

Optimal Control for Epidemic Routing of Two Files with Different Priorities in Delay Tolerant Networks

Shangxing Wang¹, MHR. Khouzani², Bhaskar Krishnamachari¹ and Fan Bai³

Abstract—We consider the problem of joint dissemination of multiple contents with different priorities through epidemic routing in a large Delay Tolerant Network (DTN). Specifically, we consider two files a and b to be distributed in a large capacity-limited DTN through opportunistic contacts between the roaming nodes. The goal is to maximize the number of nodes that receive the files within a delay window, but with a priority for file b over file a . This preference can reflect difference in popularity or significance of files, or offering different grades of service. The restriction is the short duration of encounters and limited transmission capacity of nodes, where decisions have to be made on which file to forward upon an opportunity of communication. By formulating this problem as an optimal control problem based on ordinary differential equations and analyzing it through Pontryagin’s Minimum Principle, we find that the optimal routing policies follow a simple but *a priori* counter-intuitive “bang-singular-bang” structure. Through numerical evaluations, we illustrate our findings and provide some intuitions about how the structure of the optimal policy changes with respect to different network settings.

I. INTRODUCTION

In Delay (or Disruption) Tolerant Networks (DTNs), permanent end-to-end connectivity is not guaranteed due to the intermittent connectivity between nodes. Such “challenged” networks arise in settings where nodes are sparsely distributed, highly mobile, and have limited wireless radio ranges. However, messages can still be delivered to their destinations thanks to the mobility of nodes through relaying of the messages. One of the most promising examples of DTNs is the vehicular network, in which moving vehicles contact each other through short-range wireless communications. Related applications and services provided by vehicular networking include road traffic information, automatic collision warning and global internet services.

The primary goal in the design of DTNs is to make it possible to transmit data from the source to the destination. However, routing in DTNs is still a challenging and open research area because of its inherent uncertainty about network conditions. One of the earliest works on packet distribution and routing is Epidemic Routing [1], where a copy of a packet is forwarded whenever possible from the

packet-carrying node to any other node that arrives within its transmission range and does not have the packet yet.

The low capacity of DTNs and resource inefficiency performance of Epidemic Routing has motivated researchers to design more economic routing algorithms by using strategies such as restricting overhead [2], making use of network information [3], or network coding [4]. Although aiming at improving delivery performance and reducing resource consumption at the same time, all of these studies only focus on a single file dissemination and do not consider the differences among files. However, files transmitted in real-life networks are different in many aspects, such as their contents and freshness. Even the same file might be favored differently by different users. All of these differences among files should be taken into consideration when designing routing schemes.

In this paper, we take into account the differences among files by assigning them distinct priorities. The goal is to develop a theoretical understanding of modeling and performance optimization for dissemination of multiple files with distinct priorities through epidemic routing in a DTN. As a starting point, we consider two types of files a and b where file b has a higher priority over file a , and the goal is to disseminate the two files through the opportunistic encounters to as many mobile users as possible within an allowed time interval. We model the distinct priorities by assigning a higher reward for delivering of file b to each node than delivering file a . What makes the problem non-trivial is the fact that opportunities of communication are sporadic and short-lived and the transmission capacities are limited. In particular, users need to decide which file to forward during encounters where both file a and file b are eligible to forward. It is best to make this decision dynamically, as the “state” of dissemination, i.e., the number of users with each type of the files is evolving over time. We model the dissemination of the two files in the DTN given the dynamic forwarding decisions as a deterministic system of non-linear ODEs when the number of highly mobile users is large. We derive the structure of the optimal forwarding policy as given by Pontryagin’s Minimum Principle despite the absence of a closed-form solution.

Contributions of this work are as follows: First, we model the two file dissemination through epidemic routing in a large scale DTN as a deterministic non-linear optimal control problem (Section II), and characterize the set of necessary conditions that the optimal solution needs to satisfy by applying the Pontryagin’s Minimum Principle (Section III). Second, without access to the closed-form solution and

*This work was supported in part by NSF award CNS-1217260

¹Shangxing Wang and Bhaskar Krishnamachari are with Ming Hsieh Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles 90007 CA USA {shangxiw, bkrishna}@usc.edu

²MHR. Khouzani is with the Royal Holloway University of London, Egham Surrey TW20 0EX UK arman.khouzani@rhul.ac.uk

³Fan Bai is with General Motors Global R&D, Warren 48154 MI USA fan.bai@gm.com

through the investigation of conditions set by Pontryagin’s Minimum Principle, we establish that the optimal control policy in the most general form has a simple bang-singular-bang structure (Section IV). Finally, we illustrate our findings through numerical evaluations and show how the optimal control policy changes with respect to different initial network conditions (Section V).

