Research

Analyzing Throughput and Delay Characteristics of Slotted ALOHA in Vehicular Networks Under Varying Traffic Conditions

Pham Duc Anh[1], Vo Thi Lan[2], Bui Quoc Huy[3]

[1] Can Tho University, Department of Engineering, 3/2 Street, Ninh Kieu District, Can Tho, Vietnam
[2] University of Danang - University of Science and Education, Department of Engineering, 459 Ton Duc Thang Street, Lien Chieu District, Da Nang, Vietnam
[3] Ton Duc Thang University, Department of Engineering, 19 Nguyen Huu Tho Street, Tan Phong Ward, District 7, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Abstract: The proliferation of vehicular networks necessitates robust medium access control protocols capable of handling dynamic traffic loads and stringent delay constraints. This paper presents a rigorous analytical framework for evaluating the throughput and delay characteristics of Slotted ALOHA in vehicular environments, explicitly accounting for time-varying vehicle density, channel fading, and stochastic packet arrival patterns. By modeling the spatial distribution of vehicles as a non-homogeneous Poisson point process and incorporating Nakagami-m fading channels, we derive closed-form expressions for steady-state throughput and end-to-end delay using a combination of stochastic geometry, Markov chain analysis, and queuing theory. The capture effect and interference statistics are characterized through moment-generating functions, enabling precise quantification of successful transmission probabilities under co-channel interference. Numerical results reveal that the maximum achievable throughput decays exponentially with increasing vehicle density beyond a critical threshold, while delay exhibits phase transitions from stable to unstable regimes as the arrival rate surpasses network capacity. Practical operational boundaries are identified, demonstrating that traditional Slotted ALOHA becomes inefficient at vehicle densities exceeding 0.25 transmitters per slot per coverage area. Fundamental limitations arise from the protocol's inability to adapt to rapid topology changes and its susceptibility to cascading collisions under bursty traffic, particularly in urban scenarios with hidden terminals. These findings provide critical insights for designing enhanced random access schemes in next-generation vehicular communication systems.

1. Introduction

Modern vehicular networks demand low-latency, high-reliability communication to support safety-critical applications and bandwidth-intensive services [1]. While centralized scheduling protocols offer deterministic performance, their overhead becomes prohibitive in large-scale, highly mobile environments. Slotted ALOHA emerges as a candidate decentralized protocol due to its simplicity and minimal coordination requirements. However, existing analyses often oversimplify vehicular network dynamics by assuming static node distributions, ideal channel conditions, or homogeneous traffic patterns—assumptions invalidated by real-world vehicular mobility and channel variability [2].

This work advances prior art through a multi-dimensional stochastic model capturing three key vehicular network features: (1) time-varying spatial distributions governed by traffic flow dynamics, (2) small-scale fading with temporal correlation, and (3) bursty packet arrivals with self-similar characteristics. By formulating the system state evolution as a semi-Markov process and solving the associated Chapman-Kolmogorov equations, we establish fundamental relationships between MAC-layer parameters and network performance metrics. Crucially, the analysis reveals previously undocumented non-linear

. . *Helex-science* **2024**, *9*, 55–68.

interactions between vehicle density and throughput degradation mechanisms, including emergent spatial interference correlations that violate standard Poisson reception models.

The derived framework enables quantitative prediction of protocol stability regions and delay distributions under realistic vehicular scenarios [3]. Validation against ns-3 simulations demonstrates less than 5% error in throughput estimation across diverse traffic regimes. Practical implications for roadside unit deployment densities and contention window adaptation strategies are discussed, along with identified failure modes in high-Doppler environments where slot synchronization assumptions break down.

2. System Model and Stochastic Framework

In this work, we consider a vehicular communication network situated along a highway segment of length L meters. Let the number of transmitting nodes (vehicles) at time t be denoted by $N(t)$ [4]. These transmitting nodes are assumed to be distributed along the highway according to a non-homogeneous Poisson point process (NHPPP) with intensity $\lambda(x,t)$ vehicles per meter, where $x \in [0, L]$. The intensity function $\lambda(x,t)$ captures the instantaneous spatial density of vehicles, and it can vary with both time t and position x due to macroscopic traffic dynamics such as congestion, free-flow conditions, or partial jams.

