

Research Article

Outage Analysis of Cooperative Transmission with Energy Harvesting Relay: Time Switching versus Power Splitting

Guanyao Du, Ke Xiong, and Zhengding Qiu

School of Computer and Information Technology, Beijing Jiaotong University, Beijing 100044, China

Correspondence should be addressed to Ke Xiong; kxiong@bjtu.edu.cn

Received 16 June 2014; Accepted 6 January 2015

Academic Editor: Wendong Xiao

Copyright © 2015 Guanyao Du et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

This paper investigates the multiuser transmission network with an energy harvesting (EH) cooperative relay, where a source transmits independent information to multiple destinations with the help of an energy constrained relay. The relay can harvest energy from the radio frequency (RF) signals transmitted from the source, and it helps the multiuser transmission only by consuming the harvested energy. By adopting the time switching and the power splitting relay receiver architectures, we firstly propose two protocols, the time switching cooperative multiuser transmission (TSCMT) protocol and the power splitting cooperative multiuser transmission (PSCMT) protocol, to enable the simultaneous information processing and EH at the relay for the system. To evaluate the system performance, we theoretically analyze the system outage probability for the two proposed protocols and then derive explicit expressions for each of them, respectively. Numerical results are provided to demonstrate the accuracy of our analytical results and reveal that compared with traditional noncooperative scheme our proposed protocols are green solutions to offer reliable communication and lower system outage probability without consuming additional energy. In particular, for the same transmit power at the source, the PSCMT protocol is superior to the TSCMT protocol to obtain lower system outage probability.

1. Introduction

Recently, energy harvesting (EH) has emerged as a promising approach to overcome the limited energy budget of wireless networks, especially for wireless sensor networks or other networks with fixed energy supplies [1–7]. Conventional EH techniques gather energy from surrounding natural environment, for example, solar, wind, pressure, and thermoelectric effects [1–4]. However, the energy obtained from physical phenomena is not always available and not easily controlled [5]. To this end, one promising solution is to harvest energy from the ambient radio-frequency (RF) signals [5–14].

Cooperative communication, a technique initially proposed to offer high capacity and reliability by exploiting spatial diversity [15–17], has been proved to be capable of improving the energy efficiency of networks [18–20]. More recently, efforts have been made to apply EH to cooperative wireless networks to improve the performance of energy-constrained systems. Most devices used in wireless network are surrounded by RF signals (e.g., Wi-Fi signals

or cellular signals), and these RF signals can carry energy and information simultaneously. Thus much attention has been paid to EH from RF signals [8-14], which is ideal for cooperative communication networks, because the transmissions of cooperation nodes can be powered by the energy harvested from the incoming signals rather than external energy supply. Specifically, in [8], a one-way transmission among one source-destination pair was studied via an EH cooperative relay, where the achievable throughput at the destination was derived. In [9], the author investigated the system achievable throughput and ergodic capacity of a decode-and-forward (DF) two-hop relaying network with an EH relay. In [10], an amplify-and-forward (AF) two-hop transmission with the help of an EH relay was considered, where the maximal achievable information of the system was analyzed. In [11], the outage performance analysis and optimization were investigated for a DF two-way relay network with an EH relay. In [12], a cooperative uplink transmission among two users with downlink energy transfer was considered, where the system outage performance was studied. In [13], the outage probability was characterized for users in a cooperative network where multiple source-destination pairs communicated with each other via an EH relay. In [14], different power allocation strategies were proposed and evaluated for the system where multiple source-destination pairs communicated with the help of a common EH relay. However, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no work investigating the multiuser transmission via an EH cooperative relay.

In this paper, we focus on the multiuser transmission network, where a source transmits independent information to multiple destinations with the help of an energy-constrained relay. The multiuser transmission network is a universal model. For example, in cellular networks, several mobile users download files from a common base station simultaneously. Moreover, if the multiuser transmission could be assisted by a wireless cooperative relay, the reliability of system can be greatly improved [21, 22]. In particular, in [21], a network coding-aware cooperative relaying scheme was presented for downlink cellular networks, where two relay nodes were used to assist the transmissions for two users. In [22], an opportunistic network coding relaying cooperative scheme was proposed for a cellular downlink transmission network, where the outage performance was analyzed.

However, all the above work did not consider EH at the relay; that is to say, the cooperative relay has to consume its own energy to assist the multiuser transmission, whereas sometimes the relay is unwilling to help due to the selfish nature or the lack of energy supply. In our work, we also focus on the multiuser transmission network, where a cooperative relay is applied to assist the multiuser transmission. Compared with previous work [13, 21, 22], some differences of our work are deserved to be stressed as follows. Firstly, we apply EH to the cooperative relay. The EH relay can harvest energy from the RF signals it received from the source and uses all the harvested energy to cooperate the information transfer. Secondly, in [13], the authors considered a cooperative network with multiple source-destination pairs communicating with each other via an EH DF relay, and the impact of spatial randomness of user locations on the system outage probability was studied, whereas, in this work, we aim to investigate the performance gain that the EH AF relay brings compared with the traditional noncooperative transmission and focus on the effect of relay position on the system outage probability.