Related Works: Dissemination of multiple files in mobile wireless networks has been investigated in several papers. Ioannidis *et al.* [5] studies heterogeneous services under constrained cache storages in an infrastructure-based network. However the distributed caching strategy they propose, PSEPHOS, mainly deals with buffer management to avoid overflow. Moghadam *et al.* [6] focuses on disseminating multiple files through storage limited nodes in a two-tier hybrid mobile network architecture by utilizing centralized control together with distributed dissemination. However, this work mainly focuses on the assignment of helper nodes for different files instead of making decisions on which file to transmit. Recent work done by Li *et al.* [7] proposes a heuristic algorithm for the multiple contents dissemination under roadside units (RSUs) aided opportunistic networks, where vehicles obtain Internet services through the static RSUs. Our work instead studies the multiple file dissemination problem in a fully distributed mobile network.

Ordinary differential equations have been used in modeling the dynamics of wireless and mobile networks, especially in the large scale networks thanks to mean-field convergence results. Zhang *et al.* [8] formulates the epidemic routing problem into an ODE-based framework and gives closed-form expressions for a number of different performance metrics. Even in a much more heterogeneous network setting where a file is constantly updated and nodes are categorized into different classes, Chaintreau *et al.* [9] shows network states can be entirely characterized by differential equations when the number of nodes becomes large. This major simplification allows one to both obtain efficient numerical solutions and derive analytical analysis. We share the same idea of using ODEs to characterize the continuously changing network states, but we concentrate on the optimal control of multiple file dissemination.

Control policies to better deploy network resources have been addressed when the network has limited resources. Optimal control theory, especially the Pontryagin’s Principle, serves as a useful tool to solve non-linear optimal control problems when the system dynamics are non-linear and traditional linear system theories are not applicable [12]-[15]. Specifically, Altman *et al.* studies single packet forwarding policies in DTNs under the constraint of limited energy in [12]-[13]. Problems concerning securing communication networks against malware attacks have been exploited in [14]-[15]. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to formulate the multiple file dissemination in DTNs as an optimal control problem and apply Pontryagin’s Principle to obtain a theoretical understanding.

TABLE I: List of main notations in the problem model

Parameter	Definition
$F_a(t)$	Fraction of nodes at time t that only possess file a
$F_b(t)$	Fraction of nodes at time t that only possess file b
$F_{ab}(t)$	Fraction of nodes at time t that possess both files a, b
$E(t)$	Fraction of empty nodes at time t
$\mu_a(t)$	Prob. at which a full node forwards file a (instead of file b) in an encounter to an empty node at time t ($1 - \mu_a(t)$ means the other way around)
$\omega_a(t)$	Prob. at which a node with only file a forwards file a in an encounter to a node with only file b at time t ($1 - \omega_a(t)$ means the other way around)
$\hat{\beta}$	Encounter rate of a pair of nodes (same for all pairs)
$[0, T]$	Dissemination time window (T : maximum delay)
W_a, W_b, W_{ab}	Reward weights respectively for nodes with file a, b and both files at the end of dissemination time window

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section, we present the model and assumptions of the problem. A list of main notations is provided in Table I.

Consider a Delay (Disruption) Tolerant Network (DTN) composed of N roaming nodes. If the area of the network is constrained and nodes move according to common mobility models such as the Random Waypoint model, then the inter-meeting time between nodes can be approximated as an exponentially distributed random variable with parameter $\hat{\beta}$ ([16]), which is inversely proportional to the roaming area.