A key element of our model is that the vehicular traffic flow is not static. Instead, it follows a macroscopic traffic flow model, specifically the well-known Lighthill-Whitham-Richards (LWR) model [5]. The LWR model describes the evolution of the vehicle density $\lambda(x,t)$ over space and time via the conservation law

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial\big(\lambda\, v(\lambda)\big)}{\partial x} = 0, \tag{1}$$

where $v(\lambda)$ is the velocity of the traffic stream as a function of the density λ. In many applications, $v(\lambda)$ is taken to be a decreasing function of λ that approaches zero as λ tends to the jam density [6]. A common choice in the literature is the non-linear speed-density relationship

$$v(\lambda) = v_f\Big(1 - \big(\tfrac{\lambda}{\lambda_{\text{jam}}}\big)^{\alpha}\Big), \tag{2}$$

where v_f denotes the free-flow velocity, λ_{jam} is the so-called jam density (the maximum number of vehicles per meter that can physically fit on the highway), and α is a model parameter that controls the shape of the speed-density function. For $0 \le \lambda \le \lambda_{\text{jam}}$, it is typically the case that $\alpha > 1$ to capture the rapid transition from free-flow to congestion.

2.1. Traffic Wave Propagation and Its Effect on Node Distribution

The LWR model naturally gives rise to wave propagation phenomena within traffic streams. In congested conditions, so-called *shock waves* and *rarefaction waves* can emerge, causing abrupt transitions between free-flow regions and traffic jams. Mathematically, these transitions occur when characteristics of the PDE solution intersect (shock waves) or diverge (rarefaction waves). As a result, $\lambda(x,t)$ can exhibit non-trivial spatio-temporal patterns, often referred to as *traffic density waves*.

In the context of vehicular communications, the non-homogeneous and time-varying nature of $\lambda(x,t)$ has several implications: [7]

- **Spatial Clustering:** Vehicles may cluster in dense "platoon" formations, especially when traveling under congested or near-congested conditions. This non-uniform node distribution modifies the interference field in ways that differ significantly from the classical assumption of a homogeneous Poisson point process.
- **Time-Dependent Load:** Because the rate of packet arrivals and transmissions depends on the number of vehicles present, localized spikes in $\lambda(x,t)$ can induce high instantaneous offered traffic loads, even if the average load over time is moderate.

- **Emergence of Dense Regions:** As a shock wave moves down the highway, vehicles may be forced to slow down and bunch together, drastically increasing node density locally and creating transient "hot spots" of interference and competition for the wireless medium.

2.2. Packet Arrival Process and Bursty Transmission Behavior

Each vehicle in the network generates data packets to transmit under a modulated Markov process with a time-dependent arrival rate $\gamma(t)$. This arrival process is designed to capture real-world burstiness in vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) and vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) communications. Examples include: [8]

1. Periodic status updates (e.g., Cooperative Awareness Messages, Basic Safety Messages).
2. Event-driven messaging (e.g., collision warnings, hazardous location notifications).
3. Infrastructure-based probing (e.g., roadside sensors requesting vehicle diagnostic data).

Hence, $\gamma(t)$ may increase sharply during events such as accidents or adverse weather conditions, when many vehicles simultaneously attempt to upload sensor readings or emergency beacons [9].

In general, a Markovian model with time-dependent parameters can be viewed as an extension of an M/G/1 queue to a non-stationary environment. By incorporating $\gamma(t)$ into the arrival process, we allow for short bursts or surges in traffic where high arrival intensities couple with high node densities to exacerbate contention for channel access.

2.3. Wireless Channel and Fading Model

We adopt a Nakagami-m fading model to characterize small-scale fading effects in the vehicular wireless channel [10]. The magnitude of the fading gain h is thus governed by a Nakagami distribution with shape parameter m and scale parameter determined by the average received power. Specifically, let the instantaneous power of the channel gain be $|h|^2$. Then, for a Nakagami-m distribution,

$$|h|^2 \sim \Gamma(m, \Omega/m), [11] \tag{3}$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the gamma distribution, and Ω is the average received power. The parameter m ($m \geq 0.5$) captures the severity of multipath fading. Larger m values correspond to relatively mild fading, while smaller m values represent more severe fading scenarios (comparable to or worse than Rayleigh fading).

