

MAB Learning in IoT Networks

Learning helps even in non-stationary settings!

Lilian Besson Rémi Bonnefoi
Émilie Kaufmann Christophe Moy Jacques Palicot

PhD Student in France
Team SCEE, IETR, CentraleSupélec, Rennes
& Team SequeL, CRIStAL, Inria, Lille

GdR ISIS - 17 novembre 2017



We want

A *lot* of IoT devices want to access to a gateway of base station.

- Insert them in a **crowded wireless network**.
- With a protocol **slotted in time and frequency**.
- Each device has a **low duty cycle** (a few messages per day).

We want

A *lot* of IoT devices want to access to a gateway of base station.

- Insert them in a **crowded wireless network**.
- With a protocol **slotted in time and frequency**.
- Each device has a **low duty cycle** (a few messages per day).

Goal

- Maintain a **good Quality of Service**.
- **Without** centralized supervision!

We want

A *lot* of IoT devices want to access to a gateway of base station.

- Insert them in a **crowded wireless network**.
- With a protocol **slotted in time and frequency**.
- Each device has a **low duty cycle** (a few messages per day).

Goal

- Maintain a **good Quality of Service**.
- **Without** centralized supervision!

How?

- Use **learning algorithms**: devices will learn on which frequency they should talk!

Outline

- 1 Introduction and motivation
- 2 Model and hypotheses
- 3 Baseline algorithms : to compare against naive and efficient centralized approaches
- 4 Two Multi-Armed Bandit algorithms : UCB, Thompson sampling
- 5 Experimental results
- 6 Perspectives and future works
- 7 Conclusion

Model

- Discrete time $t \geq 1$ and N_c radio channels (e.g., 10) (*known*)




Figure 1: Protocol in time and frequency, with an *Acknowledgement*.

- D **dynamic** devices try to access the network *independently*
- $S = S_1 + \dots + S_{N_c}$ **static** devices occupy the network :
 S_1, \dots, S_{N_c} in each channel (*unknown*).

Hypotheses I

Emission model

- Each device has the same *low* emission probability: each step, each device sends a packet with probability p . (this gives a duty cycle proportional to $1/p$)

Background traffic

- Each static device uses only one channel.
- Their repartition is fixed in time.

⇒ *Background traffic, bothering the dynamic devices!*

Hypotheses II

Dynamic radio reconfiguration

- Each **dynamic device decides the channel it uses to send every packet.**
- It has memory and computational capacity to implement basic decision algorithm.

Problem

- *Goal : maximize packet loss ratio (= number of received Ack) in a finite-space discrete-time Decision Making Problem.*
- *Solution ? **Multi-Armed Bandit algorithms, decentralized and used independently** by each device.*

A naive strategy : uniformly random access

- **Uniformly random access:** dynamic devices choose uniformly their channel in the pull of N_c channels.
- Natural strategy, dead simple to implement.

A naive strategy : uniformly random access

- **Uniformly random access:** dynamic devices choose uniformly their channel in the pull of N_c channels.
- Natural strategy, dead simple to implement.
- Simple analysis, in term of **successful transmission probability** (for every message from dynamic devices) :

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{success}|\text{sent}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} \underbrace{(1 - p/N_c)^{D-1}}_{\text{No other dynamic device}} \times \underbrace{(1 - p)^{S_i}}_{\text{No static device}} \times \frac{1}{N_c}.$$

A naive strategy : uniformly random access

- **Uniformly random access:** dynamic devices choose uniformly their channel in the pull of N_c channels.
- Natural strategy, dead simple to implement.
- Simple analysis, in term of **successful transmission probability** (for every message from dynamic devices) :

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{success}|\text{sent}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} \underbrace{(1 - p/N_c)^{D-1}}_{\text{No other dynamic device}} \times \underbrace{(1 - p)^{S_i}}_{\text{No static device}} \times \frac{1}{N_c}.$$

- Works fine only if all channels are similarly occupied, but **it cannot learn** to exploit the best (more free) channels.

Optimal centralized strategy I

- If an oracle can decide to affect D_i dynamic devices to channel i , the **successful transmission probability** is:

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{success}|\text{sent}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} \underbrace{(1-p)^{D_i-1}}_{D_i-1 \text{ others}} \times \underbrace{(1-p)^{S_i}}_{\text{No static device}} \times \underbrace{D_i/D}_{\text{Sent in channel } i}.$$

- The oracle has to solve this **optimization problem**:

$$\begin{cases} \arg \max_{D_1, \dots, D_{N_c}} & \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} D_i (1-p)^{S_i + D_i - 1} \\ \text{such that} & \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} D_i = D \text{ and } D_i \geq 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq N_c. \end{cases}$$

- We solved this quasi-convex optimization problem with *Lagrange multipliers*, only numerically.

Optimal centralized strategy II

- \implies Very good performance, maximizing the transmission rate of all the D dynamic devices

But unrealistic

But **not achievable in practice**: no centralized oracle!

Let see *realistic decentralized approaches*

\hookrightarrow Machine Learning ?

\hookrightarrow Reinforcement Learning ?