Two types of files, file a and file b , are to be disseminated through the opportunistic encounters of the mobile nodes. For simplicity, we assume that the two files have the same size. At time zero, some nodes possess a copy of file a , some possess a copy of file b , and some are *full*, i.e., possess both files. The rest of the nodes are *empty*, i.e., do not have either of the two files. Duplication and transmission happen when two nodes encounter, i.e., enter the communication range of each other. We assume at most one copy of a file can be transmitted during an encounter between two nodes. This assumption is reasonable considering the short duration of the encounters, the limited capacity of the radio transmitters and the non-trivial size of a files, reflecting the limited communication capacity and high mobility of the nodes.

The dynamics of the dissemination of the two files is as follows: When a non-empty node that carries a copy of only one of the files meets an empty node, it duplicates a copy of its file and transmits it, i.e., *forwards* it, to the empty node. After receiving the copy, the empty node becomes a new non-empty node carrying that file. When a full node carrying both copies and a node that carries only one of the files encounter, the full node forwards the missing file. The recipient becomes a full node that carries both files. No file transmission decision needs to be made so far, since the sender simply forwards the file that the receiver does not yet have. However, a decision on which file (a or b) to transmit has to be made in the following two interesting scenarios. The first interesting cases, *Full-Empty Encounters*, happen whenever a full node (a node containing both files) encounters an empty node. Based on the assumption that at most one copy of a file can be forwarded at a time per

each encounter, the full node has to make a decision about which file to forward. Let $\mu_a(t)$ represent the probability that a full node forwards a copy of file a to an encountered empty node at time t . Correspondingly, $1 - \mu_a(t)$ is the probability that a full node forwards file b to an encountered empty node at time t . The second interesting cases, *Single-a-Single-b Encounters*, occur whenever a node that carries only file a and a node that carries only file b meet. Similarly, a decision on which file to transmit has to be made during such an encounter. Let $\omega_a(t)$ be the probability that at time t a copy of file a is forwarded from the node carrying only file a to the node carrying only file b , and $1 - \omega_a(t)$ be the probability that a copy of file b is forwarded the other way around. The recipient becomes a node possessing both files after the transmission. We assume that nodes are distinguishable only based on their status with regards to the possession of the files. Hence, the two control variables are assumed to be the same across *all* nodes of the same state. Clearly, we must have $0 \leq \mu_a(t), \omega_a(t) \leq 1$. Note that in this problem, we do not consider resource consumption metrics like energy (battery usage), and our only constraint is the short-lived nature of the encounters and the limited communication capacity of the nodes. Therefore, one copy of a file is indeed forwarded upon constructive encounters, the questions at hand is to optimally choose the file to forward given their distinct priorities.

Let $E(t)$, $F_a(t)$, $F_b(t)$ and $F_{ab}(t)$ respectively represent the *fraction* of empty nodes, nodes that carry a copy of file a , nodes that carry a copy of file b , and nodes that carry both files, at time t . Let $\beta = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N\hat{\beta}$ and assume it converges to a constant¹. When N is large, the dynamics of the system can be approximated by the following ordinary differential equations (ODEs):

$$\dot{E}(t) = -\beta E(t)(F_a(t) + F_b(t) + F_{ab}(t)) = -\beta E(t)(1 - E(t)) \quad (1a)$$

$$\dot{F}_a(t) = \beta E(t)F_a(t) + \beta\mu_a(t)E(t)F_{ab}(t) - \beta F_a(t)((1 - \omega_a(t))F_b(t) + F_{ab}(t)) \quad (1b)$$

$$\dot{F}_b(t) = \beta E(t)F_b(t) + \beta(1 - \mu_a(t))E(t)F_{ab}(t) - \beta F_b(t)(\omega_a(t)F_a(t) + F_{ab}(t)) \quad (1c)$$

$$\dot{F}_{ab}(t) = \beta F_{ab}(t)(F_a(t) + F_b(t)) + \beta F_a(t)F_b(t) \quad (1d)$$

with initial conditions $E_0, F_{a0}, F_{b0}, F_{ab0}$ that are strictly positive and satisfy the following constraints:

$$E(t), F_a(t), F_b(t), F_{ab}(t) \geq 0, \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \quad (2a)$$

$$E(t) + F_a(t) + F_b(t) + F_{ab}(t) = 1, \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \quad (2b)$$

The above ODE system is illustrated in Figure 1.