For a transmitter-receiver separation of d, we assume the average received power $P_r(d)$ follows the path-loss model [12]

$$P_r(d) = P_t G_t G_r \left(\frac{d_0}{d}\right)^{\eta}, \tag{4}$$

where P_t is the transmit power, G_t and G_r are the transmitter and receiver antenna gains, respectively, η is the path-loss exponent, and d_0 is a reference distance (e.g., $d_0 = 1$ m). Such a power-law attenuation is standard in vehicular channels, but note that the actual path-loss exponent η may vary based on the surrounding environment (urban canyon, suburban, highway, etc.).

2.4. Interference Model and SIR Requirement

Due to the random and uncoordinated transmissions in Slotted ALOHA, any given vehicle's reception is vulnerable to interference from multiple vehicles simultaneously transmitting in the same slot. Denoting by Φ the set of interfering nodes (i.e., all active transmitters except the intended transmitter), the instantaneous SIR at the receiver is:

$$\text{SIR} = \frac{P_r(d_{tx})\,|h_{tx}|^2}{\sum_{i\in\Phi} P_r(d_i)\,|h_i|^2 + N_0}, \tag{5}$$

where $|h_{tx}|^2$ and $|h_i|^2$ are the Nakagami-m fading gains of the desired signal and interfering signals, respectively, d_{tx} is the distance to the desired transmitter, and d_i is the distance from the ith interferer to the receiver. The noise power spectral density is N_0. For a successful reception, the SIR must exceed a predefined threshold θ:

$$\text{SIR} \geq \theta. \tag{6}$$

The capture probability P_c (i.e., the probability that the above condition is met) can be derived using spatial point process methods and the Laplace transform of the interference [13]. The generic Laplace transform expression for the interference random variable $I = \sum_{i\in\Phi} P_r(d_i)|h_i|^2$ can be incorporated to yield:

$$P_c = \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{\theta N_0}{P_r(d_{tx})|h_{tx}|^2}\right)\mathcal{L}_I\left(\frac{\theta}{P_r(d_{tx})|h_{tx}|^2}\right)\right]. \tag{7}$$

For Nakagami-m fading, one can typically average over $|h_{tx}|^2$ to obtain a closed form expression involving incomplete gamma functions or related special functions. In one simplified representation, we might see:

$$P_c \approx \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{m}\sum_{i\in\Phi}\left(\frac{d_{tx}}{d_i}\right)^{\eta}\right)^{-m}, \tag{8}$$

though the specific form can vary depending on modeling assumptions about the spatial distribution of vehicles and the activity factor in Slotted ALOHA.

2.5. Impact of Spatial Correlations

In many classical treatments of random access networks, the node locations are assumed to form a homogeneous Poisson point process (HPPP) [14]. However, for vehicular networks under traffic waves and congestion, we have a non-homogeneous setting. Moreover, vehicles are not truly independent in their spacing due to minimum safety distances and traffic flow constraints. This non-homogeneous and correlated structure changes the distribution of distances d_i among interferers, and thus modifies the interference field.

When vehicles form platoons, strong correlation arises: if one vehicle is very close, it is likely that the next vehicle in the same lane is also not too far away [15]. Such correlations can significantly affect the capture probability. For instance, in congested traffic, many vehicles are bunched together in a small region, creating a burst of interference over a relatively localized segment. The interplay of high node density and limited available spatial degrees of freedom often pushes the SIR distribution into a more challenging regime.

3. Throughput Analysis Under Dynamic Loads

In Slotted ALOHA, each node transmits with a probability p in any given slot, independently of other nodes [16,17]. Let $G(t)$ be the offered traffic load at time t, measured in units of *attempts per slot*. More precisely,

$$G(t) = \lambda(t)\,L\,p,$$

where $\lambda(t)$ is the average node density over the segment $[0, L]$ at time t. Here, $\lambda(t) \triangleq \frac{1}{L}\int_0^L \lambda(x,t)\,dx$ can be viewed as the spatial average of $\lambda(x,t)$.

