# Energy-Efficient Downlink Resource Scheduling for LTE-A Networks with Carrier Aggregation

You-Chiun Wang and Hung-Yi Ko

**Abstract**—To tackle the dilemma of supporting broadband, high-speed wireless access or well utilizing narrow, non-contiguous spectral resource, *Long Term Evolution-Advanced (LTE-A)* employs carrier aggregation. It combines different component carriers to send data to users in high rates. Many LTE-A downlink resource scheduling methods seek to assign component carriers or resource blocks to improve throughput or maintain fairness. However, how to save energy spent on communication has not been well studied. Thus, the paper formulates a *minimum-energy LTE-A downlink resource scheduling (MARS)* problem by using carrier aggregation to allocate resource to users, such that network throughput is improved while energy consumption is reduced. We show that the MARS problem is NP-hard and propose an efficient heuristic by considering data backlog, channel condition, and energy expense of users. Experimental results verify that our heuristic can increase system performance, conserve energy of user equipment, and reduce transmission power emitted from the base station.

**Index Terms**—4G system, carrier aggregation, energy saving, LTE-A, resource scheduling.

## 1 Introduction

Due to the popularization of mobile devices, there has been a growing demand for wireless broadband service like video streaming and teleconference. Thus, ITU (International Telecommunication Union) regulates IMT-A (International Mobile Telecommunications-Advanced) for 4G systems, which provides 1Gbps and 500Mbps peak rates for downlink and uplink transmission, respectively. To meet IMT-A requirement, 3GPP (3rd Generation Partnership Project) defines *Long Term Evolution-Advanced (LTE-A)*, which specifies the support for up to 100MHz channel bandwidth [1].

However, many frequency bands in the microwave spectrum have been dedicated to 2G/3G systems. It is not easy to find large, contiguous bands to meet IMT-A. To overcome the difficulty, LTE-A uses *carrier aggregation* to integrate multiple frequency segments (called *component carriers, CCs*). For example, LTE-A allows a base station (called *eNB*) to combine five 20MHz CCs to obtain 100MHz bandwidth. This technique is backward compatible with old LTE *user equipments (UEs)*. Besides, the eNB can aggregate CCs located in different bands to improve the spectrum's utilization.

Carrier aggregation improves LTE-A performance, but how to efficiently schedule downlink resource is a challenge. Most LTE-A resource scheduling methods can be classified into two categories [2]: *CC selection* and *resource block (RB) assignment*. CC selection methods allocate downlink CCs to UEs to send data, while RB assignment methods deal out RBs (i.e., the substantiation of time-frequency resource in CCs) to UEs in a *transmission time interval (TTI)*. Many methods seek to improve throughput by increasing channel quality of UEs or balancing loads among CCs. However, how to save energy spent on communication is rarely discussed. Due to carrier aggregation, UEs will consume more energy on hearing multiple CCs. Besides, to improve channel quality, the eNB has to emit higher transmission power on CCs, causing a waste of energy.

*The authors are with the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, 80424, Taiwan.*
*E-mail: ycwang@cse.nsysu.edu.tw; m013040023@student.nsysu.edu.tw*

By the above motivation, we propose a *minimum-energy LTE-A downlink resource scheduling (MARS)* problem. Given traffic demands of UEs and the eNB's maximum power $P_{\max}$, it asks how to assign downlink RBs to UEs such that 1) network throughput is maximized, 2) energy consumption of UEs is minimized, and 3) the eNB's transmission power is reduced. We show that MARS is NP-hard and develop an efficient heuristic. The idea is to let the eNB find the best *modulation and coding scheme (MCS)* for each (CC, UE) pair under $P_{\max}$ constraint. It then iteratively selects a CC to meet the demand of each UE and allocates RBs accordingly. However, unlike most methods where the 'best' CC is always given to the selected UE, the eNB should consider whether other UEs also prefer this CC. We thus define an *eagerness degree* to help the eNB select the proper CC, so as to help conserve UEs' energy. Finally, our heuristic adaptively adjusts the power on CCs to save the eNB's energy and reduce the interference to other cells.

Our contributions are threefold. First, we propose a MARS problem that considers throughput and energy consumption in LTE-A. Second, we prove that the MARS problem is NP-hard and develop an energy-efficient heuristic. Third, our heuristic maneuvers resource allocation based on traffic loads and noise levels of UEs. Simulation results show that our heuristic improves network throughput and saves energy of UEs and the eNB, as compared with both max-CQI and *proportional fair (PF)* methods.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 surveys LTE-A and related work. Section 3 defines the MARS problem. Sections 4 and 5 propose and discuss our heuristic. Experimental results are given in Section 6. A conclusion is drawn in Section 7.

## 2 Preliminary

### 2.1 Downlink Spectral Resource in LTE-A

LTE-A proposes the 'frame-based' downlink transmission by using OFDMA (orthogonal frequency division multiple access). The length of a downlink frame is 10ms, which is divided

TABLE 1: MCSs and bits carried by an RB under different CQI values [3].

| CQI | MCS | bits per RB | CQI | MCS | bits per RB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | QPSK | 12.79 | 9 | 16QAM | 202.13 |
| 2 | QPSK | 19.69 | 10 | 64QAM | 229.36 |
| 3 | QPSK | 31.67 | 11 | 64QAM | 279.07 |
| 4 | QPSK | 50.53 | 12 | 64QAM | 327.79 |
| 5 | QPSK | 73.67 | 13 | 64QAM | 379.97 |
| 6 | QPSK | 98.77 | 14 | 64QAM | 429.68 |
| 7 | 16QAM | 124.03 | 15 | 64QAM | 466.59 |
| 8 | 16QAM | 160.78 | | | |

QPSK: Quadrature phase shift keying
QAM: Quadrature amplitude modulation

into 10 subframes (also known as TTIs). Each subframe is composed of 2 slots. Thus, a slot has the length of 0.5ms, which contains 6 or 7 OFDM symbols. In LTE-A, RB is the unit for resource allocation, which occupies 1 slot and 12 consecutive subcarriers (in the same CC), where a subcarrier has 15kHz bandwidth. With different MCSs, each RB carries different number of data bits, as presented in Table 1. This determines the transmission speed for a UE using that RB.

To select MCS, the eNB emits a downlink reference signal for UEs to measure channel condition. A UE computes the *channel quality indicator (CQI)* such that it corresponds to the best MCS. Based on LTE-A specification [3], this MCS should allow the UE to decode data with *block error rate (BLER)* $\leq$ 10%. The UE then feeds back its CQI, which indicates the channel quality and receiver capability. Through CQI, the eNB can choose MCS and its code rate along with efficiency for that UE. These factors together determine the number of data bits carried by one RB for the UE (shown in Table 1).

To support backward-compatibility for LTE Release 8/9 UEs, LTE-A employs the same range of CC bandwidths. Each CC can have the bandwidth of 1.4, 3, 5, 10, 15, and 20MHz, which support 12, 30, 50, 100, 150, and 200 RBs in a TTI, respectively. LTE-A Release 10 [4] proposes both *intra-band* and *inter-band* carrier aggregation, where the eNB combines different CCs from the *same* and *different* frequency bands, respectively. Aggregating multiple CCs for data transmission improves efficiency. However, it also consumes more energy of a UE, because multiple *radio frequency (RF)* chains and *fast Fourier transform (FFT)* modules are required to hear different, non-contiguous CCs [5]. This motivates us to propose the MARS problem which considers not only carefully assigning CCs to each UE (to save its energy), but also reducing the transmission power on each CC (to save the eNB's energy and reduce interference).

