclusively on orthogonal resources has its limitations, especially in large-scale IoT setups. Non-Orthogonal Multiple Access (NOMA) emerges as a potential solution, offering two primary categories: code-domain NOMA

and power-domain NOMA. Power-domain NOMA, exemplified by its implementation in 3GPP LTE, involves superposing power from multiple users at the transmitter, with successive interference cancellation (SIC) employed at the receiver for decoding [3], [4], [5]. Unlike conventional techniques such as Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA) and orthogonal multiple access methods, NOMA leverages the power domain for user multiplexing, thereby enhancing spectral efficiency and accommodating diverse connectivity requirements prevalent in massive IoT deployments.

Recent progress in grant-free multiple access has seen remarkable advancements in adopting NOMA. These advancements utilize techniques spanning from deep learning to reinforcement learning to enhance user detection accuracy, spectral efficiency, and interference mitigation [6], [7]. However, the realization of scalable multi-packet reception systems, capable of accommodating thousands of transmitting nodes, remains a challenge. While Successive Interference Cancellation (SIC) offers performance gains, the benefits diminish with each iteration, highlighting the need for further research and optimization in this domain [8]. It has been seen that SIC enhances the connectivity in short packet data transmission as the number of users increases [9], [10]. This calls for an efficient adaptive protocol that can ensure necessary connectivity with minimal signaling overhead and reduce the age of information which is a parameter to measure the freshness of information. Such a protocol should dynamically adjust transmission parameters as the number of users fluctuates in the highly sporadic IoT environment. An adaptive parameter-based random access protocols have been proposed recently [11], [12], [13], [14] to improve the system capacity and low latency.

However, there exists a significant gap in the literature regarding the understanding of the role of decoding capabilities given by SIC toward different transmission schemes. This scenario becomes critical in the vast world of IoT, where every device is constantly sending and receiving data, and ensuring that information flows smoothly. The conventional methods, as explained struggle a lot to maintain the flow of traffic in a reliable way. To tackle this challenge, we are exploring the SIC, which has the potential to revolutionize how we handle data in IoT networks by allowing us to decode multiple data streams even when they overlap.

The real twist comes while considering a non-saturated network to investigate how we can tweak and optimize the

network with the help of SIC based parameters to work even better in different traffic scenarios with lower complexity, as SIC requires an adaptive system to enhance the performance gains based on the transmitting nodes. Hence, we investigate two different strategies: adaptive and fixed parameter schemes. The adaptive approach is like having a smart system that can adjust its settings based on what is happening in the network. So, if there is a sudden surge in data traffic, the system can automatically adapt to handle it more effectively. On the other hand, the fixed parameter scheme sticks to a set of predetermined settings regardless of the network conditions. While this approach may be simpler, it might not always be the most efficient, especially when the network experiences fluctuations in traffic. We have set the optimal parameters toward the fixed and adaptive parameter schemes with SIC provided gains in terms of throughput, and age of information as given in [14], [15].

We seek to gain insights into the trade-offs inherent in the implementation by exploring the two strategies. How much does the adaptive approach outperform the fixed one, and is the increased complexity of adaptivity justified in terms of overall system performance compared to fixed parameters? We delve into the systems success rate, access delay, throughput, and Age of Information (AoI) to address these questions, offering insights that will ease this revolution of IoT toward future multiple access schemes. This study highlights the balance between simplicity and efficiency, ensuring smooth data flow even in the busiest IoT environments.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the analytical model along with system analysis, including assumptions, definitions, and notation. Numerical results are reported in Section III. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section IV.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL AND ANALYSIS

Model assumptions and notation are introduced in Section II-A. Analysis of the model is carried out in Section II-B.

### A. Model definition

We consider a network of  $n$  nodes, sending update messages to a sink, referred to as Base Station (BS). The time axis is slotted. A transmission attempt is made by backlogged nodes in each slot with a given probability. More in-depth, a backlogged node attempts transmission with probability  $p$  and picks its modulation and coding scheme according to a target Signal to Noise plus Interference Ratio (SNIR)  $\gamma$ . Assuming an Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN) communication channel, the target SNIR  $\gamma$  is tied to the achievable spectral efficiency  $\eta$  (bit per symbol) of the adopted modulation and coding scheme according to  $\eta = \log_2(1 + \gamma)$ . A packet is correctly decoded if its average SNIR at the BS is no less than  $\gamma$ . We assume also that feasible values of  $\gamma$  are upper limited to some value  $\gamma_{\max}$ , related to maximum available transmission power and target coverage distance of the BS.