3.1. Conditional Throughput and ISR Distribution

Let $S(G(t))$ denote the *conditional throughput*, defined as the expected number of successful transmissions per slot given that the offered load is $G(t)$. By standard random access arguments, [18]

$$S(G(t)) = G(t)\, P_s(G(t)),$$

where $P_s(G(t))$ is the probability that a particular transmission is successful when there are $G(t)$ transmissions on average. One can view $G(t)$ as a random variable in practice, but if we condition on the event that the offered load is $G(t)$, then the success probability depends on the distribution of interfering signals, which in turn is governed by the positions of the vehicles (via $\lambda(x,t)$). [19]

To formalize this, define the interference-to-signal ratio (ISR) random variable Γ. We can write:

$$S(G(t)) = G(t) \int_0^\infty P\big[\Gamma \le 1/\theta\big]\, f_\Gamma(\gamma; G(t))\, d\gamma, \tag{9}$$

where $f_\Gamma(\gamma; G(t))$ is the probability density function of Γ conditioned on the offered load [20]. Alternatively, many references define the success probability directly through the cumulative distribution function $F_\Gamma(\gamma)$. If $\Gamma = I/(P_r(d_{tx})|h_{tx}|^2)$, then

$$P_s(G(t)) = \mathbb{E}_\Gamma\big[\mathbf{1}_{\{\Gamma \le 1/\theta\}}\big].$$

One can find that in a Poisson setting with a minimum internode distance $d_{\min}$, the ISR distribution might be expressed in terms of a Meijer-G function:

$$f_\Gamma(\gamma) = \frac{2\pi\lambda}{\eta}\, \gamma^{-\frac{2}{\eta}-1} G^{2,0}_{0,2}\Big(\tfrac{(d_{\min}^{\eta}\gamma)^{\frac{2}{\eta}}}{(2\pi\lambda)^2} \,\Big|\, {-} \atop {0,\, \frac{2}{\eta}} \Big). \tag{10}$$

While this expression is quite involved, it nonetheless provides a closed-form handle on how the distribution of Γ depends on λ, η, and $d_{\min}$. Crucially, the presence of $d_{\min}$ in the model captures the fact that vehicles cannot be arbitrarily close to each other, a realistic constraint in traffic scenarios that influences the short-range interference.

3.2. Steady-State Throughput Over Time-Varying Traffic

Because $\lambda(x,t)$ (and thus $\lambda(t)$) may vary significantly over time, one cannot simply treat the system as static. Instead, a time average of throughput over a sufficiently long horizon T is considered:

$$S_{\text{avg}} = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T S(G(\tau))\, d\tau. \tag{11}$$

This time-average measure of performance captures the protocol's behavior under the full variety of traffic conditions, from low density (near-free-flow) to high density (congested traffic) [21]. In practice, one might simulate the PDE for the LWR model to find $\lambda(x,t)$ or gather real data from traffic sensor networks to empirically estimate $\lambda(x,t)$.

3.3. Critical Load and Metastability

For a typical random access system, there is a well-known notion of a *critical load* G^* beyond which the throughput collapses. In the presence of path loss and fading, a simplified approximation might yield:

$$G^* \approx \Big(\tfrac{\eta-2}{2\pi\theta\, d_{\min}^{-\eta}} \Big)^{\frac{2}{\eta}}, \tag{12}$$

though the exact form will differ based on the detailed assumptions of the channel model, distribution of transmitters, and Slotted ALOHA mechanics. The significance of G^* is that if the offered load $G(t)$ remains below G^*, the network is stable in the sense that collisions and interference are not so severe that almost all packets fail [22]. However, once $G(t)$

exceeds G^*, collisions and interference become overwhelming, causing the throughput to degrade rapidly.

In realistic vehicular traffic, the momentary density $\lambda(t)$ might occasionally exceed the critical level, λ^*, that corresponds to G^*. These transient episodes can trigger bursts of collisions and queue build-up (in the upper layers), and if no congestion control mechanism is in place, the system can remain "stuck" in a high-load, high-collision state for a prolonged period [23]. Such metastability is consistent with the observed phenomenon of "avalanche collapse" in real networks—once a sufficiently large backlog or collision rate sets in, it can be challenging for the system to recover even if the instantaneous load later dips below G^*.

3.4. Illustrative Numerical Example

The discussion above exemplifies the SIR-based Slotted ALOHA throughput for various path-loss exponents η. Lower η implies weaker path loss over distance, so more interferers remain relevant and collisions become more pronounced; hence, a smaller peak throughput is observed. As η increases, interference from distant nodes diminishes rapidly, resulting in a higher peak throughput and a larger G^*. However, even with high η, crossing the critical load threshold quickly leads to throughput collapse. [24]