### 2.2 Survey of CC Selection Methods

Based on [2], there are three common categories of 'static' CC assignment. Random selection methods [6], [7] arbitrarily choose available CCs for UEs to provide a balanced load among CCs in the long term. Circular selection methods [8], [9] assign CCs to UEs in a round-robin manner, which supports higher throughput than random selection methods. Least load methods [9], [10] always select the CC with the lowest traffic load to transmit data, so as to balance CCs' loads. However, they do not consider channel quality of CCs and traffic demands of UEs, which may degrade system performance.

Some studies consider 'dynamically' assigning CCs based on channel condition of UEs. Liu et al. [11] adaptively add/remove the secondary CC of a UE by its signal quality. Wang et al. [12] use a geometry factor to find cell-edge UEs, and assign low- frequency CCs (with better coverage) to improve their throughput. In [13], the CCs with similar channel quality are grouped together to improve spectrum utilization. A utility-based CC selection method is then proposed by taking channel quality and load balance into account. Li et al. [14] deal with CC selection by a micro-economic model, where the data rate of each CC is treated as a sale item, and UE's experience is viewed as a profit. Then, CCs are graded by the states of utilization with the goal of maximizing the total profit. However, these studies do not address the energy issue in LTE-A.

### 2.3 Survey of RB Assignment Methods

Several studies develop RB assignment strategies for LTE without carrier aggregation. In [15], RB assignment is formulated by an optimization problem whose goal is to keep UEs' fairness. Both [16] and [17] then use greedy-based and meta-heuristic methods to get suboptimal solutions to the problem, respectively. Wang et al. [18] assign RBs to different flows based on their channel quality, packet delay, and buffer length, which supports QoS (quality of service) for real-time service. Obviously, our MARS heuristic considers carrier aggregation, which distinguishes this paper from the above studies.

RB assignment with carrier aggregation has also been discussed. Motivating from PF scheduling [19], both [7], [20] seek to distribute downlink RBs to improve throughput and keep fairness. They give a higher priority to the UEs that currently have fast data rates or encounter slow data rates in the past. However, [7], [20] do not dynamically change the CCs assigned to each UE based on its channel quality. Cheng et al. [21] propose a backlog-based scheduling method to assign downlink resource to UEs, where backlog indicates the amount of unsatisfied demand of a UE. UEs with longer queue lengths or larger packet delays are given with a higher priority to select CCs, in order to achieve load balance and better throughput. Liao et al. [22] formulate an RB assignment problem with the MCS constraint, where a UE can use only one MCS for all its assigned RBs in each TTI. Then, a PF-based method is developed to improve network throughput while keeping fairness among UEs. Apparently, none of these work addresses energy consumption in LTE-A. On the contrary, our work targets at how to select CCs and adjust their transmission power, so as to conserve the energy spent on communication.

## 3 Problem Definition

We consider an LTE-A cell coordinated by one eNB, whose maximum transmission power is $P_{\max}$. A set of UEs $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, u_2, \cdots, u_m\}$ reside in the cell and ask for spectral resource, where $u_i \in \mathcal{U}$ has downlink data demand of $d_i$. Suppose that LTE-A spectrum is divided into a set of CCs $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_n\}$. The eNB can adjust its transmission power $p_j$ on each CC $c_j \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, it should always satisfy the power constraint below:

$$\sum_{c_j \in \mathcal{C}} p_j \leq P_{\max}. \quad (1)$$

Depending on the channel bandwidth, each CC $c_j \in \mathcal{C}$ supports $r_j$ RBs in a TTI. The carrier aggregation technique allows a UE to use the RBs located in different CCs. However, each UE is able to use up to $\delta$ CCs in one TTI (e.g., $\delta = 5$ in LTE-A Release 10).

Let $b(j,k,l(i,j))$ be the number of data bits carried by an RB $\beta_k$ in CC $c_j$ under MCS $l(i,j)$ for a UE $u_i$. We define an indicator $I(i,j,k)$ to check whether RB $\beta_k$ in CC $c_j$ is allocated to UE $u_i$. Specifically, $I(i,j,k)=1$ if so; $I(i,j,k)=0$ otherwise. Then, our MARS problem asks how to select CCs and allocate their RBs to UEs, determines the MCS levels used by CCs, and adjusts the transmission power on each CC such that

$$\max \sum_{u_i \in \mathcal{U}} \min \left\{ \sum_{j,k} [b(j,k,l(i,j)) \times I(i,j,k)], d_i \times t \right\}, \quad (2)$$

$$\min \sum_{u_i \in \mathcal{U}} P_{u_i}, \quad (3)$$

$$\min \sum_{c_j \in \mathcal{C}} p_j. \quad (4)$$

under constraint (1), where $t$ is the length of a TTI, and $P_{u_i}$ is the total power of UE $u_i$ to receive data from its assigned CCs. Here, Eq. (2) wants to maximize the number of data bits transmitted. However, the eNB may allocate more resource than UE ui needs (i.e., $\sum_{j,k}[b(j,k,l(i,j)) \times I(i,j,k)], d_i \times t$). In this case, we count the amount of data received by ui (i.e., $d_i \times t$). Then, Eq. (3) seeks to reduce the amount of energy consumed by all UEs. To find $P_{u_i}$, we employ the power model in [23]. It considers two types of UE receivers: 1) single RF front-end with single wide-band *analog-to-digital converter (ADC)* and dual *base band (BB)* processor, and 2) dual RF with dual narrow ADCs and dual BBs. Type-1 receiver is used only in intra-band contiguous carrier aggregation, where

$$P_{u_i} = P_{RC} + P_{RF}(S_{RC}) + P_{ADC}(B_{RC}) + \sum_{k=1}^{2} [P_{BB_k}(R_{RC_k}) + P_{CW} \times q_{CW,cc_k}]. \quad (5)$$

Here, $P_{RC}$ is the base power consumed by the *receive chain (RC)*, $P_{RF}(S_{RC})$ is the RF's power consumption (depending on power level $S_{RC}$), $P_{ADC}(B_{RC})$ is the ADC's power consumption (depending on bandwidth $B_{RC}$), $P_{BB}(R_{RC})$ is the BB's power consumption (depending on data rate $R_{RC}$), $P_{CW}$ is the power consumption of using two code-words, and $q_{CW}$ is the probability of using two code-words. On the other hand, type-2 receiver can be used in intra-band and inter-band non-contiguous carrier aggregation, where

$$P_{u_i} = 2P_{RC} + \sum_{k=1}^{2} [P_{RF_k}(S_{RC_k}) + P_{ADC_k}(B_{RC_k}) + P_{BB_k}(R_{RC_k}) + P_{CW} \times q_{CW,cc_k}]. \quad (6)$$

Finally, Eq. (4) means to minimize the eNB's transmission power. Theorem 1 proves the NP-hardness of the MARS problem. We also summarize our notations in Table 2.