Note from (1a) that the evolution of the fraction of empty nodes, $E(t)$, does not depend on the control functions $\mu_a(t)$ and $\omega_a(t)$, either directly or indirectly through other

¹According to [16], the exponential distribution parameter $\hat{\beta}$ is inversely proportional to the size of the network area. Thus, $N\hat{\beta}$ is proportional to the nodes' density. The assumption that β is a constant is valid when the "density" of nodes (number of nodes per unit area) is non-degenerate and uniform over the roaming region.




Fig. 1: System Dynamics (Fluid Model)

variables. Indeed, the expression for $E(t)$ can be (in fact in closed-form) derived independently of the choice of the control variables from the differential equation (1a) and the initial condition $E(0) = E_0$. Moreover, the relationship $F_a(t) + F_b(t) + F_{ab}(t) + E(t) = 1$ holds at all times. Following these observations, the ODE system in (1) can be simplified by using only the following two differential equations with their initial conditions $F_a(0) = F_{a0}$ and $F_b(0) = F_{b0}$:

$$\dot{F}_a(t) = \beta F_a(t)(2E(t) + F_a(t) + \omega_a(t)F_b(t) - 1) + \beta\mu_a(t)E(t)(1 - F_a(t) - F_b(t) - E(t)) \quad (3a)$$

$$\dot{F}_b(t) = \beta F_b(t)(2E(t) + F_b(t) + (1 - \omega_a(t))F_a(t) - 1) + \beta(1 - \mu_a(t))E(t)(1 - F_a(t) - F_b(t) - E(t)) \quad (3b)$$

The objective of the problem is to judiciously choose the control functions $\mu_a(t)$ and $\omega_a(t)$ over a time interval $[0, T]$ so that at the end time T : (a) as many nodes as possible contain both files; and (b) among nodes that contain a single file, the nodes that contain file b are favored more than those containing file a . The time interval of $[0, T]$ can be thought of as the interest window of the files, when the two files are relevant. This introduces a hard limit on the maximum allowable delay in the delivery of the two files. According to these two preferences, the system reward \mathcal{R} can be represented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\mu_a, \omega_a) = & W_a F_a(T) + W_b F_b(T) + W_{ab} F_{ab}(T) = \\ & W_a F_a(T) + W_b F_b(T) + W_{ab}(1 - F_a(T) - F_b(T) - E(T)) \end{aligned}$$

where $0 < W_a < W_b < W_{ab}$. A special case is when $W_{ab} = W_a + W_b$, which represents the scenario where delivering a file to a node that does not have the file brings a fixed reward that depends on the file itself but not on the state of the node with respect to possession of the other file. Specifically, delivering file b to a new node brings a reward W_b which is strictly larger than the reward for delivering a copy of file a to a new node. This reflects that the priority of file b is higher than that of file a .

We seek to find optimal controls $(\mu_a^*(t), \omega_a^*(t)) \in \mathcal{S}$ to achieve a maximum reward \mathcal{R} , where \mathcal{S} is the admissible control region of any pair of piecewise continuous functions $(\mu_a, \omega_a) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying $\forall t \in [0, T], 0 \leq \mu_a(t), \omega_a(t) \leq 1$.

We start with the following technical but useful lemma, that for any admissible control function (μ_a, ω_a) , the fraction of the nodes of each type is strictly positive, and hence the state constraints (2a) and (2b) are never active, and thus can be ignored (proof in [17]).

Lemma 1: For any $(\mu_a, \omega_a) \in \mathcal{S}$, $E(t)$, $F_a(t)$, $F_b(t)$ and $F_{ab}(t)$ are strictly positive.

III. OPTIMAL CONTROL POLICY

Since the system dynamics are non-linear, existing solutions developed for linear systems cannot be applied to solve this optimal control problem. Instead, by defining a cost function as $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = -\mathcal{R}$ and converting the reward maximization problem to a cost minimization problem, we use *Pontryagin's Minimum Principle* to deal with this deterministic continuous-time optimal control problem. The corresponding *Hamiltonian function*, denoted by H , of this system characterized by equations (3) along with its objective function $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$, is defined as follows²:

$$\begin{aligned} H((\mu_a, \omega_a), (E, F_a, F_b), (\lambda_a, \lambda_b)) = \\ \lambda_a[\beta F_a(2E + F_a + \omega_a F_b - 1) + \beta \mu_a E(1 - F_a - F_b - E)] \\ + \lambda_b[\beta F_b(2E + F_b + (1 - \omega_a)F_a - 1) \\ + \beta(1 - \mu_a)E(1 - F_a - F_b - E)] \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_a(t), \lambda_b(t)$ are *adjoint (co-state) functions* satisfying:

$$\dot{\lambda}_a = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial F_a} = -\{\beta \lambda_a[2E + 2F_a + \omega_a F_b - \mu_a E - 1] - \beta \lambda_b[(1 - \mu_a)E - (1 - \omega_a)F_b]\} \quad (4a)$$

$$\dot{\lambda}_b = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial F_b} = -\{\beta \lambda_b[2E + 2F_b + (1 - \omega_a)F_a - (1 - \mu_a)E - 1] - \beta \lambda_a(\mu_a E - \omega_a F_a)\} \quad (4b)$$

with final constraints $\lambda_a(T) = W_{ab} - W_a$ and $\lambda_b(T) = W_{ab} - W_b$. According to *Pontryagin's Minimum Principle* ([18]), any optimal control (μ_a^*, ω_a^*) that minimizes the cost $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ also (point-wise) minimizes the Hamiltonian H as the following:

$$(\mu_a^*, \omega_a^*) \in \arg \min_{(\mu_a, \omega_a) \in \mathcal{S}} H((\mu_a, \omega_a), (E^*, F_a^*, F_b^*), (\lambda_a^*, \lambda_b^*)),$$

where the state and adjoint functions $(E^*, F_a^*, F_b^*), (\lambda_a^*, \lambda_b^*)$ are absolutely continuous (and piecewise differentiable) functions of time satisfying (3a), (3b), (4a) and (4b) respectively. Define $\varphi \triangleq \beta E(1 - F_a - F_b - E)(\lambda_a - \lambda_b)$ and $\sigma \triangleq \beta F_a F_b (\lambda_a - \lambda_b)$. The Hamiltonian H can now be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H = \varphi \mu_a + \sigma \omega_a + \lambda_a[\beta F_a(2E + F_a - 1)] \\ + \lambda_b[\beta F_b(2E + F_a + F_b - 1) + \beta E(1 - F_a - F_b - E)] \end{aligned}$$

Hence, according to Pontryagin's principle, for all $(\mu_a, \omega_a) \in \mathcal{S}$, we must have:

$$\varphi^* \mu_a^* + \sigma^* \omega_a^* \leq \varphi^* \mu_a + \sigma^* \omega_a$$

²We omit the explicit dependence on t for brevity wherever not ambiguous.

Define the *switching function* as:

$$\phi \triangleq \lambda_a - \lambda_b. \quad (5)$$

Since β , E , F_a , F_b and $F_{ab} = 1 - F_a - F_b - E$ are all strictly positive (following Lemma 1), minimizing $\varphi^* \mu_a + \sigma^* \omega_a$ is equivalent to minimizing $\phi^* \mu_a + \phi^* \omega_a = \phi^*(\mu_a + \omega_a)$. Thus, at any time t , the two-dimensional control (μ_a, ω_a) depends on the same switching function $\phi^*(t)$. Therefore, in order to minimize the Hamiltonian, the optimal control policy $(\mu_a^*(t), \omega_a^*(t))$ should be chosen as follows:

$$(\mu_a^*(t), \omega_a^*(t)) = \begin{cases} (0, 0) & \phi^*(t) > 0 \\ (1, 1) & \phi^*(t) < 0 \end{cases}$$

Note that the Pontryagin's principle is silent on the value of the optimal control when $\phi^*(t) = 0$. If $\phi^*(t)$ is at zero over a sub-interval of non-zero length, then other tools than Pontryagin's principle should be used to determine the solution, which can make the problem more challenging. The optimal control over such sub-intervals is referred to as *singular control* and the trajectory of the optimal control over such sub-intervals are often referred to as singular subarcs. If no singular subarc exists, the optimal control is called *non-singular*. In what follows, we observe that singular subarcs can indeed exist in our problem. From now on, we will omit the asterisks from the optimal variables (controller, state and adjoint functions), noting that, unless otherwise mentioned, all variables are according to their optimum values.