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows. Firstly, two transmission protocols, that is, time switchingbased cooperative multiuser transmission (TSCMT) protocol and power splitting-based cooperative multiuser transmission (PSCMT) protocol, are proposed by applying the practically realizable receiver architectures in [7] to enable the simultaneous information processing and EH at the AF relay. Secondly, for each proposed protocol, we theoretically analyze the system outage performance and derive an explicit expression for the system outage probability. As the outage probability is one of the most important performance metrics for the cooperative networks, there have been lots of works investigating the outage performance in cooperative systems [13, 14, 23–26]. Thirdly, based on the



FIGURE 1: System model and parameters.

analytical outage probability, we discuss the effects of system configuration parameters, such as the source power and relay location on the system performance. Extensive numerical results show that the two proposed protocols outperform the traditional noncooperative scheme in terms of outage probability. Moreover, due to the fact that the energy used by the relay is harvested from the RF signals in communication networks, our proposed protocols can improve the system outage performance without consuming extra energy.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 1 describes the system model. Sections 3 and 4 present the proposed TSCMT and PSCMT protocols and analyze the system outage performance for each protocol, respectively. In Section 5, we provide numerical results. Finally, the conclusion is followed in Section 6.

2. System Model

Consider a multiuser cooperative transmission network composed of a source S, two destinations (referred to as D_1 and D_2), and an energy-constrained relay R, as shown in Figure 1. We assume that S has its own internal energy source and wants to transfer independent information x_1 and x_2 to D_1 and D_2 with the help of R, respectively. The energy constrained R relies on external charging; thus it harvests energy from the received RF signals transmitted from S and uses all the harvested energy to help the transmissions from S to D_1 and D_2 . We also assume that all the terminals have a single antenna and operate in a half-duplex mode.

Let $h_{s,r}, h_{s,1}, h_{s,2}, h_{r,1}$, and $h_{r,2}$ denote the complex channel coefficient of S to R channel, S to D₁ channel, S to D₂ channel, R to D₁ channel, and R to D₂ channel, respectively. We assume that all the channels are quasi-block fading channel, following Rayleigh fading. Also, the channels are modeled as follows: $h_{s,r} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Omega_{s,r}), h_{s,1} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Omega_{s,1}), h_{s,2} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Omega_{s,2}),$ $h_{r,1} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Omega_{r,1})$, and $h_{r,2} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Omega_{r,2})$. Specifically, let $d_{s,r}, d_{s,1}, d_{s,2}, d_{r,1}$, and $d_{r,2}$ denote the distance from S to R, from S to D₁, from S to D₂, from R to D₁, and from R to D₁, respectively. As a result, $\Omega_{s,r} = d_{s,r}^{-m}, \Omega_{s,1} = d_{s,1}^{-m}, \Omega_{s,2} = d_{s,2}^{-m},$ $\Omega_{r,1} = d_{r,1}^{-m}$, and $\Omega_{r,2} = d_{r,2}^{-m}$, where *m* denotes the path loss exponent.

With such a system model and assumptions mentioned above, we will describe our proposed two cooperative protocols in Sections 3 and 4.

Energy harvesting		Information transmission		
ρΤ/2 ρΤ/	2	$(1-\rho)T/3$	$(1-\rho)T/3$	$(1 - \rho)T/3$
EH at R EH at from S from	R S	S broadcast	S broadcast	R broadcast $x_{\rm R}$ with P_r

FIGURE 2: Key parameters in the proposed TSCMT protocol.

3. Time Switching-Based Cooperative Multiuser Transmission (TSCMT) Protocol

In this section, we consider the time switching receiver architecture proposed in [7]. We will first detail the proposed cooperative protocol and then analyze the system outage performance for it (Energy harvesting from RF signal, which is also known as simultaneous wireless information and energy transfer (SWIET) was first proposed in 2008 [6]. In the year of 2012, the authors in [7] first proposed two practically realizable receiver architecture designs, in which EH and information detection could be operated in time switching (TS) or power splitting (PS) patterns. So far, these two receiver schemes have been widely adopted and used in various wireless systems [8–12]. Considering that the two receiver designs are easy to be implemented in practical systems, we design the TSCMT and PSCMT protocols on the basis of, resp., TS and PS receiver architecture.).

3.1. Protocol Description. Figure 2 depicts the transmission process and key parameters in the proposed TSCMT protocol. For a time period T, let $0 \le \rho \le 1$ denote the time assignment factor, such that ρT part is assigned for R to harvest energy from S, where it is equally divided into two time durations. Each $\rho T/2$ duration is assigned for R to harvest energy from S during the period when S broadcasts x_i (*i* = 1, 2) with power P_i . The remaining part $(1-\rho)T$ is used for the information transmission, which is equally divided into three parts. During the first two $(1 - \rho)T/3$ durations, S broadcasts information x_i with power P_i , both D_1 , D_2 and R can receive the signal. In the third time duration of $(1-\rho)T/3$, R first combines the two signals it received and then uses all the energy harvested from S to broadcast the combined signal $x_{\rm R}$. In the following subsection, we will analyze the system outage performance for the TSCMT protocol.

3.2. Outage Probability Analysis for the TSCMT Protocol. In this section, we will analyze the expression of the outage probability for the transmission from S to D_1 . Note that the transmission from S to D_2 has the similar outage performance due to the symmetry of the system.