***Theorem 1.*** The MARS problem is NP-hard.

*Proof:* Following the similar concept in [24], we first define a metric value

$$\alpha(i,j,k,l(i,j)) = \frac{\min\{b(j,k,l(i,j)), d_i \times t\}}{d_i \times t}, \quad (7)$$

for each UE $u_i$ on an RB $\beta_k$ in CC $c_j$ under MCS $l(i,j)$; in other words, the metric value indicates the ratio of $u_i$'s traffic demand satisfied by this RB in the current TTI. Then, we can define one decision version of our MARS problem by $\alpha(i,j,k,l(i,j))$. In particular, it determines whether for a given collection of values $\alpha(i,j,k,l(i,j))$ across all UEs, CCs, RBs, and MCSs, there can exist a resource scheduling solution to meet the constraint that each UE selects only one MCS and result in an aggregate value of $D$.

TABLE 2: Summary of notations.

| notation | definition |
|---|---|
| $d_i$ | traffic demand of UE $u_i$ |
| $q_i$ | current backlog of UE $u_i$ |
| $p_j$ | transmission power allocated to CC $c_j$ |
| $r_j$ | number of available RBs in CC $c_j$ |
| $e(i,j)$ | eagerness of CC $c_j$ for UE $u_i$ |
| $\delta$ | maximum number of CCs that can be aggregated for a UE |
| $P_{\max}$ | maximum transmission power of the eNB |
| $T_m$ | data-rate mapping table |
| $N(u_i,c_j)$ | number of data bits supported by CC $c_j$ for UE $u_i$ |
| $b(j,k,l(i,j))$ | number of data bits carried by an RB $\beta_k$ in CC $c_j$ under MCS $l(i,j)$ |




Fig. 1: An example of reducing the 3-SAT problem to one MARS problem instance.

To prove the NP-hard property of MARS, we employ a well-known NP-complete problem, namely *three-satisfiability (3-SAT)* problem [25]. Given a set of clauses $\{L_1, L_2, \cdots, L_K\}$ based on a set of Boolean variables $X = \{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_m\}$, where each clause contains three variables, 3-SAT asks whether there is a satisfying truth assignment. Here, a clause is a disjunction of three distinct terms (in the format of $T_1 \vee T_2 \vee T_3$, where each term $T_i$ belongs to $\{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_m, \neg x_1, \neg x_2, \cdots, \neg x_m\}$, and the notations '$\vee$' and '$\neg$' represent the 'OR' and 'NOT' operators, respectively). A *truth assignment* for $X$ is an assignment of the value 0 or 1 to every variable $x_i$. We say that an assignment 'satisfies' a set of clauses $L_1, L_2, \cdots, L_K$ if and only if it makes the result of each clause $L_i$ to be 1 according to the rules of Boolean logic. In other words, the result of conjunction $L_1 \wedge L_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge L_K$ must be also 1, where the notation '$\wedge$' represents the 'AND' operator.

We then reduce the 3-SAT problem to a MARS problem instance. Specifically, we are given any instance of 3-SAT that has $m$ variables (i.e., $x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_m$) and $K$ clauses (i.e., $L_1, L_2, \cdots, L_K$). Let us consider an LTE-A network with two MCS levels (denoted by $M_H$ and $M_L$). Then, each UE in $\mathcal{U}$ corresponds to a variable in 3-SAT. In particular, for each variable $x_i$ and its negation $\neg x_i$, we have a UE $u_i$ that uses MCS $M_H$ and $M_L$ to receive data, respectively. Moreover, each RB corresponds to one clause in 3-SAT, so we have $m$ UEs and $K$ RBs in the MARS instance. Fig. 1 gives an example with four variables and four clauses, where gray RBs correspond to the 3-SAT terms appearing in their clauses. Since each RB can be allocated to at most one UE, it allows us to choose one single term in each clause of 3-SAT whose result will be 1. Then, we

transform the values $\alpha(i,j,k,l(i,j))$ in the MARS instance into the conflicts in 3-SAT, where two terms are called *conflict* if one is equal to a variable $x_i$ while the other is equal to its negation $\neg x_i$. In the MARS instance, either $M_H$ or $M_L$ can be assigned to each UE. It thus proves that the MCS constraint well fits the conflicting operation in 3-SAT. Specifically, for each RB $\beta_k$, we set $\alpha(i,j,k,M_H)=1$ when $x_i$ appears in clause $L_k$, and $\alpha(i,j,k,M_L)=1$ when $x_i$ is in $L_k$. If $L_k$ contains neither $x_i$ nor $\neg x_i$, we define $\alpha(i,j,k,l(i,j))=0$. Then, we set the aggregate value $D$ to $K$ (i.e., the number of clauses in 3-SAT), so as to finish constructing the MARS instance.

We argue that our reduction is correct by showing that the MARS problem instance has a feasible solution if and only if the 3-SAT problem has a feasible solution below.

**[If part]** Suppose that there is a solution $S_{3\text{-SAT}}$ to the 3-SAT problem. Then, for each variable $x_i \in S_{3\text{-SAT}}$, we can allocate a corresponding RB with MCS $M_H$ to UE $u_i$. Similarly, we can allocate a corresponding RB with MCS $M_L$ to UE $u_i$ when a negation $\neg x_i$ belongs to $S_{3\text{-SAT}}$. In this way, each RB in the MARS instance can be assigned to one UE with MCS $l(i,j)$ whose metric value $\alpha(i,j,k,l(i,j))=1$. Notice that it is impossible to set MCS $l(i,j)$ to $M_H$ and $M_L$ simultaneously, as the corresponding terms in 3-SAT will conflict with each other.

**[Only if part]** Suppose that there is a solution $S_{\text{MARS}}$ to the MARS instance, where it must assign one UE with $\alpha(i,j,k,l(i,j))=1$ for every RB. We then show that there will exist a satisfying truth assignment $A$ in 3-SAT. Specifically, for each variable $x_i$, if a UE $u_i$ is not assigned in $S_{\text{MARS}}$, we arbitrarily set $A(x_i)=1$. Otherwise, $S_{\text{MARS}}$ must select exactly one MCS for $u_i$. When $S_{\text{MARS}}$ chooses $M_H$, we can set $A(x_i)=1$; on the other hand, we set $A(x_i)=0$ if $S_{\text{MARS}}$ chooses $M_L$. In this way, all clauses in 3-SAT can be evaluated to 1 by the truth assignment $A$ (i.e., we find a feasible solution to 3-SAT).

Based on the above argument, we prove that the MARS problem is NP-hard. □

## 4 The Proposed MARS Heuristic

Given the power constraint $P_{\max}$ and traffic demands of all UEs, our MARS heuristic involves the following steps:

**[Step 1]** The eNB equally distributes its power to all CCs, so each CC $c_j \in \mathcal{C}$ is allocated with an amount ($p_j = P_{\max}/|\mathcal{C}|$) of power. Following LTE-A specification (referring to Section 2.1), the eNB sends a reference signal to all UEs based on this power. A UE then evaluates its channel quality on CCs. It is done by measuring SINR (signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio) on every CC and finding the highest CQI, such that BLER $\leq 10\%$. Then, the UE feeds back its CQI measurement to the eNB for reference.