Let  $L$  be the length of the transmitted packets and  $W$  be the channel bandwidth. It is assumed that the slot size just fits

a packet transmission time. The time required to transmit a packet for a given target SNIR  $\gamma$  is

$$T(\gamma) = \frac{L}{W \log_2(1 + \gamma)} \quad (1)$$

We consider two approaches to set transmission parameter  $p$  and  $\gamma$ . First, the fixed transmission parameter setting, in which  $p = p^*$  and  $\gamma = \gamma^*$  irrespective of the actual number of backlogged nodes in each time slot. In this case, the slot size is fixed and equal to  $T^* = T(\gamma^*)$  from Equation (1), even if no nodes transmit. Second, the Adaptive transmission parameter setting, where  $p = p(t)$ , and  $\gamma = \gamma(t)$  are set as a function of the number  $Q(t)$  of backlogged nodes at the beginning of slot  $t$ . In this case, the slot size varies with the number of backlogged nodes. More in depth, we set  $p = p_k^*$  and  $\gamma = \gamma_k^*$ , if  $Q(t) = k$ , for  $k \geq 1$ . In case  $Q(t) = 0$ , the slot size is assigned a fixed value  $T_0$ , that does not depend on values of  $p$  and  $\gamma$ .

New messages are generated at each node according to a Poisson process with mean rate  $\lambda$ . Messages are generated in upper layers and passed down to the MAC layer entity. Once a node MAC entity is engaged with contention/transmission of a message, it cannot be interrupted. If the MAC entity of the node is engaged in contention/transmission of a message, a new arriving message is dropped. It is shown in [16] that having no buffer at the MAC level is beneficial to AoI, which is the relevant metric in the considered use case of update messages.

The transmission power level is adjusted to compensate for path loss and slow fading. Then, the received power level is modeled as  $P_{rx} = G_f P_0$ , where  $G_f$  is the fast fading gain, characterized as a negative exponential random variable with mean 1 (Rayleigh fading), and  $P_0$  is the average received power level at BS.  $P_0$  is set to a target value, so that the probability of failing to decode a packet sent by a *single* transmitting node is no more than  $\epsilon$ . Decoding of a packet sent by a single transmitting node is successful, if the Signal to Noise Ratio (SNR) exceeds  $\gamma$ , i.e.,  $P_{rx}/P_N \geq \gamma$ , where  $P_N$  is the background noise power level. Since the average received power level is  $P_0$ , the requirements translates to

$$\frac{G_f P_0}{P_N} \geq \gamma \quad \text{w.p. } 1 - \epsilon \quad (2)$$

Given that  $G_f$  has a negative exponential Probability Density Function (PDF),  $P_0$  is set so that  $\mathcal{P}(G_f P_0 / P_N \geq \gamma) = e^{-\gamma P_N / P_0} = 1 - \epsilon$ . Hence, the target SNR level  $S_0$  at the receiving BS is set as follows:

$$S_0 = \frac{P_0}{P_N} = \frac{\gamma}{-\log(1 - \epsilon)} = \frac{\gamma}{c} \quad (3)$$

where we have introduced the constant  $c = -\log(1 - \epsilon)$ .

We assume an ideal SIC receiver. Let  $h$  packets be received simultaneously in the same slot and let  $S_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, h$  be their respective received power levels, normalized with respect to the background noise power level<sup>1</sup>. Let the  $S_j$ 's be ordered

<sup>1</sup>Note that  $S_j = G_{f,j} S_0$ , where  $G_{f,j}$  is the fading path gain of the  $j$ -th user and  $S_0$  is given in Equation (3).

in descending order, i.e.,  $S_1 \geq S_2 \geq \dots \geq S_h$  (ties are broken at random). The SIC receiver works as follows. Provided decoding of packets  $1, \dots, \ell - 1$  be successful, packet  $\ell$  is decoded successfully if and only if the following inequality holds:

$$\frac{S_\ell}{1 + \sum_{r=\ell+1}^h S_r} \geq \gamma \quad (4)$$

Note that we assume perfect interference cancellation. Hence, the residual interference is due only to signals weaker than the  $\ell$ -th one.