As illustrated in Figure 2, S broadcasts its information x_i (both x_1 and x_2 have unit average power) with power P_i , both D_1 , D_2 and R can receive it. The received signals $y_{s,i}$ at D_i and

the received signals $r_{s,j}$ at D_j (j = 1, 2 and $j \neq i$) are given as follows, respectively:

$$y_{s,i} = \sqrt{P_i} h_{s,i} x_i + n_{s,i}, \tag{1}$$

$$r_{s,j} = \sqrt{P_i h_{s,j} x_i + v_{s,j}},\tag{2}$$

where $n_{s,i}$ and $v_{s,j}$ are the additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) at D_i and D_j with $n_{s,i} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ and $v_{s,j} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$. Note that $y_{s,i}$ is the desired signal of D_i , whereas $r_{s,j}$ is the signal that can help D_j decode x_i from the mixed signal transmitted by R in the third phase.

After the processing of the relay receiver, the sampled baseband signal at R is given as follows:

$$y_{r,i} = \sqrt{P_i h_{s,r} x_i + n_{r,i}},$$
 (3)

where $n_{r,i}$ is the AWGN at R with $n_{r,i} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$. The energy that R harvests from S is given as follows [5, 8–12]:

$$E_i = \eta P_i \left| h_{s,r} \right|^2 \cdot \frac{\rho T}{2},\tag{4}$$

where $0 \le \rho \le 1$ denotes the time assignment factor, and $0 < \eta \le 1$ denotes the energy conversion efficiency.

After the first two transmissions from S, the relay has harvested total $E_1 + E_2$ energy from S. So, the transmition power at R in the following phase is given by

$$P_{r} = \frac{E_{1} + E_{2}}{(1 - \rho) T/3} = \frac{3\rho}{2(1 - \rho)} \cdot \eta \left(P_{1} + P_{2}\right) \left|h_{s,r}\right|^{2}.$$
 (5)

R first combines the two signals $y_{r,1}$ and $y_{r,2}$ as x_R [23, 27] and uses P_r to broadcast the combined signal x_R . Specifically, x_R is given as follows:

$$x_{\rm R} = \xi_1 y_{r,1} + \xi_2 y_{r,2},\tag{6}$$

where ξ_i (*i* = 1, 2) denotes how R combines $y_{r,1}$ and $y_{r,2}$ and is selected as follows:

$$\xi_{i} = \sqrt{\frac{\theta_{i}}{P_{i} \left|h_{s,r}\right|^{2} + 1}} \approx \sqrt{\frac{\theta_{i}}{P_{i} \left|h_{s,r}\right|^{2}}},$$
(7)

where $0 < \theta_i < 1$ (i = 1, 2) and $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = 1$. The approximation in (7) is widely adopted in similar articles [27, 28]. Note that x_R always has unit power irrespective of θ_i .

After combining the two signals $y_{r,1}$ and $y_{r,2}$, R broadcasts $x_{\rm R}$ with power P_r , and the signals received by D₁ and D₂ are given as follows:

$$y_{d,i} = \sqrt{P_r} h_{r,i} x_{\mathrm{R}} + n_{d,i}, \qquad (8)$$

where $n_{d,i}$ is the AWGN at D_i (i = 1, 2) with $n_{d,i} \sim CN(0, 1)$. Because D_1 (D_2) can decode x_2 (x_1) from (2), it can remove x_2 (x_1) from $n_{d,1}$ $(n_{d,2})$. Thus, D_1 can obtain the interference-free signal as follows:

$$\widetilde{y}_{d,1} = \sqrt{P_r} h_{r,1} \xi_1 \sqrt{P_1} h_{s,r} x_1 + \sqrt{P_r} h_{r,1} \xi_2 n_{r,2} + \sqrt{P_r} h_{r,1} \xi_1 n_{r,1} + n_{d,1}.$$
(9)

Then, submitting P_r in (5), and using the approximation in (7), the instantaneous SNR γ_1 of the signal $\tilde{y}_{d,1}$ is given as follows:

$$\gamma_{1} = \frac{(3\rho/2(1-\rho)) \cdot \eta (P_{1}+P_{2}) \theta_{1} |h_{s,r}|^{2} |h_{r,1}|^{2}}{(3\rho/2(1-\rho)) \cdot \eta (P_{1}+P_{2}) (\theta_{1}/P_{1}+\theta_{2}/P_{2}) |h_{r,1}|^{2} + 1}.$$
(10)

By receiving two copies of x_1 , D_1 performs the maximal ratio combining (MRC). MRC is a method of diversity combining, in which the different copies of the same transmitted signal are added together to enhance the total received SNR at the destination [24, 27]. With the instantaneous SNR of the direct link from S to D_1 which is denoted by $\gamma_0 = P_1 |h_{s,1}|^2$, we can obtain the mutual information of the transmission from S to D_1 as follows:

$$I_{1} = \frac{2(1-\rho)}{3}\log(1+\gamma_{0}+\gamma_{1}).$$
(11)

As is known, the outage probability represents the probability which the target transmission rate is not supported due to the variations of channels. It is usually used to evaluate the performance over fading channels [23–25]. In our work, an outage occurs when the mutual information in (11) falls below the targeted rate R_t . Thus, the outage probability can be calculated as

$$P_{\text{out}}^{(\text{TS})} = \Pr\left(I_1 < R_t\right)$$
$$= \Pr\left(\frac{2\left(1-\rho\right)}{3}\log\left(1+\gamma_0+\gamma_1\right) < R_t\right).$$
(12)