**[Step 2]** With CQI, the eNB finds the best MCS for each (UE, CC) pair. From Table 1, the eNB builds a *data-rate mapping table* $T_m$, where each tuple $(u_i, c_j)$ records the number of data bits $N(u_i,c_j)$ that can be transmitted by a CC $c_j \in \mathcal{C}$ for a UE $u_i \in \mathcal{U}$:

$$N(u_i,c_j) = b(j,k,l(i,j)) \times r_j, \tag{8}$$

where $u_i$ uses MCS $l(i,j)$ and $c_j$ has $r_j$ RBs. For example, suppose that $c_j$ has 5MHz bandwidth and $u_i$ reports CQI = 7. Then, we have $b(j,k,l(i,j)) = 124.03$ and $r_j = 50$. Thus, the number of data bits transmitted by $c_j$ for $u_i$ is $N(ui,cj) = 124.03 \times 50 \approx 6201$.

**[Step 3]** For each UE $u_i \in \mathcal{U}$, we use a variable $q_i$ to indicate how many data bits have not been sent yet (called *backlog*), which is initially set to $d_i \times t$. Then, the UE with the largest $q_i$ value, say, $u_i$ is selected for resource allocation. The eNB will assign one CC (and allocate its RBs) to $u_i$ by the three rules:

- **Rule 1:** If only one CC $c_j$ can satisfy UE $u_i$'s backlog (i.e., $N(u_i,c_j) \geq q_i$), the eNB assigns $c_j$ to $u_i$, and allocates a number of $x_i = \lceil q_i / b(j,k,l(i,j)) \rceil$ RBs to send $u_i$'s data. Then, we deduct $x_i$ from $r_j$. For each $u_k \in \mathcal{U}$, its $N(u_k,c_j)$ value in table $T_m$ is recomputed by Eq. (8). Besides, we set $q_i = 0$ since $u_i$'s entire backlog has been satisfied.
- **Rule 2:** If a subset $\mathcal{C}_s \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ of CCs each can satisfy UE $u_i$'s backlog, where $|\mathcal{C}_s| \geq 2$, the eNB compares their *eagerness degrees*. Specifically, for each CC $c_j \in \mathcal{C}_s$, its eagerness degree (for UE $u_i$) is defined by

$$e(i,j) = \sum_{\forall u_k \in \mathcal{U}} \{N(u_k,c_j) \mid u_k \neq u_i \text{ and } q_k > 0\}, \tag{9}$$

  which is the sum of data bits supported by $c_j$ for all other UEs with positive backlog (except $u_i$). Here, a smaller $e(i,j)$ value implies that most of other UEs have worse channel quality on $c_j$. In this case, it can cause less effect on other UEs when $u_i$ selects $c_j$ to receive data, because the average data rate for other UEs on $c_j$ is small (and thus they do not prefer using $c_j$). Thus, the eNB can assign CC $c_a$ in $\mathcal{C}_s$ with the minimum eagerness degree for UE $u_i$. Following Rule 1, we will also update variables $r_a$, $N(u_k,c_a)$, and $q_i$ accordingly.
- **Rule 3:** If no single CC can satisfy UE $u_i$'s backlog (i.e., $N(u_i,c_a) < q_i$ for all $c_a \in \mathcal{C}$), the eNB picks the CC, say, $c_j$ with the maximum $N(u_i,c_j)$ value. In case of tie, it chooses the CC $c_j$ with the minimum eagerness degree $e(i,j)$. The eNB sets $N(u_k,c_j)=0$ in table $T_m$ for each $u_k \in \mathcal{U}$, because it has allocated all RBs in $c_j$ to $u_i$, and thus $c_j$ cannot support any UE. Then, $u_i$'s backlog is updated by $q_i - N(u_i,c_j)$.

Here, a UE consumes more energy to receive data from non-contiguous CCs. Thus, we can adaptively adjust the eagerness degrees of some CCs to increase the possibility that a UE will use contiguous CCs for communication. Suppose that a CC $c_j$ has been assigned to a UE $u_i$. If another CC, say, $c_k$ and $c_j$ are contiguous, we multiply its eagerness degree by a scaling factor $\sigma$ (i.e., $e(i,j) = \sigma \times e(i,j)$), where $0 < \sigma < 1$. Thus, there will be a high possibility that the eNB also assigns $c_k$ to $u_i$ by using Rule 2 or 3. Since $c_j$ and $c_k$ are contiguous, $u_i$ can significantly save its energy when applying carrier aggregation.

**[Step 4]** The eNB iteratively executes step 3 to select CCs and allocate RBs to UEs, until any of the three cases occurs:

- The backlog of each UE becomes zero.
- Table $T_m$ has no non-zero $N(u_i,c_j)$ value, but there is one UE with positive backlog.
- A UE $u_i$ has been assigned with $\delta$ CCs, but it still has residual backlog.

Case 1 indicates that the demands of all UEs are satisfied (i.e., the overall throughput is maximized). Thus, we can execute step 5 to further reduce the eNB's transmission power. Case 2 occurs when the eNB has no sufficient resource for all UEs. In this case, it is difficult to lower the power on any CC, so the eNB skips step 5 and allocates all RBs to UEs based on the

TABLE 3: An example of the data-rate mapping table $T_m$.

| UE | $c_1$ | $c_2$ | $c_3$ | $c_4$ | $c_5$ | $c_6$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $u_1$ | 606 (4) | 606 (4) | 380 (3) | 606 (4) | 606 (4) | 236 (2) |
| $u_2$ | 153 (1) | 606 (4) | 380 (3) | 380 (3) | 884 (5) | 380 (3) |
| $u_3$ | 153 (1) | 236 (2) | 236 (2) | 153 (1) | 380 (3) | 884 (5) |

scheduling result. Case 3 means that the eNB can no longer allocate RBs to UE $u_i$ (or it will violate LTE-A specification). Thus, the eNB removes $u_i$ from $\mathcal{U}$ (but still gives $u_i$ its allocated RBs) and goes back to step 3 to schedule other UEs.

**[Step 5]** For each assigned CC, the eNB checks if it can save the transmission power while still satisfying the demands of UEs. Let us consider a simple case where a CC $c_j$ is assigned to only one UE $u_i$. Suppose that the power calculated in step 1 allows the eNB to use an MCS level $l(i,j)$ for $c_j$. Then, the eNB iteratively tries to use the MCS level lower than $l(i,j)$, and checks if the RBs assigned to $u_i$ can support its demand. If so, the eNB recalculates the new power $p_j$ for CC $c_j$ based on its SINR value and the new MCS level. We then discuss the complex case where a CC $c_j$ is assigned to a set of UEs $\mathcal{U}_s \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. Let $p_j$ be the current power on CC $c_j$ and $p_j(i)$ denote the new power calculated from UE $u_i$'s perspective (using the above method). Obviously, we have $p_j(i) \leq p_j$ for all $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_s$. Then, the new transmission power on CC $c_j$ will be

$$p_j = \max_{u_i \in \mathcal{U}_s} p_j(i). \tag{10}$$

Here, since CC $c_j$ is shared by multiple UEs, we have to take care of each such UE when reducing the transmission power. That is why we take the maximum value in Eq. (10).