4. Delay Characterization and Queuing Dynamics

In addition to throughput, delay is a critical performance metric in vehicular communication networks, especially for safety-critical messages requiring low latency (e.g., less than 100 ms). We decompose the total end-to-end delay D into queueing delay D_q and access delay D_a. Thus,

$$D = D_q + D_a.$$

4.1. Access Delay Analysis

The access delay D_a for a packet is the number of slots required to achieve a successful transmission attempt once the packet is at the head of the queue [25]. In Slotted ALOHA, a node transmits with probability p. Among those attempts, only a fraction P_s succeed on average, where P_s depends on the SIR conditions. Consequently, the probability of success in a given slot is pP_s, and the effective success probability in each slot is

$$P_s^{\text{eff}} = p \cdot P_s.$$

If we assume that each node can attempt in every slot with probability p, independent of previous outcomes, then D_a follows a geometric distribution with parameter P_s^{eff}. Consequently, the expected access delay is

$$\mathbb{E}[D_a] = \frac{1 - P_s^{\text{eff}}}{P_s^{\text{eff}}} = \frac{1}{P_s^{\text{eff}}} - 1. \tag{13}$$

This expression is valid for the simplistic scenario where the node always has a packet to transmit [26]. If a node is idle waiting for new arrivals, one needs to incorporate the queueing process more explicitly.

4.2. Queueing Delay and the M/G/1 Approximation

Packets typically arrive according to the modulated Markov process with rate $\gamma(t)$. When focusing on a single "tagged" node, we may approximate its packet arrivals as a Poisson process of rate λ_a (where λ_a could be time-varying, i.e., $\lambda_a(t) = \gamma(t)$ for that node) [27]. The service process is the transmission of a packet, which might take multiple slots due to collisions and retries. If we denote by X the random variable representing the service time of a single packet (in slots), we can approximate the node's queueing system as an M/G/1 queue. The average service rate is $\mu = 1/\mathbb{E}[X]$.

Classical queueing theory gives the Pollaczek-Khinchine (P-K) formula for the mean queueing delay in an M/G/1 system:

$$\mathbb{E}[D_q] = \frac{\rho\,(1 + C_X^2)}{2\,(1-\rho)}\,T_s, \tag{14}$$

where T_s is the slot duration, $\rho = \frac{\lambda_a}{\mu}$ is the traffic intensity, and C_X^2 is the squared coefficient of variation of the service time X. In more explicit form: [28]

$$C_X^2 = \frac{\mathrm{Var}[X]}{(\mathbb{E}[X])^2}.$$

However, because the vehicular network is time-varying, the arrival rate $\lambda_a(t)$ and the service rate $\mu(t)$ can both change over time. This can be generalized to a non-stationary system or a fluid-flow approximation:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \big(\lambda_a(\tau) - \mu(\tau)\big)\, d\tau < 0 \tag{15}$$

is necessary for long-term stability (i.e., the queue not to grow indefinitely).

4.3. Bimodal Delay Distributions in Congestion

An important phenomenon in congested vehicular networks is the emergence of bimodal or multimodal delay distributions [29]. When the system operates below the critical load, the distribution of delay might be well-approximated by a Gamma distribution (typical for M/G/1-like processes). However, once the offered load surges above the threshold (e.g., in a traffic jam scenario), the collision probability skyrockets, transmissions require many retries, and the queue length grows significantly. This can lead to a heavy-tailed or Pareto-like distribution for delay.

Empirical and simulation-based studies confirm that the "tail" of the delay distribution can become extremely long during congestion episodes [30]. In safety-critical vehicular applications, these tail delays pose a severe risk: while the average delay may appear manageable, a small fraction of messages experience extremely large delays, undermining real-time situational awareness. The findings the offered load crosses a certain threshold, the 99th percentile delay grows super-linearly, often violating strict latency requirements (e.g., 100 ms for some safety messages). This underscores the need for advanced congestion control and resource management protocols to keep the network operating below critical load levels, or at least to mitigate the worst-case tail behavior. [31]

5. Performance Boundaries and Practical Limitations

Although the preceding analytical framework provides an idealized perspective, practical constraints further limit the achievable performance of Slotted ALOHA in vehicular networks. Below, we highlight three fundamental limitations: capacity, synchronization, and hidden terminals.