IV. STRUCTURAL RESULTS OF OPTIMAL CONTROL

In this section, we present our main result, that the optimal dissemination policy (μ_a, ω_a) follows a simple bang-singular-bang structure. Specifically we show that there is at most one singular sub-interval that separates the whole interval into three parts: nonsingular, singular and nonsingular sub-intervals. In the first nonsingular sub-interval, μ_a and ω_a are the same and remain as either maximum (one) or minimum (zero). In the singular sub-interval, μ_a and ω_a must be adjusted to guarantee approaching to the steady status as soon as possible. And in the last nonsingular sub-interval, μ_a and ω_a become the same again and can only be the minimum. Moreover, if no singular case occurs, in the optimal control policy, μ_a and ω_a follow the same bang-bang structure and switch from the maximum to the minimum at most once with terminating in minimum towards the end of the interval.

In words, the optimal forwarding policy is bound to behave like one of the four cases: (1) In both *Full-Empty Encounter* and *Single-a-Single-b Encounter*, always forward the file with higher priority; (2) In both *Full-Empty Encounter* and *Single-a-Single-b Encounter*, initially forward the file with lower priority (somewhat counter-intuitively), and then switch to forwarding only the file with higher probability till the end; (3) In both encounters, initially, only the file with lower priority is forwarded. Then once the fractions of nodes containing different single files become equal in the network,

file forwarding in *Full-Empty Encounter* and *Single-a-Single-b Encounter* become *complementary*³ to make sure the fractions of nodes containing different single files remain equal in the network for a limited interval. But after such interval, in both two encounters, switch to forwarding only the file with higher probability that extends till the end; (4) At first in both encounters, only forward the higher priority file until the fractions of nodes with each file become equal. Then there is a sub-interval of singular control over which file forwarding in these two encounters remain complementary for some time. After that, only the higher priority file is forwarded again towards the end in both encounters.

Theorem 1: The optimal control policy $(\mu_a(t), \omega_a(t))$ has one of the two structures as follows:

$$(\mu_a(t), \omega_a(t)) = \begin{cases} (1, 1) & t \in [0, \tau_1) \\ (\mu_a, \omega_a) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ s.t. } (2\mu_a - 1)E(1 - 2F_a) \\ \quad + (2\omega_a - 1)F_a^2 = 0 & t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2) \\ (0, 0) & t \in [\tau_2, T] \end{cases}$$

or

$$(\mu_a(t), \omega_a(t)) = \begin{cases} (0, 0) & t \in [0, \tau_1) \\ (\mu_a, \omega_a) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ s.t. } (2\mu_a - 1)E(1 - 2F_a) \\ \quad + (2\omega_a - 1)F_a^2 = 0 & t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2) \\ (0, 0) & t \in [\tau_2, T] \end{cases}$$

where $\tau_1 \in [0, T)$, $\tau_2 \in [0, T)$ and $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$.

Proof: See [17]. ■

Remark: Before proceeding, we give some intuitions behind the singular subarcs. During the time interval where singular case happens, the fractions of nodes containing two single files must remain the same all the time. Thus, the two control functions μ_a and ω_a are chosen complementarily to guarantee that at any time during this singular interval, if in the *Single-a-Single-b Encounter* the fraction of nodes containing a single file (say file a) decreases due to receiving a different file (b) from the sender and becoming a full node, then in the *Full-Empty Encounter*, this fraction decrease would be compensated for by full nodes forwarding this single file (a) to empty nodes during the *Full-Empty Encounter*.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We first present numerical results to illustrate Theorem 1. The simulation tool we use is DIDO⁴, which is widely used for solving optimal control problems. We use $\beta = 0.2$, $W_a = 15$, $W_b = 15.5$, $W_{ab} = 30$, $T = 20$, $E_0 = 0.4$, $F_{ab0} = 0.05$; F_{a0} and F_{b0} are varied as shown in Fig. 2(a) and 2(b). The optimal control policy is plotted together with the corresponding state functions. As can be seen from these figures, the structure of the optimal control policy has a bang-singular-bang structure, and two possible structures occur based on different initial conditions.