We give an example to demonstrate our heuristic, where $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_6\}$ (in the same band). Each CC has 1.4MHz bandwidth and supports 12 RBs. We set $\sigma = 0.5$ and $T_m$ is given in Table 3, where each number in brackets indicates the CQI index. UEs $u_1$, $u_2$, and $u_3$ have data demands of 1200, 1150, and 600 bits in a TTI, respectively. Then, the MARS heuristic will execute the following iterations:

1) The eNB first picks UE $u_1$ (with the largest backlog) and uses Rule 3. CCs $c_1$, $c_2$, $c_4$, and $c_5$ will be candidates, and their eagerness degrees are $e(1,1) = 153 + 153 = 306$, $e(1,2) = 606 + 236 = 842$, $e(1,4) = 380 + 153 = 533$, and $e(1,5) = 884 + 380 = 1264$, respectively. In this case, we prefer selecting $c_1$, because comparing with $c_1$, all other candidates ($c_2$, $c_4$, and $c_5$) can allow other UEs ($u_2$ and $u_3$) to enjoy higher data rates. In other words, selecting $c_1$ for $u_1$ can have the least impact on other two UEs. Then, we set $N(u_1,c_1) = N(u_2,c_1) = N(u_3,c_1) = 0$, and update $q_1 = 1200 - 606 = 594$.
2) UE $u_2$ is chosen and Rule 3 is used, so CC $c_5$ is the only candidate. The eNB assigns $c_5$ to $u_2$, sets $N(u_1,c_5) = N(u_2,c_5) = N(u_3,c_5) = 0$, and updates $q_2 = 1150 - 884 = 266$.
3) The eNB chooses UE $u_3$. Since only CC $c_6$ can satisfy $u_3$'s backlog, Rule 1 is adopted. However, $u_3$ requires just $\lceil 600/73.67 \rceil = 9$ RBs, so $c_6$ remains $12 - 9 = 3$ RBs. Thus, the eNB assigns $c_6$ to $u_3$, sets $N(u_1,c_6) = 19.69 \times 3 \approx 59$, $N(u_2,c_6) = 31.67 \times 3 \approx 95$, $N(u_3,c_6) = 73.67 \times 3 \approx 221$, and updates $q_3 = 0$.
4) The eNB picks UE $u_1$ again. Here, since CCs $c_2$ and $c_4$ can satisfy $u_1$'s residual backlog, Rule 2 is applied. Thus, the eNB computes their eagerness degrees as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} e(1,2) &= \sum\{N(u_k,c_2) \mid u_k \neq u_1, q_k > 0\} \times \sigma \\ &= N(u_2,c_2) \times 0.5 = 303, \\ e(1,4) &= \sum\{N(u_k,c_4) \mid u_k \neq u_1, q_k > 0\} \\ &= N(u_2,c_4) = 380. \end{aligned}$$

   Since $u_1$ has been assigned with CC $c_1$ in iteration 1 and CCs $c_1$ and $c_2$ are contiguous, $u_1$ prefers $c_2$ than $c_4$. This is realized by multiplying $c_2$'s eagerness degree $e(1,2)$ by $\sigma$. Then, the eNB sets $N(u_1,c_2) = N(u_2,c_2) = N(u_3,c_2) = 0$, and updates $q_1 = 0$.
5) Then, only UE $u_2$ has residual backlog. By Rule 2, CCs $c_3$ and $c_4$ become candidates, but their eagerness degrees are both zero (based on Eq. (8)). In this case, the eNB assigns $c_4$ to $u_2$, since CC $c_5$ has been assigned to $u_2$, and both $c_4$ and $c_5$ are contiguous.

Thus, UEs $u_1$, $u_2$, and $u_3$ are assigned with CCs $\{c_1, c_2\}$, $\{c_4, c_5\}$, and $\{c_6\}$, respectively. The eNB can employ *contiguous* carrier aggregation to save UEs' energy. Finally, by step 5, the eNB checks if it can lower MCS to save the power on each CC. In particular, it can change the MCS of CC $c_6$ from CQI = 5 to CQI = 4. Thus, $c_5$ can support $50.53 \times 12 \approx 606$ bits, which satisfies UE $u_3$'s demand (i.e., 600 bits). In this case, the eNB can reduce the power on $c_6$ to save its energy, and also reduce the interference to other cells.

## 5 Discussion on The MARS Heuristic

We discuss the rationale of our heuristic, which involves four special designs. First, in the MARS problem, the eNB should not only determine the CC assignment for UEs, but also estimate the transmission power on each CC. These two factors could affect with each other, making the problem complex. Thus, step 1 fixes one factor by giving the 'default' power on CCs, so the eNB can use a data-rate mapping table for reference. Then, the eNB tries to reduce the power on each assigned CC in step 5 if the UE has a lower noise level. It has two advantages to use the default power. On one hand, the proposed heuristic is relatively simple for the eNB to execute in every short TTI period. On the other hand, the eNB actually considers the 'worst' case in the beginning (i.e., all CCs consume the maximum power Pmax). This can help the eNB determine whether the system resource is enough to satisfy the demands of all UEs.

Second, many existing methods directly assign the 'best' CC $c_j$ to the selected UE $u_i$. However, other UEs could be 'eager' for $c_j$ as they have better channel quality on $c_j$. Once $c_j$ is given to $u_i$, other UEs would have to use CCs with worse channel condition. In this case, the eNB may need to aggregate more CCs to meet their demands, thereby not only wasting more resource but also forcing UEs to spend more energy. To solve this problem, our heuristic uses eagerness degrees in step 3. When the selected UE $u_i$ has multiple choices of CCs, the eNB selects the CC $c_k$ with the minimum eagerness degree for $u_i$, where other UEs do not have good channel quality on $c_k$. In this way, assigning $c_k$ to $u_i$ can have less impact on other UEs whose demands have not been satisfied yet.

Third, a UE can preserve more energy if it uses contiguous CCs to receive data by Eqs. (5) and (6). To address this issue, we scale down the eagerness degree of a contiguous CC by a

factor $\sigma$. Because our MARS heuristic always asks the UE to select the CC with the minimum eagerness degree, the above design can increase the opportunity that the UE selects the contiguous CC to receive data. This design is also lightweight, so the eNB can avoid complicated calculation.

Fourth, we discuss two abnormal cases in step 4, where the eNB has no sufficient resource to meet the demands of some UEs. We have two solutions to deal with them. One solution is that the eNB invokes *call admission control* [26] to ask these UEs to decrease their demands or decline some UEs with excessive requests. Thus, the eNB can allocate RBs to satisfy the modified demands of all UEs. Alternatively, the eNB can keep the unsatisfied demands for *next-TTI scheduling*. Since our heuristic first selects the UE with the maximum demand, a UE with more unsatisfied demand in the previous TTI will have a higher opportunity to be allocated with RBs first in the next TTI.

We finally analyze the time complexity of our MARS heuristic in Theorem 2.