### B. Model Analysis

The model analysis is carried out by considering the point of view of a tagged node, say node  $i$ . We drop the subscript denoting the tagged node unless required to avoid ambiguity. If not stated explicitly, it is understood that each variable or quantity refers to the tagged node.

We follow two schemes to set the transmission parameters:

- *Fixed parameter.* Given  $n$  nodes in the system, the transmission probability and the SNIR threshold are fixed once and for all as follows:

$$p^* = 1, \quad \gamma^* = \frac{1}{a_\gamma n + b_\gamma} \quad (5)$$

- *Adaptive parameter.* Given that  $Q(t) = k$  nodes are backlogged at the beginning of slot  $t$ , with  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , the transmission probability and the SNIR threshold are set as follows:

$$p_k^* = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k} & \text{for } 1 \leq k < k_c, \\ 1 & \text{for } k \geq k_c. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

$$\gamma_k^* = \begin{cases} \gamma_{\max} & \text{for } 1 \leq k < k_c, \\ \frac{1}{a_\gamma k + b_\gamma} & \text{for } k \geq k_c. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

It is important to select values of the constants  $k_c$ ,  $a_\gamma$  and  $b_\gamma$  carefully. Let us define the sum-rate of the system with  $n$  nodes, for given values of  $p$  and  $\gamma$ :

$$U(p, \gamma) = \log_2(1 + \gamma) \sum_{h=0}^k m_h(\gamma) \binom{k}{h} p^k (1-p)^{k-h} \quad (8)$$

where  $m_h(\gamma)$  is the mean number of packets successfully decoded, given that  $h$  nodes transmit in the same time slot<sup>2</sup>. The sum-rate gives the achieved spectral efficiency of the multiple access channel in bits/s/Hz [9].

Equations (6) and (7) provide an asymptotically sharp approximation of the values of  $p$  and  $\gamma$  that maximize the sum rate, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .<sup>3</sup> As a matter of example, for  $\epsilon = 0.1$  and  $\gamma_{\max} = 31$ , it is found that  $k_c = 6$ ,  $a_\gamma = 0.39$ , and  $b_\gamma = 0.78$ .

In the rest of this section, we derive the performance metrics in case of *fixed parameters*. The analysis of the adaptive parameter model is deferred to [18] for space reasons.

<sup>2</sup>We do not provide analytical expressions for the functions  $m_h(\gamma)$ . It is actually computationally simpler to get those functions numerically by means of ad-hoc simulations of the SIC decoder.

<sup>3</sup>The development of the formal proofs is lengthy and cannot be included here for space reasons. It can be consulted in [17].

With a fixed parameter setting, assigned once the overall number of nodes in the system is given, the slot time is fixed to  $T^* = T(\gamma^*)$ , (see Equation (1)).

Let us define the probability distribution of the number of backlogged nodes seen by a tagged node:

$$q_k = \binom{n-1}{k} b^k (1-b)^{n-1-k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1 \quad (9)$$

Here  $q_k$  is the probability that  $k$  nodes, out of the  $n-1$  nodes different from the tagged one, are backlogged. The parameter  $b$  is the probability that a node is backlogged at the beginning of a slot. The probability  $b$  is found based on the renewal reward theorem as the ratio of the mean number of slots where the node is backlogged to the sum of the mean number of slots where the nodes is backlogged and the mean number of slots where it is idle:

$$b = \frac{1/p^*}{1/p^* + \frac{1}{1-e^{-\lambda T^*}}} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{1-e^{-\lambda T^*}}} \quad (10)$$

where we have accounted for the choice  $p^* = 1$ .

1) *Inter-departure time:* Let  $Y$  denote the inter-departure time between two consecutive packets transmitted by the tagged node. Then we have:

$$Y = R + C \quad (11)$$

where  $R$  is the idle time of the tagged node and  $C$  denotes the contention time, defined as the number of slot times it takes for the tagged node to attempt a transmission, once it becomes backlogged. The mean of  $C$  is given by  $E[C] = T^*/p^*$ . As for  $R$ , it is distributed geometrically, i.e., it is

$$\mathcal{P}(R = jT^*) = \left( e^{-\lambda T^*} \right)^{j-1} \left( 1 - e^{-\lambda T^*} \right), \quad j \geq 1. \quad (12)$$

and the mean is  $E[R] = T^*/(1 - e^{-\lambda T^*})$ .