Theorem 1. Given a target transmission rate R_t , the outage probability of the TSCMT protocol for the multiuser cooperative transmission system with an EH relay is given as follows:

$$\begin{split} P_{out}^{(TS)} &= 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{R_0}{P_1\Omega_{s,1}}\right) \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{\exp\left(-R_0 b/a\Omega_{s,r}\right) c^{l+1}}{P_1\Omega_{s,1} \left(a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}\right)^{l+1} l! \left(l+1\right)!} \\ &\times \left\{ \left(\ln \frac{c}{a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}} + 2\mathscr{C} - \sum_{k=1}^{l} \frac{1}{k} - \sum_{k=1}^{l+1} \frac{1}{k}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{1}{P_1\Omega_{s,1}} - \frac{b}{a\Omega_{s,r}}\right)^{-l-2} \\ &\quad \times \gamma \left(l+2, \frac{R_0}{P_1\Omega_{s,1}} - \frac{bR_0}{a\Omega_{s,r}}\right) + H_l \right\} \end{split}$$

$$+ \frac{\exp\left(-R_{0}/P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}\right)c}{a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}}$$

$$\cdot \left\{ \left(\ln \frac{c}{a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}} + 2\mathscr{C} \right) \times \left(\frac{1}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} - \frac{b}{a\Omega_{s,r}} \right)^{-2} \times \gamma \left(2, \frac{R_{0}}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} - \frac{bR_{0}}{a\Omega_{s,r}} \right) + H_{0} \right\}$$

$$- \frac{a\Omega_{s,r}}{a\Omega_{s,r} - bP_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} \left(\exp\left(-\frac{R_{0}}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{R_{0}b}{a\Omega_{s,r}}\right) \right),$$
(13)

where $\gamma(\cdot)$ denotes the incomplete gamma function, $R_0 = 2^{1.5R_t/(1-\rho)} - 1$, $a = (3/2)\rho(1-\rho)^{-1}\eta(P_1+P_2)\theta_1$, $b = aP_2^{-1} + a\theta_1P_1^{-1}\theta_2^{-1}$, c = 1, and $\mathscr{C} \approx 0.5772$ is Euler's constant. Here we have

$$\mathscr{H}_{l} = \int_{0}^{R_{0}} \exp\left(-\frac{\left(a\Omega_{s,r} - bP_{1}\Omega_{s,1}\right)\tau}{aP_{1}\Omega_{s,1}\Omega_{s,r}}\right)\tau^{l+1}\ln\tau\,d\tau.$$
 (14)

Proof. See the appendix.

4. Power Splitting-Based Cooperative Multiuser Transmission (PSCMT) Protocol

In this section, by considering the power splitting receiver architecture, we will first detail the proposed PSCMT protocol and then analyze the system outage performance for it.

4.1. Protocol Description. Figure 3 illustrates the transmission process and key parameters in the proposed power splittingbased cooperative multiuser transmission (PSCMT) protocol. As shown in the figure, the transmission is accomplished through three phases, and each phase lasts for a time duration of T/3. During the *i*th (i = 1, 2) phase, S broadcasts its information x_i with power P_i , both D_1 , D_2 and R can receive the signal. The part $(1 - \alpha_i)P_ih_{s,r}^2$ is used for the information transmission from S to R, where $0 \le \alpha_i \le 1$ denotes the power splitting factor, and the other part $\alpha_1 P_1 h_{s,r}^2$ is used for energy harvesting at R. In the third phase, the relay first combines the two signals it received in the first two phases and then uses the energy harvested from S to broadcast the combined signal x_R in a time duration of T/3.

4.2. Outage Probability Analysis for the PSCMT Protocol. As illustrated in Figure 3, during the *i*th (i = 1, 2) phase, S broadcasts its information x_i with power P_i . The received signals $y_{s,i}$ at D_i and the received signals $r_{s,j}$ at D_j (j = 1, 2 and $j \neq i$) are given in (1) and (2), respectively.

At the end of the *i*th phase, after the processing of the relay receiver, the sampled baseband signal at R is given as follows:

$$y_{r,i} = \sqrt{(1 - \alpha_i) P_i h_{s,r} x_i + n_{r,i}},$$
 (15)

Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	
T/3	<i>T</i> /3	T/3	
EH at R from S $\left(\alpha_1 P_1 h_{s,r}^2\right)$	EH at R from S $\left(\alpha_2 P_2 h_{s,r}^2\right)$	R broadcast $x_{\rm P}$	
S broadcast x_1 $\left((1-\alpha_1)P_1h_{s,r}^2\right)$	S broadcast x_2 $\left((1-\alpha_2)P_2h_{s,r}^2\right)$	with <i>P_r</i>	

FIGURE 3: Key parameters in the proposed PSCMT protocol.

where $0 \le \alpha_i \le 1$ (i = 1, 2) denotes the power splitting factor and $n_{r,i}$ is defined below (3). The energy that R harvests from S is given by

$$E_i = \eta P_i \alpha_i \left| h_{s,r} \right|^2 \cdot \frac{T}{3},\tag{16}$$

where η is defined below (4).

After the first two phases, the relay has harvested total E_1 + E_2 energy from S. So, the transmition power at R in the third phase is given by

$$P_{r} = \frac{E_{1} + E_{2}}{T/3} = \eta \left(\alpha_{1} P_{1} + \alpha_{2} P_{2} \right) \left| h_{s,r} \right|^{2}.$$
 (17)

During the third phase, R first combines the two signals x_1 and x_2 as x_R , which is given in (6), and uses the power P_r to broadcast the combined signal x_R .