***Theorem 2.*** Given $m$ UEs and $n$ CCs, the MARS heuristic spends $O(m\delta \times (n+m))$ time to schedule RBs for UEs in the worst case.

*Proof:* In our heuristic, step 1 takes $O(1)$ time since it is trivial to find the transmission power on each CC. In step 2, the eNB builds table $T_m$ for reference, which takes $O(mn)$ time. For step 3, it spends $O(m)$ time to calculate the backlog of each UE. Then, the eNB can use a maximum binary heap to store all UEs by their backlog values, which requires $O(m)$ time. To speed up step 3, the eNB keeps a table to store the eagerness degree $e(i,j)$ for each pair of UE $u_i$ and CC $c_j$. From Eq. (9), $e(i,j)$ is the sum of all $N(u_k,c_j)$ values for each $u_k \neq u_i$. Because there are $n$ CCs, building this table requires $O(n(m-1))$ time. Since a UE can be given with at most $\delta$ CCs, the eNB will repeat step 3 for at most $O(m\delta)$ times. Each iteration of step 3 involves the following operations:

- Get UE $u_i$ with the maximum backlog from the heap, which requires $O(\lg m)$ time.
- Find a CC by the three rules. It takes $O(n)$ time since the eNB has to search all CCs.
- The eNB updates the eagerness degree $e(k,j)$ for each pair of UE $u_k$ and CC $c_j$, where $u_k \neq u_i$. This operation spends $O(m-1)$ time.
- If UE $u_i$ still has positive backlog, the eNB inserts $u_i$ into the heap for scheduling later. This operation takes $O(\lg m)+O(1)=O(\lg m)$ time.

Steps 3 and 4 together thus spend time of $O(m)+O(m)+O(n(m-1))+O(m\delta)\times[O(\lg m)+O(n)+O(m-1)+O(\lg m)] = O(m\delta\times(n+m-1))$. Finally, each UE is assigned with at most $\delta$ CCs, so step 5 needs to check at most $O(m\delta)$ pairs of UEs and CCs to save the power on each CC. Thus, our MARS heuristic totally requires $O(1)+O(mn)+O(m\delta\times(n+m-1))+O(m\delta) = O(m\delta\times(n+m))$ time. □

## 6 Performance Evaluation

We develop a simulator in C++ to evaluate the performance of our MARS heuristic. Following LTE-A Release 10 [4], two frequency bands are adopted: Band 1 (2110MHz ~ 2170MHz) and Band 5 (869MHz ~ 894MHz). Band 1 is cut into twelve 5MHz CCs, while Band 5 is cut into two 5MHz CCs and five 3MHz CCs. Thus, we have $|\mathcal{C}| = 19$. We consider an LTE-A macro-cell where a number of UEs randomly reside. There are six eNBs deployed outside the macro-cell to generate noise on different CCs. The log-distance path loss model is used to simulate radio propagation of wireless communication:

$$PL = 128.1 + 37.6 \log_{10} \mathrm{dist}(\mathrm{eNB}, u_i), \tag{11}$$

where $PL$ is the path loss (in milliwatts) and $\mathrm{dist}(\mathrm{eNB}, u_i)$ denotes the distance between the eNB and UE $u_i$ (in kilometers). The eNB can aggregate up to 5 CCs for a UE to receive its data (i.e., $\delta = 5$). Besides, each UE generates its traffics according to Table 4.

TABLE 4: Traffic demands of UEs in simulations.

| traffic type | average bit rate | ratio |
|---|---|---|
| VoIP (G.711 standard) | 64 Kbps | 4/15 |
| IPTV (H.264 standard) | 128 Kbps | 4/15 |
| HTTP/FTP | 169 Kbps | 4/15 |
| video (low quality) | 21.8 Mbps | 1/15 |
| video (medium quality) | 28.3 Mbps | 1/15 |
| video (high quality) | 34.4 Mbps | 1/15 |

We compare our heuristic with two resource scheduling methods. The PF method in [22] computes the 'weighted' transmission rate of a UE on each CC, and selects the maximum one. To keep PF among UEs, a larger weight is given to a UE that sent less data (and vice versa). The max-CQI method in [27] always selects the UE with the best channel quality to use each CC. In our MARS heuristic, we set $\sigma = 0.5$. For each experiment, we conduct 1000 simulations and take their average. Remark 1 discusses our measurement of overheads in communication and carrier aggregation in the simulations.

***Remark 1 (Overheads in communication and carrier aggregation).*** In MARS, the overhead in communication only occurs in step 1, as the eNB has to emit the downlink reference signal and all UEs need to report their CQI indices. Other steps only involve the calculation in the eNB, which requires no overhead in communication. However, step 1 is the necessary operation defined in the LTE-A standard [3]. In other words, both PF and max-CQI methods also require step 1 to obtain the information of channel condition of every CC, or otherwise their scheduling algorithms cannot work. Thus, we do not evaluate the overhead in communication, because it will be the same for each method (and also for the original proposal of LTE-A).

On the other hand, the overhead in carrier aggregation reflects on the energy consumption of UEs. As discussed in Section 3, a UE consumes more energy on receiving data from multiple CCs according to Eqs. (5) and (6). Therefore, we measure the average amount of energy spent by each UE on receiving downlink data to evaluate the overhead in carrier aggregation. Moreover, we will also measure the average number of CCs used by each UE. Obviously, when more CCs are used, the UE will incur a higher overhead in carrier aggregation, as it has to simultaneously listen to more CCs.

### 6.1 Effect of Different Number of UEs

By changing the number of UEs, we study its effect on scheduling results, where $P_{\max}$ = 40watts. Fig. 2(a) shows the *successful ratio* of resource scheduling, which is defined by the ratio of the number of simulations that the eNB satisfies the demands of all UEs to the total 1000 ones. When there are more UEs, the ratio decreases as more UEs compete for the fixed resource. Since




(a) successful ratio




(b) satisfied demand

Fig. 2: Comparison on the scheduling results under different number of UEs.




(a) energy consumption




(b) number of CCs used

Fig. 3: Comparison on the amount of resource spent under different number of UEs.




Fig. 4: Comparison on the eNB's transmission power under different number of UEs.

the PF method has fairness concern, it may not give enough resource to the UEs with better channel quality, thereby decreasing the ratio. By considering the backlog, channel quality, and eagerness degree, MARS always has the highest ratio. Even though there are 70 UEs in the cell (i.e., a dense scenario), it still can keep around 30% of the successful ratio (but other two methods have less than 10%). On the other hand, Fig. 2(b) presents the *average satisfied demand* of each UE. We can observe that MARS outperforms other methods, especially when there are more UEs. This verifies the effectiveness of our heuristic in terms of resource allocation.

We then evaluate the amount of resource spent by each UE. Fig. 3(a) gives the average energy consumption of UEs. Since the number of CCs and $P_{\max}$ are constant, the amount of resource does not change. When there are more UEs, each one is given less resource. Thus, a UE does not spend much energy to use its resource. That is why the energy consumption decreases when the number of UEs grows. Since the PF method allocates less resource to UEs than the max-CQI method does, it lets each UE consume less energy. However, the PF and max-CQI methods do not prefer assigning contiguous CCs to UEs, so they may force each UE to spend more energy to hear non-contiguous CCs. On the contrary, our MARS heuristic encourages UEs to receive data from contiguous CCs. Thus, UEs can significantly save their energy. Fig. 3(b) gives the average number of CCs assigned to each UE. As the number of UEs increases, the eNB would need to aggregate more CCs to satisfy the growing demand. By using the eagerness degree, MARS can reduce the number of CCs used by a UE, thereby preserving its energy.