The structure of the optimal control policy reflects a phenomenon similar to the *Most Rapid Approach Path* ([19]), where the optimal control is chosen such that the system state

approaches to its steady state as quickly as possible. And after reaching the steady state, the optimal control guarantee that the system stays at its steady state as long as possible before it goes to some final state to meet certain condition. The optimal control policy turns out to have the structure as it is shown in Fig. 2(a) when the lower priority file a is less than the higher priority file b in the beginning. First always transmitting file a in both *Full-Empty Encounter* and *Single-a-Single-b Encounter* increases the fraction of nodes receiving file a . This further increases the fraction of full nodes due to the packet transmission in the increased opportunistic encounters between two single file nodes. After some time when the fractions of different single file nodes become equal, optimal policy then switches to forwarding file a and b complementarily. This would keep the fractions of nodes containing two different single files equal, which maximize the encounter chance between nodes with different single files. And this in turn maximize the rate of nodes becoming a full nodes, which yields a higher system reward. However, at some later time point, the optimal control policy goes back to only transmitting file b in both encounter cases because file b has a higher priority and more nodes containing file b at the end leads to a higher system reward. Similar explanations hold for Fig. 2(b) with the only difference that the optimal control policy starts with forwarding the higher priority file b during some initial time period because of less nodes with file b in the beginning.

Second, to gain some intuitions on how the optimal control policy switches in different situations, we depict the optimal control in non-singular cases as we vary T , E_0 and W_{ab} respectively. The parameters we have used are depicted in the caption of Fig. 3. All the scenarios we consider here are non-singular. In all the three cases of Fig. 3(a), there are less nodes with the lower priority file a than those with the higher priority file b at the beginning. So according to the optimal policy, first forward the lower priority file in both *Full-Empty Encounter* and *Single-a-Single-b Encounter* until some time threshold, and then switch to only forwarding the higher priority file till the end. As we increase the interest time window T , the switching time, i.e., the time when switch to forwarding the higher priority file is more postponed, which indicates the system spends more time forwarding the less priority file. This would increase the fraction of nodes with the lower priority file and make it close enough to the fraction of nodes with the higher priority file, and thus provides more chance for nodes with two different files to meet. As more such encounters happen, more nodes receive both two files due to the file transmission during these encounters, which further brings a better system reward. Similar postponement behavior of the switching time of the optimal policy is observed when we increase E_0 and W_{ab} respectively in Fig. 3(b) and 3(c). The discrepancy of $\mu_a(t)$ during switching is due to discretization in DIDO.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have studied the dissemination problem of two files with distinct priorities through epidemic routing

³By saying *Complementary* or *Complementarily*, we mean if one file is prioritized in the *Full-Empty Encounter*, the other file is prioritized in the *Single-a-Single-b Encounter*.

⁴<http://www.elissarglobal.com/academic/products/>





Fig. 3: The changing switching times of the optimal control policy with different initial conditions. The common parameters are $F_{a0} = 0.05$, $F_{b0} = 0.3$, $W_a = 15$, $W_b = 15.5$. For Fig.3(a), we have used $E_0 = 0.4$, $F_{ab0} = 0.25$, and $W_{ab} = 30$; For Fig.3(b), we have used $T = 20$, $W_{ab} = 30$ and $F_{ab0} = 0.65 - E_0$; For Fig.3(c), we have used $E_0 = 0.4$, $F_{ab0} = 0.25$ and $T = 20$.

for large scale DTNs. By formulating an optimal control problem that can be dealt with by using Pontryagin’s Minimum Principle, we have found that the optimal control policy for transmitting files with different priorities follows a simple bang-singular-bang structure. In addition, under some system initial settings the singular case may not exist and the optimal control policy becomes even more simplified as a bang-bang structure with at most one jump from the maximum (forward only the lower priority file) to the minimum (forward only the higher priority file). Though updated continuously and dynamically in time, the simple-structure optimal policy is convenient to implement in real applications. Numerical results have been presented to illustrate our analysis. Moreover, through numerical simulations, we have provided some intuitions on how the optimal policy changes according to different initial system settings.