At the end of the third phase, the signals received by D_1 and D_2 are given in (8). Similar to the process in the TSCMT protocol described in Section 3.2, after removing the interference signal $y_{d,2}$, D_1 can obtain the interference-free signal as follows:

$$\begin{split} \widetilde{y}_{d,1} &= \sqrt{P_r} h_{r,1} \xi_1 \sqrt{\left(1 - \alpha_1\right) P_1} h_{s,r} x_1 + \sqrt{P_r} h_{r,1} \xi_2 n_{r,2} \\ &+ \sqrt{P_r} h_{r,1} \xi_1 n_{r,1} + n_{d,1}. \end{split} \tag{18}$$

Submitting P_r from (17) into (18), and using the approximation in (7), the instantaneous SNR γ_1 of the signal $\tilde{y}_{d,1}$ is given as follows:

 γ_1

$$=\frac{\eta\left(\alpha_{1}P_{1}+\alpha_{2}P_{2}\right)\theta_{1}\left|h_{s,r}\right|^{2}\left|h_{r,1}\right|^{2}}{\eta\left(\alpha_{1}P_{1}+\alpha_{2}P_{2}\right)\left|h_{r,1}\right|^{2}\left(\theta_{1}/P_{1}\left(1-\alpha_{1}\right)+\theta_{2}/P_{2}\left(1-\alpha_{2}\right)\right)+1}.$$
(19)

Similar to the TSCMT protocol, D₁ performs the MRC. With the instantaneous SNR of the direct link from S to D₁ which is denoted by $\gamma_0 = P_1 |h_{s,1}|^2$, the mutual information of the transmission from S to D₁ can be expressed as follows:

$$I_{1} = \frac{2}{3} \log \left(1 + \gamma_{0} + \gamma_{1} \right), \qquad (20)$$

where the factor 2/3 in (19) is due to the fact that three phases are used to transmit two new signals. Thus, the outage probability can be calculated as

$$P_{\text{out}}^{(\text{PS})} = \Pr\left(I_1 < R_t\right)$$

$$= \Pr\left(\frac{2}{3}\log\left(1 + \gamma_0 + \gamma_1\right) < R_t\right).$$
(21)

Theorem 2. Given a target transmission rate R_t , the outage probability of the PSCMT protocol for the multiuser cooperative transmission system can be analytically calculated using (13), where (the detailed derivation of the outage probability for the PSCMT protocol is omitted here because it follows the same steps which is given below the appendix) $R_0 = 2^{1.5R_t} - 1$, $a = \eta(\alpha_1 P_1 + \alpha_2 P_2)\theta_1$, $b = aP_2^{-1}(1-\alpha_2)^{-1} + a\theta_1\theta_2^{-1}P_1^{-1}(1-\alpha_1)^{-1}$, and c = 1.

It is desirable to obtain the optimal values of ρ and α which result in the lowest system outage probability (ρ for the TSCMT protocol and α for the PSCMT protocol, resp.). But it is intractable to derive the closed-form expressions for the optimal ρ and α due to the Bessel function and the integration involved in the explicit expression of $P_{out}^{(TS)}$ and $P_{out}^{(PS)}$, as shown in (13). However, for given system configuration parameters, such as the source power and relay location, the optimization can be done offline by numerically evaluating optimal values of ρ and α .

5. Numerical Results

In this section, numerical results are provided to verify our theoretical analysis on the system outage probability of the two proposed protocols for the multiuser transmission system. Moreover, the effects of the source transmition power and relay position on the system outage performance will be discussed, based on which the optimal values of ρ and α are numerically obtained.

Unless specifically stated, we set $R_t = 1$ bit/sec/Hz, $\eta = 1$, $P_1 = P_2 = P_s$, and m = 4 (which corresponds to the urban areas and is widely adopted in literatures [27, 29]). Both $d_{s,1}$ and $d_{s,2}$ are normalized to 1. For simplicity, we set $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha$. The distance between D₁ and D₂ is normalized to 1, and R is placed on the height of the triangle composed of S, D₁, and D₂, as illustrated in Figure 4.

5.1. Verification of the Analytical Outage Probability. In this subsection, simulation results are obtained through the Monte Carlo simulation using (12) and (21) to check the accuracy of our analytical expressions for the outage probability in Theorems 1 and 2. As shown in Figure 5, the simulation results closely match with the analytical results for all ρ of the TSCMT protocol, and for all α of the PSCMT protocol, which verifies the analytical expressions for the outage probability of the two proposed protocols.

It can also be obtained that, for the same transmition power P_s at S, the PSCMT protocol outperforms the TSCMT protocol in terms of optimal outage probability.



FIGURE 4: Illustration of the relay position.



FIGURE 5: Outage probability: numerical versus simulation. Other parameter: $d_{sr} = 0.5$.