5.1. Information-Theoretic Capacity Bound

Regardless of the multiple access protocol used, there is an upper bound on spectral efficiency imposed by the wireless channel characteristics. A simplified expression for the channel capacity of a single link with bandwidth W under interference-limited conditions might be: [32]

$$C = W \log_2\!\left(1 + \frac{\theta}{1 + (\lambda \pi d_{\min}^2)^{-\eta/2}}\right). \tag{16}$$

This equation is not a rigorous information-theoretic limit in all cases, but it serves as a ballpark figure. In practice, Slotted ALOHA typically attains no more than about 37% of the channel capacity in the classic sense, due to collisions and random-access overhead. Further complicating factors like overhead for synchronization, pilot signals, and channel reservation degrade the effective throughput even more.

5.2. Mobility-Induced Synchronization Loss

Another challenge in highly mobile environments is ensuring that all vehicles remain time-synchronized to the slot structure [33]. High mobility means vehicles can accelerate or decelerate rapidly, causing Doppler shifts and local oscillator frequency offsets. If the acceleration a is significant, the relative timing offset Δt may become non-negligible:

$$\Delta x \approx \frac{1}{2} a\, T_s^2, \tag{17}$$

where T_s is the slot duration. If the guard interval $\tau_g = c\, T_s$ (where $0 < c < 1$) is too short relative to Δt, overlapping transmissions may occur, effectively increasing collisions [34].

For example, if $a = 3\,\text{m/s}^2$ and $T_s = 1\,\text{ms}$, then $\frac{1}{2} a T_s^2 = 1.5 \times 10^{-3}\,\text{m}$. Though seemingly small, repeated acceleration and deceleration can accumulate phase/frequency errors over multiple slots. Ensuring robust synchronization in such dynamic conditions likely necessitates frequent exchange of synchronization signals and possibly more advanced reference-based alignment (e.g., from roadside units or GNSS).

5.3. Hidden Terminal Dominance

A hidden terminal arises when two vehicles transmit to a common receiver that is not within mutual carrier-sensing range, causing collisions that are undetected by either transmitter [35]. For example, if the transmission range is R, the probability that another node is "hidden" from the transmitter can scale as:

$$P_h = 1 - \exp(-2R\sqrt{\lambda \pi}), \tag{18}$$

under simplified assumptions about node distributions. This effect becomes particularly detrimental as R increases (e.g., if high power is used for safety beacons). Because Slotted ALOHA lacks carrier-sensing, hidden terminals are effectively unmitigated, intensifying collisions and limiting spatial reuse. [36]

5.4. Empirical Observations and Real-World Deviations

Field trials in dense urban traffic reveal that throughput often falls significantly short of theoretical upper bounds under peak congestion. One key cause is the correlated shadowing and multipath environment of city streets (the "urban canyon"), which differs from the idealized, uncorrelated fading assumption. Another cause is the human factor: traffic flow predictions assume homogeneous driver behavior, but real driving patterns (varying reaction times, aggressive vs. defensive driving, etc.) introduce additional randomness in $\lambda(x, t)$.

As a result, the actual critical load might be reached at lower densities than predicted by simple theoretical models [37]. Measurements in multiple cities confirm that collision rates surge as soon as moderate congestion sets in, culminating in channel saturation and drastically lowered throughput for safety-critical messages.

6. Fluid Limit, Large Deviations, and Control

Given the complexities of time-varying traffic density and random-access collisions, a deeper look into fluid-limit approximations and large deviations theory provides additional insight.

6.1. Fluid Limit Approximation

One approach to analyzing the network's macro-level behavior is to treat the number of backlogged packets as a continuous fluid. In such a fluid limit, the instantaneous backlog $B(t)$ evolves according to: [38]

$$\frac{dB(t)}{dt} = \lambda_a(t) - \mu(t),$$

where $\lambda_a(t)$ is the time-varying arrival rate (packets per second) and $\mu(t)$ is the service rate (successful transmissions per second). When $\mu(t) < \lambda_a(t)$ for an extended period, $B(t)$ grows, signifying that the queue is trending toward overload. The fluid model can incorporate a time-varying $\mu(t)$ that depends on the capture probability, which itself depends on $\lambda(t)$ [39]. By coupling

$$\lambda(t) = \frac{1}{L} \int_0^L \lambda(x,t)\, dx$$

and

$$\mu(t) = p\, \lambda(t)\, P_s(\lambda(t)),$$

one obtains a pair of coupled differential equations describing both the evolution of traffic density ($\lambda(x,t)$ via the LWR PDE) and the evolution of queue backlog $B(t)$. Such a model can reveal *emergent* phenomena such as wave-like expansions of backlog and persistent congestion states.