2) *Success Probability and Channel Busy Ratio (CBR):* Let  $\tau = bp^*$  be the probability that the tagged node transmits in a given slot. The probability of success is found as follows:

$$P_s = \frac{1}{n\tau} \sum_{h=1}^n m_h(\gamma) \binom{n}{h} \tau^h (1-\tau)^{n-h} \quad (13)$$

The CBR is the mean fraction of time that the tagged node senses the channel as busy. It is found simply as:

$$\text{CBR} = 1 - (1 - bp^*)^n \quad (14)$$

3) *Throughput:* Given the generation rate  $\lambda$  of messages at a node, there are two sources of message loss: (i) dropping of arriving messages when the tagged node is busy in contention or transmission; (ii) failed decoding. The mean rate of messages sent on air by a node is  $1/E[Y]$ , i.e., the mean inter-departure rate. The net throughput in messages per unit time is therefore given by  $\Theta = P_s/E[Y]$ . The throughput in bit/s can be obtained by considering the message payload  $L$ , i.e., it is  $\Theta_{\text{bps}} = L\Theta$ .

4) *Access Delay*: The access delay  $D$  is defined as the interval between the arrival time of a message and the completion of the transmission time of that message. The access delay is  $D = V + C$ , where  $V$  is the time elapsing since the *last* arrival within a time slot and the end of that time slot. The mean access delay is given by:

$$E[D] = \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{T^*}{e^{\lambda T^*} - 1} + \frac{T^*}{p^*} \quad (15)$$

It is easily recognized that  $T^*/p^* < E[D] \leq T^*/p^* + T^*/2$  as  $\lambda$  grows from 0 to  $\infty$ .

5) *Age of Information*: The AoI is defined as the age of data stored at the BS for the tagged node. It is akin to the excess random variable associated to the random variable  $Z$ , defined as the time elapsing between two successive successful reception of messages coming from the tagged node. Recalling that  $Y$  denotes the inter-departure time of packets from the tagged node, we have

$$Z = \sum_{i=1}^N Y^{(i)} \quad (16)$$

where  $N$  is the number of attempts required to achieve a successful message delivery. The random variable  $N$  is Geometrically distributed, with  $\mathcal{P}(N = k) = (1 - P_s)^{k-1} P_s$ ,  $k \geq 1$ .

Accounting also for the mean access delay, the mean AoI can be written as

$$E[A] = E[D] + \frac{E[Z^2]}{2E[Z]} = E[D] + \frac{E[Y^2]}{2E[Y]} + E[Y] \left( \frac{1}{P_s} - 1 \right) \quad (17)$$

We recall that  $Y = R + C$ . Since  $p^* = 1$ , it is  $C = T^*$ . As for  $R$ , it has a Geometric PDF. Hence

$$E[Y] = T^* + \frac{T^*}{1 - e^{-\lambda T^*}} \quad (18)$$

$$E[Y^2] = (T^*)^2 \left[ 1 + \frac{3 - e^{-\lambda T^*}}{(1 - e^{-\lambda T^*})^2} \right] \quad (19)$$

### III. NUMERICAL EVALUATIONS

The numerical evaluations are done in the following way for each scheme.

- *Fixed parameters*: In case of the fixed parameter model, we only used the analytical expressions given in Section II to derive the performance metrics as there exists no assumption and the system is simple enough. The slot time, along with transmission probability, and the target SNIR, is fixed to a constant number given by Equation (5).
- *Adaptive parameters*: In case of the adaptive parameter model, only simulations are done. For simulations, we fully consider the evolution of the system. Each node evolves according to a two-state Markov chain. A node is idle until a new message is generated. At the end of the slot where a new message is generated, the node transitions to the active state, where it contends for the channel. While active, it transmits with probability  $p_k$  in a slot, if  $k$  nodes are backlogged at the beginning of that slot. Immediately after having transmitted, the node moves

back to the idle state. The slot time in the simulation is set to  $T_k$  if  $k$  nodes are backlogged at the beginning of the slot. The time-varying size of slot times gives rise to a complex interplay between nodes, since the more nodes are active in one slot, the longer its duration, the higher the probability that a new message arrives at those nodes that are not active in that slot.