\hookrightarrow *Multi-Armed Bandit !*

Multi-Armed Bandit formulation

A dynamic device tries to collect *rewards* when transmitting :

- it transmits following a Bernoulli process (probability p of transmitting at each time step τ),
- chooses a channel $A(\tau) \in \{1, \dots, N_c\}$,
- if Ack (no collision) \implies reward $r_{A(\tau)} = 1$,
- if collision (no Ack) \implies reward $r_{A(\tau)} = 0$.

Multi-Armed Bandit formulation

A dynamic device tries to collect *rewards* when transmitting :

- it transmits following a Bernoulli process (probability p of transmitting at each time step τ),
- chooses a channel $A(\tau) \in \{1, \dots, N_c\}$,
- if Ack (no collision) \implies reward $r_{A(\tau)} = 1$,
- if collision (no Ack) \implies reward $r_{A(\tau)} = 0$.

Reinforcement Learning interpretation

Maximize transmission rate \equiv **maximize cumulated rewards**

$$\max_{\text{algorithm } A} \sum_{\tau=1}^{\text{horizon}} r_{A(\tau)}.$$

Upper Confidence Bound algorithm (UCB₁)

A dynamic device keeps τ number of sent packets, $T_k(t)$ selections of channel k , $X_k(t)$ successful transmission in channel k .

- ① For the first N_c steps ($\tau = 1, \dots, N_c$), try each channel *once*.
- ② Then for the next steps $t \geq N_c$:

- Compute the index $g_k(\tau) := \underbrace{\frac{X_k(\tau)}{N_k(\tau)}}_{\text{Mean } \hat{\mu}_k(\tau)} + \underbrace{\sqrt{\frac{\log(\tau)}{2N_k(\tau)}}}_{\text{Upper Confidence Bound}}$,
- Choose channel $A(\tau) = \arg \max_k g_k(\tau)$,
- Update $T_k(\tau + 1)$ and $X_k(\tau + 1)$.

References: [Lai & Robbins, 1985], [Auer et al, 2002], [Bubeck & Cesa-Bianchi, 2012]

Experimental setting

Simulation parameters

- $N_c = 10$ channels,
- $S + D = 10000$ devices in total,
- $p = 10^{-3}$ probability of emission,
- horizon = 10^5 time slots ($\simeq 100$ messages / device),
- The proportion of dynamic devices $D/(S + D)$ varies,
- Various settings for (S_1, \dots, S_{N_c}) static devices repartition.

What do we show

- After a short learning time, MAB algorithms are almost as efficient as the oracle solution.
- Never worse than the naive solution.
- Thompson sampling is even more efficient than UCB.

10% of dynamic devices




Figure 2: 10% of dynamic devices. 7% of gain.

30% of dynamic devices




Figure 3: 30% of dynamic devices. 3% of gain but not much is possible.

Dependence on $D/(S + D)$




Figure 4: *Almost optimal, for any proportion of dynamic devices, after a short learning time. Up-to 16% gain over the naive approach!*

Perspectives

Theoretical results

- MAB algorithms have performance guarantees for *stochastic settings*,
- But here the collisions cancel the *i.i.d.* hypothesis,
- Not easy to obtain guarantees in this mixed setting (*i.i.d.* emission process, game theoretic collisions).

Perspectives

Theoretical results

- MAB algorithms have performance guarantees for *stochastic settings*,
- But here the collisions cancel the *i.i.d.* hypothesis,
- Not easy to obtain guarantees in this mixed setting (*i.i.d.* emission process, game theoretic collisions).

Real-world experimental validation ?

- Real-world radio experiments will help to validate this.

In progress...

Other direction of future work

- *More realistic emission model*: maybe driven by number of packets in a whole day, instead of emission probability.
- Validate this on a *larger experimental scale*.

Conclusion

We showed numerically...

- After a learning period, MAB algorithms are as efficient as we could expect.
- Never worse than the naive solution.
- Thompson sampling is even more efficient than UCB.
- Simple algorithms are up-to 16% more efficient than the naive approach, and straightforward to apply.

But more work is still needed...

- **Theoretical guarantees** are still missing.
- Maybe study **other emission models**.
- And also implement this on **real-world radio devices**.

Thanks! *Question?*

Thompson Sampling : Bayesian approach

A dynamic device assumes a stochastic hypothesis on the background traffic, modeled as Bernoulli distributions.

- Rewards $r_k(\tau)$ are assumed to be *i.i.d.* samples from a Bernoulli distribution $\text{Bern}(\mu_k)$.
 - A **binomial Bayesian posterior** is kept on the mean availability $\mu_k : \text{Bin}(1 + X_k(\tau), 1 + N_k(\tau) - X_k(\tau))$.
 - Starts with a *uniform prior* : $\text{Bin}(1, 1) \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$.
- ① Each step $\tau \geq 1$, a sample is drawn from each posterior $i_k(t) \sim \text{Bin}(a_k(\tau), b_k(\tau))$,
 - ② Choose channel $A(\tau) = \arg \max_k i_k(\tau)$,
 - ③ Update the posterior after receiving Ack or if collision.