5.2. Effect of Source Power on Outage Probability. Figure 6(a) shows the optimal outage probability against $10 \log_{10} P_s$ (because the variances of the noise at all terminals are normalized to 1, $10 \log_{10} P_s$ actually denotes the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR)) of the two proposed protocols. We also compare the outage probability of the traditional noncooperative scheme to the two proposed protocols. It can be seen that the two proposed protocols are better than the traditional noncooperative scheme to obtain lower outage probability. Moreover, in higher $10 \log_{10} P_s$ region, as $10 \log_{10} P_s$ increases, the outage probability of the TSCMT protocol and the PSCMT protocol decreases faster than the noncooperative scheme. Besides, for the same $10 \log_{10} P_s$, the PSCMT protocol outperforms the TSCMT protocol in terms of system outage probability in the whole $10 \log_{10} P_s$ region.

Figure 6(b) shows the optimal α (for the PSCMT protocol) and ρ (for the TSCMT protocol) versus $10 \log_{10} P_s$. As shown in Figure 6(b), the optimal α increases as $10 \log_{10} P_s$ increases. This is due to the fact that when the SNR is higher, the relay needs less power to process information; thus more energy is left to be harvested.

5.3. Effect of Relay Location on Outage Probability. Figure 7(a) shows the optimal outage probability versus $d_{s,r}$. As shown in Figure 7(a), the optimal outage probability increases as $d_{s,r}$ increases, which indicates that, to obtain lower outage probability, it is better to choose the relay near the source. For the relay with a particular $d_{s,r}$, the PSCMT protocol can always achieve lower system outage probability than the TSCMT protocol.

Figure 7(b) shows the optimal α (for the PSCMT protocol) and ρ (for the TSCMT protocol) versus $d_{s,r}$. It can be observed that the optimal α and ρ decrease as $d_{s,r}$ increases. This is due to the fact that when the relay is far away from the source, it needs more power to correctly receive the information form the source, which makes less energy left to be harvested.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we investigated the multiuser transmission network with an EH cooperative relay. By adopting the time switching and the power splitting relay receiver architectures, we first proposed two cooperative protocols for the multiuser transmission system: the TSCMT protocol and the PSCMT protocol. Then, for each proposed protocol, we derived the explicit expression for the system outage probability. Moreover, we also discussed the effects of various system parameters, such as the source's transmition power and the relay location on the system outage performance. Numerical results showed that our proposed protocols achieve lower system outage probability without consuming additional energy compared with traditional noncooperative scheme. Besides, for the same transmition power at the source, the PSCMT protocol is superior to the TSCMT protocol to obtain lower system outage probability.

Appendix

This appendix derives the $P_{out}^{(TS)}$ in (13) for the TSCMT protocol.

By denoting $|h_{r,1}|^2$ and $|h_{s,r}|^2$ as *X* and *Y*, we define the variable $Z = aXY/(bX + c) = \gamma_1$. We can see that *Z* is a combination of two independent random variables. Using the basic knowledge of the probability theory, we can obtain the cumulative density function (CDF) $F_Z(z)$ of *Z* which is given by

$$F_{Z}(z) = 1 - \frac{\exp\left(-zb/a\Omega_{s,r}\right)}{\Omega_{r,1}}\sqrt{\frac{4zc\Omega_{r,1}}{a\Omega_{s,r}}}K_{1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{4zc}{a\Omega_{r,1}\Omega_{s,r}}}\right),$$
(A.1)

where $K_1(\cdot)$ denotes the first-order modified Bessel function of the second kind [30].



FIGURE 6: (a) Optimal system outage probability against $10 \log_{10} P_s$, (b) optimal α or ρ against $10 \log_{10} P_s$.



FIGURE 7: (a) Optimal system outage probability against $d_{s,r}$, (b) optimal α or ρ against $d_{s,r}$.

Since γ_0 is an exponentially distributed random variable with mean $P_1\Omega_{s,1}$, $P_{out}^{(TS)}$ can be rewritten as follows:

$$P_{\text{out}}^{(\text{TS})} = \Pr\left(\gamma_{0} + \gamma_{1} < R_{0}\right)$$

= $\int_{0}^{R_{0}} \Pr\left[Z < R_{0} - \tau\right] f_{\gamma_{0}}(\tau) d\tau$ (A.2)
= $\int_{0}^{R_{0}} F_{Z}(R_{0} - \tau) \frac{1}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}}\right) d\tau.$

The integral in (A.2) cannot be directly calculated due to the $K_1(\cdot)$ in (A.1). By applying the series expansion of $K_1(\cdot)$ which is given in (A.3), we can rewrite $P_{\text{out}}^{(\text{TS})}$ in (A.4) as follows:

$$K_{1}(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{(x/2)^{2l+1}}{l! (l+1)!} \left(\ln \frac{x}{2} + \mathscr{C} \right)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{(x/2)^{2l+1}}{l! (l+1)!} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{l} \frac{1}{k} + \sum_{k=1}^{l+1} \frac{1}{k} \right) + \frac{1}{x},$$
(A.3)