In the results presented, we consistently set the number of nodes to  $n = 50$ , and the packet size to  $L = 500$  Byte, while varying the mean message generation time  $S = 1/\lambda$  between 1 ms and 1000 ms. The *fixed parameter* results are displayed with a solid blue line, while the *adaptive parameter* results are displayed with a dashed circle blue line. The other numerical values of the main system parameters include  $P_N = -107$  dBm and  $W = 1$  MHz.

#### A. Light and heavy traffic regimes

Numerical results are plotted as a function of the mean message generation time,  $S = 1/\lambda$ . We consider a quite stretched range of  $S$  values, to highlight the existence of two different operational regimes of the system. Low values of  $S$ , lying on the left side of the  $x$  axis of each plot is referred as a heavy traffic regime, corresponding to nodes generating new messages very frequently, i.e., with mean generation time smaller than the average time slot size. On the opposite side of  $x$ -axis, large values of  $S$  correspond to the light traffic regime, where nodes generate new messages infrequently, imposing a light load on the channel, given that message generation times are much bigger than the average slot time. In between these two regions, there exists a region that can be called a transition region.

#### B. Packet Delivery Ratio (PDR) and access delay

PDR is plotted in Figure 1 as a function of  $S$ . The PDR measures the mean fraction of packets that are delivered successfully to the BS. An high level of PDR is achieved in the heavy traffic regime, which gives evidence of the effectiveness of SIC in dealing with a large number of backlogged nodes. The PDR in heavy traffic regime is the same for both *fixed* and *adaptive* schemes. This is based on the fact that the optimal parameters in the case of *fixed parameter* scheme are set to a maximum number of nodes present in the system but the number of backlogged nodes never crosses this limit, hence every node that is backlogged is allowed to transmit successfully, but with low data rates as compared to *adaptive* scheme as the  $\gamma$  is less for *fixed parameter* scheme.

In the low traffic regime, the number of backlogged nodes is typically below  $k_c$  and hence following the *adaptive parameter* scheme the transmission probability is set to  $1/k$ , which entails that the expected number of transmitting nodes is 1. If more nodes transmit simultaneously, failure is most probable, given that  $\gamma_k = \gamma_{\max}$  in this region. The system dynamics resemble those of classic Slotted ALOHA (SA), wherein the success probability collapses as the load increases (i.e.,  $S$  decreases in our scenario). In contrast to classic SA, in our scenario, as we approach the transition region, the number of backlogged




Figure 1. Packet delivery ratio as a function of  $S$ .




Figure 2. Mean access delay as a function of  $S$ .

nodes grows, and SIC is increasingly triggered when  $k > k_c$ . Then, we transition into the heavy traffic regime.

The down notch seen in the PDR plot is reminiscent of the performance drop of classic SA. When  $S$  decreases from the right of the plot, the load on the system grows, and the probability of failing decoding with  $\gamma = \gamma_{\max}$  grows. While classic SA throughput collapses as the load further increases, here the adaptation of the parameters  $p$  and  $\gamma$  restores high PDR values, to the cost of slowing down transmission rate (longer time slots are used). In case of *fixed parameter* scheme, we don't see any down notch as the probability of failing decoding doesn't drop due to lower  $\gamma^*$ .

The mean access delay is shown in Figure 2 as a function of mean message generation time  $S$ . The mean access delay is defined as the duration starting from when the message intended for transmission arrives at the node until the transmission of that message is completed.

In the case of a *fixed parameter* scheme, the mean access delay is very high as compared to an *adaptive parameter* scheme in a heavy traffic regime, which is based on the fact that the parameter  $\gamma$  is set based on overall nodes present in the systems i.e.  $n$  instead of a backlogged number of nodes  $k$ . Hence, the transmission time  $T$  differs accordingly for both schemes.

Smaller access delays are seen in the light traffic regime for the *adaptive parameter* scheme, mainly because of the much smaller transmission time, even if using  $p_k < 1$  introduces a non-null contention time, i.e., on average  $1/p_k$  time slots are required before transmission is attempted. While it gets even worse in the light traffic regime for *fixed parameter* scheme.