TABLE 5: Performance improvement by MARS under different number of UEs.

| UEs | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Successful ratio of scheduling:** | | | | | | | |
| PF | 0.6% | 14.1% | 50.7% | 123.1% | 248.9% | 398.2% | 139.3% |
| max-CQI | 0.4% | 3.9% | 23.0% | 68.9% | 133.2% | 222.4% | 75.3% |
| **Average satisfied demand:** | | | | | | | |
| PF | 0.1% | 3.0% | 10.8% | 20.1% | 24.7% | 25.8% | 14.1% |
| max-CQI | 0.0% | 0.5% | 4.5% | 10.1% | 12.9% | 13.9% | 7.0% |
| **Average energy consumption of UEs:** | | | | | | | |
| PF | 6.1% | 4.7% | 4.3% | 4.1% | 3.9% | 2.9% | 4.3% |
| max-CQI | 4.9% | 4.9% | 4.4% | 4.4% | 4.2% | 4.4% | 4.5% |
| **Average number of CCs used:** | | | | | | | |
| PF | 12.7% | 13.4% | 13.3% | 10.2% | 7.0% | 3.9% | 10.1% |
| max-CQI | 9.8% | 9.8% | 10.5% | 8.7% | 6.3% | 3.9% | 8.2% |
| **eNB's transmission power:** | | | | | | | |
| both | 78.3% | 66.1% | 57.8% | 51.4% | 45.2% | 41.8% | 56.8% |

Fig. 4 shows the eNB's transmission power. Since both PF and max-CQI do not consider saving the eNB's energy, they always ask the eNB to emit the maximum power, which wastes resource. On the contrary, MARS decreases the transmission power on each assigned CC (in step 5) by using lower MCS levels if feasible. Thus, without decreasing system performance, it can reduce the eNB's transmission power while satisfying the traffic demands of UEs. Notice that when there are more UEs, the eNB should try to improve the channel quality of each CC in order to satisfy the growing demand, so the transmission power increases as the number of UEs increases in MARS. Table 5 summarizes the performance improvement by MARS under different number of UEs.

We remark that MARS seeks to save the eNB's energy consumption by selecting lower MCSs for data transmission. This operation may affect packet latency of some flows. Thus, we conduct an experiment to evaluate the average packet delay of real-time flows, as shown in Fig. 5, where 'L', 'M', and 'H' respectively denote 'low quality', 'medium quality', and 'high quality' of videos. Apparently, when the number of UEs grows, the packet delay increases accordingly. The max-CQI method has the lowest packet delay, as it always chooses the UE with the best channel quality to use each CC. Nevertheless, such low delay is at the sacrifice of successful ratio of scheduling, energy consumption of UEs, and eNB's transmission power (referring to Figs. 2–4). On the other hand, MARS adopts the eagerness degree to increase the successful ratio of scheduling, and lowers MCSs to reduce the eNB's transmission power when feasible. It thus incurs slightly higher packet delay than other two methods. However, since MARS significantly improves the amount of satisfied demand of UEs (referring to Fig. 2), it can also increase the opportunity of meeting the transmission demand of real-time flows.



(a) 40UEs

(b) 60UEs

Fig. 5: Comparison on average packet delay of different methods.

### 6.2 Effect of Different $P_{\max}$ Power

By increasing $P_{\max}$ from 20 to 70watts, we measure its effect on different methods. In this experiment, there are 45 UEs, and Fig. 6 shows the simulation results. When $P_{\max}$ is enlarged, it means that the total spectral resource increases, as the eNB can transmit higher power to improve channel quality of CCs. Thus, not only the successful ratio of resource scheduling but also the satisfied demand of UEs increases when $P_{\max}$ grows. Our MARS heuristic always has the best performance among all methods, because it does not simply assign the best CC to the selected UE. Instead, MARS will consider the eagerness degree of each CC, so as to get better resource allocation.

Fig. 7 presents the amount of resource spent by each UE under different $P_{\max}$ power. Because the total number of CCs is fixed, increasing $P_{\max}$ only slightly increases the energy consumption of each UE (since the UE still listens to similar number of CCs). In addition, when $P_{\max}$ grows, the probability that the eNB employs fewer CCs to satisfy the demand of each UE increases. Therefore, the number of CCs used by each UE can also slightly decreases. From Fig. 7(a) and (b), our MARS heuristic can help UEs spend less resource (i.e., energy and CCs) to meet its demand.

TABLE 6: Performance improvement by MARS under different $P_{\max}$ power.

| $P_{\max}$ | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Successful ratio of scheduling:** | | | | | | | |
| PF | 363.2% | 149.8% | 84.1% | 58.2% | 39.8% | 27.1% | 120.4% |
| max-CQI | 165.5% | 70.1% | 39.5% | 27.1% | 18.0% | 12.2% | 55.4% |
| **Average satisfied demand:** | | | | | | | |
| PF | 54.3% | 24.9% | 16.0% | 10.9% | 7.4% | 5.1% | 19.8% |
| max-CQI | 25.9% | 12.1% | 7.9% | 5.1% | 3.6% | 2.5% | 9.5% |
| **Average energy consumption of UEs:** | | | | | | | |
| PF | 5.0% | 4.8% | 4.2% | 3.5% | 2.9% | 2.3% | 3.8% |
| max-CQI | 4.6% | 4.6% | 4.4% | 4.0% | 3.6% | 3.2% | 4.1% |
| **Average number of CCs used:** | | | | | | | |
| PF | 9.1% | 11.1% | 11.6% | 11.9% | 12.1% | 11.4% | 11.2% |
| max-CQI | 8.2% | 9.3% | 9.3% | 9.6% | 9.6% | 9.3% | 9.2% |
| **eNB's transmission power:** | | | | | | | |
| both | 64.4% | 58.7% | 54.4% | 51.9% | 50.3% | 48.3% | 54.7% |




(a) successful ratio




(b) satisfied demand

Fig. 6: Comparison on the scheduling results under different $P_{\max}$ power.




(a) energy consumption




(b) number of CCs used

Fig. 7: Comparison on the amount of resource spent under different $P_{\max}$ power.

We then measure the eNB's transmission power under different $P_{\max}$ power, as shown in Fig. 8. Because both PF and max-CQI do not take the eNB's energy consumption into account, they will ask the eNB to use the maximum power to serve all UEs. By adaptively adjusting the transmission power on each CC, our MARS heuristic allows the eNB to use less energy to satisfy the demands of its UEs. Finally, we summarize the performance improvement by MARS under different $P_{\max}$ power in Table 6.