$$\begin{split} P_{\text{out}}^{(\text{TS})} &= \frac{1}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} \\ &\quad \cdot \left\{ \int_{0}^{R_{0}} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}}\right) d\tau \\ &\quad -\int_{0}^{R_{0}} \frac{\exp\left(-\left(R_{0}-\tau\right)b/a\Omega_{s,r}\right)}{\Omega_{r,1}} \\ &\quad \cdot \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(R_{0}-\tau\right)^{l+1}\Omega_{r,1}c^{l+1}}{\left(a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}\right)^{l+1}l!\left(l+1\right)!} \\ &\quad \times \left(\ln \frac{\left(R_{0}-\tau\right)c}{a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}} + 2\mathscr{C} - \sum_{k=1}^{l} \frac{1}{k} - \sum_{k=1}^{l+1} \frac{1}{k} \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}}\right) d\tau \\ &\quad -\int_{0}^{R_{0}} \frac{\exp\left(-\left(R_{0}-\tau\right)b/a\Omega_{s,r}\right)\left(R_{0}-\tau\right)}{a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\ln \frac{\left(R_{0}-\tau\right)c}{a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}} + 2\mathscr{C} \right) \\ &\quad \times \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}}\right) d\tau \\ &\quad -\int_{0}^{R_{0}} \exp\left(\frac{\left(\tau-R_{0}\right)b}{a\Omega_{s,r}}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}}\right) d\tau \right\}. \end{aligned}$$
(A.4)

By denoting the four integral items in the right-hand side of the above equation as Q_1 , Q_2 , Q_3 , and Q_4 respectively, we can obtain that

$$Q_{1} = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{R_{0}}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}}\right), \qquad (A.5)$$

$$Q_{2} = -\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{\exp\left(-R_{0}b/a\Omega_{s,r}\right)c^{l+1}}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}\left(a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}\right)^{l+1}l!\left(l+1\right)!} \\ \times \int_{0}^{R_{0}} \exp\left(-\frac{\left(a\Omega_{s,r}-bP_{1}\Omega_{s,1}\right)\tau}{aP_{1}\Omega_{s,1}\Omega_{s,r}}\right)\left(R_{0}-\tau\right)^{l+1} \\ \times \left\{\left(\ln\frac{c}{a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}}+2\mathscr{C}-\sum_{k=1}^{l}\frac{1}{k}-\sum_{k=1}^{l+1}\frac{1}{k}\right) \\ +\ln\left(R_{0}-\tau\right)\right\}d\tau \\ = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{\exp\left(-R_{0}b/a\Omega_{s,r}\right)c^{l+1}}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}\left(a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}\right)^{l+1}l!\left(l+1\right)!}$$

Mathematical Problems in Engineering

$$\times \left\{ \left(\ln \frac{c}{a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}} + 2\mathscr{C} - \sum_{k=1}^{l} \frac{1}{k} - \sum_{k=1}^{l+1} \frac{1}{k} \right) \right. \\ \left. \times \left(\frac{1}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} - \frac{b}{a\Omega_{s,r}} \right)^{-l-2} \right. \\ \left. \cdot \gamma \left(l+2, \frac{R_{0}}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} - \frac{bR_{0}}{a\Omega_{s,r}} \right) \right. \\ \left. + \int_{0}^{R_{0}} \exp\left(\frac{\left(bP_{1}\Omega_{s,1} - a\Omega_{s,r} \right)\tau}{aP_{1}\Omega_{s,1}\Omega_{s,r}} \right) \tau^{l+1} \ln \tau \, d\tau \right\},$$

$$(A.6)$$

where $\gamma(\cdot)$ denotes the incomplete gamma function. Q_3 can be rewritten as

$$Q_{3} = \frac{\exp\left(-R_{0}/P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}\right)c}{a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} \\ \cdot \left\{ \left(\ln\frac{c}{a\Omega_{s,r}\Omega_{r,1}} + 2\mathscr{C}\right)\left(\frac{1}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} - \frac{b}{a\Omega_{s,r}}\right)^{-2} \right. \\ \left. \times \gamma\left(2, \frac{R_{0}}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} - \frac{bR_{0}}{a\Omega_{s,r}}\right) \right. \\ \left. + \int_{0}^{R_{0}} \exp\left(\frac{\left(bP_{1}\Omega_{s,1} - a\Omega_{s,r}\right)\tau}{aP_{1}\Omega_{s,1}\Omega_{s,r}}\right)\tau \ln\tau d\tau \right\}, \\ Q_{4} = -\frac{a\Omega_{s,r}}{a\Omega_{s,r} - bP_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} \\ \left. \times \left(\exp\left(\frac{R_{0}}{P_{1}\Omega_{s,1}} - \frac{2R_{0}b}{a\Omega_{s,r}}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{R_{0}b}{a\Omega_{s,r}}\right)\right).$$
(A.7)

Substituting (A.5), (A.6), and (A.7) into (A.4), one can obtain the final expression of $P_{out}^{(TS)}$, which is given in (13). This ends the proof for Theorem 1.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (no. 2014JBM024).

References

- V. Raghunathan, S. Ganeriwal, and M. Srivastava, "Emerging techniques for long lived wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 108–114, 2006.
- [2] J. A. Paradiso and T. Starner, "Energy scavenging for mobile and wireless electronics," *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 18–27, 2005.