Figure 3. Throughput in kilo-bit per second as a function of  $S$ .

The intermediate peak in case of an *adaptive parameter* scheme, stems from the adverse effect of the transition region, where the system oscillates between non-null contention time and immediate transmission ( $p_k = 1$ ), but with a large slot time.

### C. Throughput and AoI

Throughput and mean AoI are presented in this section. Throughput measures the mean delivered bit rate or, if normalized, the mean fraction of generated messages that are successfully delivered to the base station. AoI is the well-known metric [19], referred to the age of the last current update data generated by each node and stored in the collecting base station.

1) *Throughput*: The node throughput and normalized throughput are shown in Figures 3 and 4 respectively, as a function of mean message generation time  $S$ . It is recalled that node throughput in Figure 3 is the mean carried bit rate of messages delivered to the base station, while in Figure 4 it is normalized with respect to message generation rate  $\lambda = 1/S$ .

The node throughput in Figure 3 saturates when the system is pushed into the heavy-traffic regime. The *adaptive parameter* multiple access scheme appears to scale robustly, with no collapse as the rate of generation of update messages increases in the limit for  $S \rightarrow 0$ . Although *fixed parameter* multiple access scales with lower throughput compared to the *adaptive parameter*, due to low  $\gamma^*$ , which results in much longer transmission slot times, and consequently throughput decreases accordingly. As  $S$  increases, after the transition region, the node throughput falls for both schemes, as expected, given the diminishing generation rate of new update messages.

Figure 4 shows that normalized throughput increases as the message generation rate increases, falling to negligible values for very low values of  $S$ . This behavior can be understood by analyzing the sources of message loss. There are two sources of loss. First, messages offered by upper layers to node MAC entity are discarded, if the MAC entity is engaged in contention or in transmission. Second, messages that are not decoded successfully, because of failure of SIC, are lost as well. The normalized throughput performance in the heavy traffic regime is primarily influenced by the first source of message loss. Both sources of loss have comparable impacts in the transition region between heavy and light traffic regimes. Packet loss is dominated by residual decoding errors when moving to the light traffic regime. In case of a *fixed parameter* scheme,




Figure 4. Normalized throughput as a function of  $S$ .




Figure 5. Mean AoI as a function of  $S$

the normalized throughput is much lower than the *adaptive parameter* scheme as we move from a heavy traffic regime to a low traffic regime, which refers to much higher failing decoding as the selected SNIR threshold is much lower in *fixed parameter* scheme.

Summing up, the two plots of throughput suggest that the highest possible throughput rate (saturation) is achieved in an *adaptive parameter* scheme under heavy traffic i.e. typical IoT operating regime, which however entails that most of the generated messages are discarded before any transmission attempt occurs. The highest efficiency, indicated by a large *normalized* throughput, is achieved under the light traffic regime in case of an *adaptive parameter* scheme. However, the throughput rate is relatively low in this regime.

2) *AoI*: The mean AoI is shown in Figure 5 as a function of mean message generation time  $S$ . In the light-traffic regime, the mean age of information is very high for both schemes, as we generate fewer and fewer updates. As we move to a heavy-traffic regime, the AoI gets low, since update messages are generated more frequently and SIC helps relieving the congestion on the channel. In case of an *adaptive parameter* scheme, the age of information is lower than the *fixed parameter* scheme, due to less mean access delay. As we move from a low-traffic regime to a heavy traffic regime this difference almost doubles. The optimal region in terms of the mean age of the information is the heavy-traffic regime with an *adaptive parameter* scheme.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a model for a random multiple access system where nodes send messages to a central BS, whose