There are several possible future directions. The first thing we want to point out is that although the optimal control in the singular case given by the numerical result seems unsteady, it might be promising to keep both $\mu_a(t)$ and $\omega_a(t)$ be 0.5 during the singular sub-interval, since this satisfies the condition in the optimal control policy and might also yield the maximum reward. We have done a number of simulations to validate our guess, but further theoretical analysis is needed to confirm our conjecture. The second is to extend this two files dissemination problem to a general multiple files dissemination problem. The third is to introduce heterogeneity to the network settings, such as heterogeneous mobility and non-uniform control functions, to the network settings. Finally, we are also interested in finding a way to theoretically characterize how the optimal control policy changes according to different initial system parameters.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Vahdat, D. Becker, “Epidemic routing for partially connected ad hoc networks,” Technical Report CS-200006, 2000.
- [2] T. Spyropoulos, K. Psounis, and C. S. Raghavendra, “Spray and Wait: An Efficient Routing Scheme for Intermittently Connected Mobile Networks,” in *Proc. of ACM WDTN*, 2005.

- [3] J. Leguay, T. Friedman and V. Conan, “Evaluating Mobility Pattern Space Routing for DTNs,” in *Proc. of IEEE INFOCOM*, 2006.
- [4] J. Widmer and J.-Y. Le Boudec, “Network coding for efficient communication in extreme networks,” in *Proc. of ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Delay Tolerant Networks*, 2005.
- [5] S. Ioannidis, L. Massoulie and A. Chaintreau, “Distributed caching over heterogeneous mobile networks,” in *Proc. of ACM SIGMETRICS*, 2010.
- [6] K. R. Moghadam, M. Sathiamoorthy, B. Krishnamachari and F. Bai, “Dynamic online storage allocation for multi-content dissemination in two-tier hybrid mobile vehicular networks,” in *IEEE Vehicular Networking Conference*, 2013.
- [7] Y. Li, X. Zhu, D. Jin and D. Wu, “Multiple content dissemination in roadside unit aided vehicular opportunistic networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, February 2013.
- [8] X. Zhang, G. Neglia, J. Kurose, and D. Towsley, “Performance modeling of epidemic routing,” *Computer Networks: The International Journal of Computer and Telecommunications Networking*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 2867-2891, 2007.
- [9] A. Chaintreau, J.-Y. Le Boudec and N. Ristanovic, “The age of gossip: Spatial mean-field regime,” in *Proc. of ACM SIGMETRICS*, 2009.
- [10] A. Krifa, C. Barakat, and T. Spyropoulos, “Optimal buffer management policies for delay tolerant networks,” in *Proc. of IEEE SECON*, 2008.
- [11] A. A. Hanbali, P. Nain, and E. Altman, “Performance of ad hoc networks with two-hop relay routing and limited packet lifetime,” in *Proc. of Valuetools*, 2006.
- [12] E. Altman, T. Basar and F. De Pellegrini, “Optimal monotone forwarding policies in delay tolerant mobile ad-hoc networks,” in *ACM Inter-Perf*, 2008.
- [13] E. Altman, F. De Pellegrini, and L. Sassatelli, “Combined optimal control of activation and transmission in delay-tolerant networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Networking*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 482-494, 2013.
- [14] X. Yan and Y. Zou, “Optimal Internet worm treatment strategy based on the two-factor model,” *ETRI J.*, vol. 30, no. 1, p. 81, 2008.
- [15] M. Khouzani, S. Sarkar and E. Altman, “Maximum damage malware attack in mobile wireless networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Networking*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 1347-1360, 2012.
- [16] R. Groenevelt, P. Nain and G. Koole, “The message delay in mobile ad hoc networks,” in *Performance Evaluation*, vol. 62, no. 1-4, 2005.
- [17] S. Wang, M. Khouzani, B. Krishnamachari and F. Bai, “Optimal Control for Epidemic Routing of Two Files with Different Priorities in Delay Tolerant Networks,” USC CENG Technical Report, CENG-2014-06 <http://www-scf.usc.edu/~shangxiw/OptimalControlACC2015TechReport.pdf>.
- [18] D.P. Bertsekas, “Dynamic programming and optimal control,” 2nd ed. Belmont, MA: Athena Scientific, 2005.
- [19] M. Spence and D. Starrett, “Most rapid approach paths in accumulation problems,” *International Economic Review*, vol.16, pp. 388403, 1975.