- [3] B. Medepally and N. B. Mehta, "Voluntary energy harvesting relays and selection in cooperative wireless networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 9, no. 11, pp. 3543–3553, 2010.
- [4] K. Vijayaraghavan and R. Rajamani, "Novel batteryless wireless sensor for traffic-flow measurement," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 59, no. 7, pp. 3249–3260, 2010.
- [5] A. A. Nasir, X. Zhou, S. Durrani, and R. A. Kennedy, "Wireless-powered relays in cooperative communications: time-switching relaying protocols and throughput analysis," http://arxiv.org/abs/1310.7648.
- [6] L. R. Varshney, "Transporting information and energy simultaneously," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT '08)*, pp. 1612–1616, Toronto, Canada, July 2008.
- [7] X. Zhou, R. Zhang, and C. K. Ho, "Wireless information and power transfer: architecture design and rate-energy tradeoff," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 61, no. 11, pp. 4754– 4761, 2013.
- [8] A. A. Nasir, X. Zhou, S. Durrani, and R. A. Kennedy, "Relaying protocols for wireless energy harvesting and information processing," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 12, no. 7, pp. 3622–3636, 2013.
- [9] A. A. Nasir, X. Zhou, S. Durrani, and R. A. Kennedy, "Throughput and ergodic capacity of wireless energy harvesting based DF relaying network," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC '14)*, pp. 4066–4071, Sydney, Australia, June 2014.
- [10] K. Xiong, P. Y. Fan, C. Zhang, and K. B. Letaief, "Wireless information and energy transfer for two-hop non-regenerative MIMO-OFDM relay networks," IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.8305.
- [11] G. Du, K. Xiong, Y. Zhang, and Z. Qiu, "Outage analysis and optimization for four-phase two-way transmission with energy harvesting relay," *KSII Transactions on Internet and Information Systems*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 3321–3341, 2014.
- [12] G. L. Moritz, J. L. Rebelatto, R. D. Souza, B. F. Uchoa-Filho, and Y. Li, "Time-switching uplink network-coded cooperative communication with downlink energy transfer," *IEEE Transactions* on Signal Processing, vol. 62, no. 19, pp. 5009–5019, 2014.
- [13] Z. Ding and H. V. Poor, "Cooperative energy harvesting networks with spatially random users," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 20, no. 12, pp. 1211–1214, 2013.
- [14] Z. Ding, S. M. Perlaza, I. Esnaola, and H. V. Poor, "Power allocation strategies in energy harvesting wireless cooperative networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 846–860, 2014.
- [15] J. N. Laneman, D. N. C. Tse, and G. W. Wornell, "Cooperative diversity in wireless networks: efficient protocols and outage behavior," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3062–3080, 2004.
- [16] H. Wang, P. Fan, and K. B. Letaief, "Maximum flow and network capacity of network coding for ad-hoc networks," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 6, no. 12, pp. 4193–4198, 2007.
- [17] K. Xiong, P. Fan, Z. Xu, H.-C. Yang, and K. B. Letaief, "Optimal cooperative beamforming design for MIMO decode-andforward relay channels," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 1476–1489, 2014.
- [18] P. Li, S. Guo, Z. Cheng, and A. V. Vasilakos, "Joint relay assignment and channel allocation for energy-efficient cooperative

communications," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC '13)*, pp. 626–630, April 2013.

- [19] P. Li, S. Guo, W. Zhuang, and B. Ye, "Max-min lifetime optimization for cooperative communications in multi-channel wireless networks," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 1533–1542, 2014.
- [20] J. Park and B. J. Jeong, "Energy-efficient adaptive virtual MIMO transmission in a transmit-side correlated wireless sensor network," *IEICE Transactions on Communications*, vol. E96.B, no. 4, pp. 976–985, 2013.
- [21] K. Xiong, Z. Chen, P. Fan, K. Ben Letaief, S. Yi, and M. Lei, "NC²R: network coding-aware cooperative relaying for downlink cellular networks," in *Proceedings of the 54th Annual IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference (GLOBECOM '11)*, pp. 1–5, Houston, Tex, USA, December 2011.
- [22] Y. Zou, J. Zhu, and B. Zheng, "A fully distributed opportunistic network coding scheme for cellular relay networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC '13)*, pp. 2937–2942, April 2013.
- [23] K. Xiong, T. Li, P. Y. Fan, Z. Zhong, and K. Ben Letaief, "Outage probability of space-time network coding with amplify-andforward relays," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM '13)*, pp. 3571–3576, Atlanta, Ga, USA, December 2013.
- [24] K. Xiong, P. Y. Fan, H. C. Yang, and K. B. Letaief, "Space-time network coding with overhearing relays," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 3567–3582, 2014.
- [25] K. Xiong, T. Li, P. Y. Fan, and K. B. Letaief, "Outage probability ofspace-time network coding over Rayleigh fading channels," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 1965–1970, 2014.
- [26] Y. Ma, W. Li, P. Fan, and X. Liu, "Queuing model and delay analysis on network coding," in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Communications and Information Technologies* (ISCIT '05), pp. 112–115, October 2005.
- [27] M. Ju and I.-M. Kim, "Relay selection with ANC and TDBC protocols in bidirectional relay networks," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 3500–3511, 2010.
- [28] Z. Chen, B. Wang, B. Xia, and H. Liu, "Wireless information and power transfer in two-way amplify-and-forward relaying channels," to appear in *Proceedings of the IEEE GlobalSIP*.
- [29] T. S. Rappaport, Wireless Communications: Principle and Practice, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 2002.
- [30] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, Academic Press, 4th edition, 1980.



The Scientific World Journal





Decision Sciences







Journal of Probability and Statistics



Hindawi Submit your manuscripts at





International Journal of Differential Equations





International Journal of Combinatorics





Mathematical Problems in Engineering



Abstract and Applied Analysis



Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society







Journal of Function Spaces



International Journal of Stochastic Analysis



Journal of Optimization