receiver exploits SIC. The model is targeted to IoT applications. The results shown answer the question of whether setting up an *adaptive* multiple access scheme buys enough performance gain to warrant its added complexity. It is apparent that significant performance gains are obtained, especially in terms of delay and mean AoI, which are key metrics in IoT scenarios. One can gain in terms of high throughput, low access delay, and lower AoI using the *adaptive parameter* scheme over the *fixed parameter* approach. These prominent gains call for the designing of complex adaptive systems instead of fixed systems for IoT networks. Further work should address the identification of practical algorithms to estimate the number of backlogged nodes and practical coding schemes for SIC, to highlight the price to be paid for a practical implementation of the general SIC receiver considered in this paper.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was partially supported by the European Union under the Italian National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP) of Next Generation EU, partnership on “Telecommunications of the Future” (PE00000001 - program “RESTART”).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] F. Guo, F. R. Yu, H. Zhang, X. Li, H. Ji, and V. C. M. Leung, “Enabling massive iot toward 6g: A comprehensive survey,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 15, pp. 11891–11915, 2021.
- [2] L. Liu, E. G. Larsson, W. Yu, P. Popovski, C. Stefanovic, and E. de Carvalho, “Sparse signal processing for grant-free massive connectivity: A future paradigm for random access protocols in the internet of things,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 88–99, 2018.
- [3] Y. Saito, Y. Kishiyama, A. Benjebbour, T. Nakamura, A. Li, and K. Higuchi, “Non-orthogonal multiple access (noma) for cellular future radio access,” in *2013 IEEE 77th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC Spring)*, pp. 1–5, 2013.
- [4] L. Dai, B. Wang, Y. Yuan, S. Han, I. Chih-lin, and Z. Wang, “Non-orthogonal multiple access for 5g: solutions, challenges, opportunities, and future research trends,” *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 53, pp. 74–81, Sep. 2015.
- [5] Z. Ding, Y. Liu, J. Choi, Q. Sun, M. Elkashlan, I. Chih-Lin, and H. V. Poor, “Application of non-orthogonal multiple access in lte and 5g networks,” *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 185–191, 2017.
- [6] A. Emir, F. Kara, H. Kaya, and H. Yanikomeroglu, “Deepmud: Multi-user detection for uplink grant-free noma iot networks via deep learning,” *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 1133–1137, 2021.
- [7] M. Fayaz, W. Yi, Y. Liu, and A. Nallanathan, “Transmit power pool design for grant-free noma-iot networks via deep reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 20, no. 11, pp. 7626–7641, 2021.
- [8] A. Zanella and M. Zorzi, “Theoretical analysis of the capture probability in wireless systems with multiple packet reception capabilities,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 1058–1071, 2012.
- [9] A. B. Abdul Razzaque, H. K. Qureshi, and A. Baiocchi, “Low vs high spectral efficiency communications with sic and random access,” in *2022 IEEE 11th IFIP International Conference on Performance Evaluation and Modeling in Wireless and Wired Networks (PEMWN)*, pp. 1–6, 2022.
- [10] Y. Li and L. Dai, “Maximum Sum Rate of Slotted Aloha With Successive Interference Cancellation,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 66, no. 11, pp. 5385–5400, 2018.
- [11] A. Shashin, A. Belogaev, A. Krasilov, and E. Khorov, “Adaptive parameters selection for uplink grant-free urllc transmission in 5g systems,” *Computer Networks*, vol. 222, p. 109527, 2023.
- [12] A. Gizik, O. A. Sensoy, and E. Masazade, “Enhanced dynamic scheduling for uplink latency reduction in broadband volte systems,” in *2021 55th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, pp. 13–17, 2021.

- [13] S.-W. Jeon and H. Jin, "Online estimation and adaptation for random access with successive interference cancellation," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 5418–5433, 2023.
- [14] B. Razzaque, "Grant-free transmissions based on successive interference cancellation in IoT," *35th International Teletraffic Congress (ITC-35)*, pp. 1–9, 2023.
- [15] B. Razzaque, Qureshi, "The role of sic on the design of next generation multiple access," *Annals of Telecommunications*, 2023.
- [16] A. Baiocchi, I. Turcanu, and A. Vinel, "To buffer or not to buffer: Ieee 802.11p/bd performance under different buffering strategies," in *2021 33th International Teletraffic Congress (ITC-33)*, pp. 1–9, 2021.
- [17] A. Baiocchi and A. Razzaque, "Asymptotic analysis of sum-rate under sic," 2024.
- [18] A. Baiocchi and A. Razzaque, "Multiple random access with sic receiver. part ii: Analysis of an optimized adaptive multiple access scheme," tech. rep., University of Rome Sapienza, DIET, 2024.
- [19] R. D. Yates, Y. Sun, D. R. Brown, S. K. Kaul, E. Modiano, and S. Ulukus, "Age of information: An introduction and survey," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1183–1210, 2021.