## 7 Conclusion

Carrier aggregation greatly improves spectrum utilization of LTE-A, but the standard leaves the problem of allocating resource to implementers. Many solutions are thus proposed to increase network throughput or keep transmission fairness. However, most of them do not consider the energy spent in communication. To deal with the issue, this paper formulates




Fig. 8: Comparison on the eNB's transmission power under different $P_{\max}$ power.

an NP-hard MARS problem with the objectives of satisfying traffic demands of UEs while reducing energy consumption in the network. We develop a heuristic by adopting the novel eagerness degree to help the eNB select a proper CC for each UE, which increases the opportunity that other UEs can be also assigned with better CCs for transmission. Moreover, the proposed heuristic adaptively adjusts MCSs used in some CCs to further save the overall transmission power. Our MARS heuristic is lightweight and efficient. By comparing with both PF and max-CQI methods through simulations, we demonstrate that the MARS heuristic can increase 55.4% $\sim$ 139.3% of successful ratio of scheduling, 7.0% $\sim$ 19.8% of average satisfied demand, 3.8% $\sim$ 4.5% of average energy consumption of UEs, 8.2% $\sim$ 11.2% of average number of CCs used, and 54.7% $\sim$ 56.8% of the eNB's transmission power, under various experimental scenarios.

## REFERENCES

[1] A. Ghosh, R. Ratasuk, B. Mondal, N. Mangalvedhe, and T. Thomas, "LTE-Advanced: next-generation wireless broadband technology," *IEEE Wireless Comm.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 10–22, 2010.

[2] H. Lee, S. Vahid, and K. Moessner, "A survey of radio resource management for spectrum aggregation in LTE-Advanced," *IEEE Comm. Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 745–760, 2014.

[3] 3GPP, "Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Physical layer procedures," TS 36.213, June 2012.

[4] 3GPP, "Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Carrier Aggregation; Base Station (BS) radio transmission and reception," TR 36.808, June 2012.

[5] Z. Shen, A. Papasakellariou, J. Montojo, D. Gerstenberger, and F. Xu, "Overview of 3GPP LTE-Advanced carrier aggregation for 4G wireless communications," *IEEE Comm. Magazine*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 122–130, 2012.

[6] H. Tian, S. Gao, J. Zhu, and L. Chen, "Improved component carrier selection method for non-continuous carrier aggregation in LTE-Advanced systems," *Proc. IEEE Vehicular Technology Conf.*, pp. 1–5, 2011.

[7] Y. Wang, K. I. Pedersen, T. B. Sorensen, and P. E. Mogensen, "Carrier load balancing and packet scheduling for multi-carrier systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Comm.*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 1780–1789, 2010.

[8] L. Zhang, F. Liu, L. Huang, and W. Wang, "Traffic load balance methods in the LTE-Advanced system with carrier aggregation," *Proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. Comm., Circuits and Systems*, pp. 63–67, 2010.

[9] L. Zhang, K. Zheng, W. Wang, and L. Huang, "Performance analysis on carrier scheduling schemes in the Long-Term Evolution-Advanced system with carrier aggregation," *IET Communications*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 612–619, 2011.

[10] L. Chen, W. Chen, X. Zhang, and D. Yang, "Analysis and simulation for spectrum aggregation in LTE-Advanced system," *Proc. IEEE Vehicular Technology Conf.*, pp. 1–6, 2009.

[11] L. Liu, M. Li, J. Zhou, X. She, L. Chen, Y. Sagae, and M. Iwamura, "Component carrier management for carrier aggregation in LTE-Advanced system," *Proc. IEEE Vehicular Technology Conf.*, pp. 1–6, 2011.

[12] H. Wang, C. Rosa, and K. Pedersen, "Performance analysis of downlink inter-band carrier aggregation in LTE-Advanced," *Proc. IEEE Vehicular Technology Conf.*, pp. 1–5, 2011.

[13] C. Li, B. Wang, W. Wang, Y. Zhang, and X. Chang, "Component carrier selection for LTE-A systems in diverse coverage carrier aggregation scenario," *Proc. IEEE Int'l Symp. Personal Indoor and Mobile Radio Comm.*, pp. 1004–1008, 2012.

[14] H. Li, Y. Yu, B. Wang, W. Wang, and Y. Zhang, "Hierarchy based component carriers selection in carrier aggregation for LTE-A system," *Proc. IEEE Int'l Symp. Personal Indoor and Mobile Radio Comm.*, pp. 2679–2683, 2013.

[15] R. Kwan, C. Leung, and J. Zhang, "Proportional fair multiuser scheduling in LTE," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 461–464, 2009.

[16] N. Guan, Y. Zhou, L. Tian, G. Sun, and J. Shi, "QoS guaranteed resource block allocation algorithm for LTE systems," *Proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. Wireless and Mobile Computing, Networking and Comm.*, pp. 307–312, 2011.

[17] M.E. Aydina, R. Kwana, and J. Wub, "Multiuser scheduling on the LTE downlink with meta-heuristic approaches," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 9, pp. 257–265, 2013.

[18] Y.C. Wang and S.Y. Hsieh, "Service-differentiated downlink flow scheduling to support QoS in Long Term Evolution," *Computer Networks*, vol. 94, pp. 344–359, 2016.

[19] Y.C. Wang and Y.C. Tseng, "Packet fair queuing algorithms for wireless networks," *Design and Analysis of Wireless Networks*, Nova Science Publishers, 2005.

[20] N. Guan, Y. Zhou, L. Tian, G. Sun, and J. Shi, "Utility maximization in LTE-Advanced systems with carrier aggregation," *Proc. IEEE Vehicular Technology Conf.*, pp. 1–5, 2011.

[21] X. Cheng, G. Gupta, and P. Mohapatra, "Joint carrier aggregation and packet scheduling in LTE-Advanced networks," *Proc. IEEE Conf. Sensor, Mesh and Ad Hoc Comm. and Networks*, pp. 469–477, 2013.

[22] H.S. Liao, P.Y. Chen, and W.T. Chen, "An efficient downlink radio resource allocation with carrier aggregation in LTE-Advanced networks," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Computing*, vol. 13, no. 10, pp. 2229–2239, 2014.

[23] M. Lauridsen, H. Wang, and P. Mogensen, "LTE UE energy saving by applying carrier aggregation in a HetNet scenario," *Proc. IEEE Vehicular Technology Conf.*, pp. 1–5, 2013.

[24] S.B. Lee, S. Choudhury, A. Khoshnevis, S. Xu, and S. Lu, "Downlink MIMO with frequency-domain packet scheduling for 3GPP LTE," *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, pp. 1269–1277, 2009.

[25] T.H. Cormen, C.E. Leiserson, R.L. Rivest, and C. Stein, *Introduction to Algorithms*, The MIT Press, 2009.

[26] F. Zarai, K.B. Ali, M.S. Obaidat, and L. Kamoun, "Adaptive call admission control in 3GPP LTE networks," *Int'l J. Comm. Systems*, vol. 27, no. 10, pp. 1–13, 2012.

[27] P. Kela, J. Puttonen, N. Kolehmainen, T. Ristaniemi, T. Henttonen, and M. Moisio, "Dynamic packet scheduling performance in UTRA Long Term Evolution downlink," *Proc. IEEE IEEE Int'l Symp. Wireless Pervasive Computing*, pp. 308–313, 2008.