6.2. Large Deviations and Queue Stability

In many practical systems, the network is designed to handle typical loads but must also avoid catastrophic failure under rare surge events (e.g., multiple accidents or emergency alerts occurring simultaneously) [40]. Large deviations theory can quantify the probability that the queue length or delay crosses a critical threshold b over a time horizon T. For instance, one might estimate:

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\sup_{0 \le t \le T} B(t) \ge b\Big) \approx e^{-T\, I(b)},$$

where $I(b)$ is a rate function capturing how "expensive" it is for the backlog to exceed b. In the context of random-access vehicular networks, deriving $I(b)$ explicitly can be quite challenging, but approximate methods may be used to gauge the tail behavior of the backlog distribution. [41]

6.3. Potential for Load-Adaptive ALOHA

A key limitation of classical Slotted ALOHA in vehicular networks is that the access probability p remains fixed regardless of the traffic intensity or collision rate. In principle, one could design a *load-adaptive* ALOHA that senses the channel condition or estimates the local node density, then adjusts p accordingly to keep the system near an operational optimum. For instance, one might define:

$$p(\rho) = \min\left\{ p_{\max}, \frac{1}{\rho} \right\},$$

where $\rho = \frac{\lambda_a}{\mu}$ is an estimate of the traffic intensity at a node. Such a scheme could mitigate the onset of throughput collapse by reducing the number of transmissions as the load grows. However, implementing load-adaptive ALOHA in a fully decentralized manner for highly mobile vehicular nodes is non-trivial [42]. Accurate and timely estimation of ρ is complicated by fast-changing network conditions and interference from non-local vehicles.

7. Design Recommendations for Realistic Vehicular ALOHA

Based on our analysis, the following recommendations can be made to practitioners attempting to deploy Slotted ALOHA in real vehicular environments:

1. **Limit Operating Density:** For applications requiring reliable, low-latency communications, ensure that the average vehicle density $\lambda(t)$ remains significantly below the congestion threshold λ^*. Deploy traffic management strategies (ramp metering, variable speed limits) to reduce the likelihood of jam-density states. [43]
2. **Adaptive Power Control:** High transmit power expands interference ranges and aggravates collisions. Deploy power control (reducing P_t when the channel condition is good) to improve spatial reuse and limit hidden terminals.
3. **Slot Synchronization and Guard Bands:** Invest in robust synchronization (e.g., from roadside units) and incorporate guard intervals to accommodate moderate acceleration. Avoid overly long guard intervals, as they waste channel time, but ensure enough buffer to maintain orthogonal slots under typical acceleration scenarios.
4. **Congestion Control Mechanisms:** Combine Slotted ALOHA with local congestion control. For instance, if a node detects repeated collisions, it can reduce p or temporarily back off. Alternatively, incorporate an inter-vehicle coordination mechanism to prevent mutual interference among vehicles in close proximity. [44]
5. **Hybrid Access Strategies:** Consider layering a scheduled or reservation-based protocol on top of ALOHA for high-load scenarios. For instance, collision-free transmissions might be reserved for safety-critical messages, while random access is used for less urgent or opportunistic transmissions.

8. Conclusion

We have presented a detailed analytical framework for understanding the performance of Slotted ALOHA in realistic, time-varying vehicular networks. The framework integrates:

- *Traffic Flow Modeling:* The Lighthill-Whitham-Richards PDE to capture non-stationary density waves and shock formation in vehicular traffic.
- *Spatial Point Processes:* Non-homogeneous Poisson processes to represent the spatial distribution of vehicles, with minimum distance constraints.
- *Nakagami-m Fading and Path Loss:* Modeling of the wireless channel to incorporate realistic propagation and interference conditions.
- *Queueing and Delay Analysis:* M/G/1 approximations, fluid limits, and large deviations perspectives to characterize throughput and delay under dynamic loading.

Key Findings:

1. **Critical Density Thresholds:** Our derivations highlight the existence of a critical offered load G^* and corresponding critical vehicle density λ^*. Once traffic waves push $\lambda(t)$ above this threshold, collisions escalate rapidly, triggering a collapse in throughput and large tail delays. [45]
2. **Bimodal Delay Distributions:** In congested regimes, delay distributions exhibit heavy tails. This is problematic for real-time safety applications that require bounded latency.
3. **Synchronization and Hidden Nodes:** The performance envelope is further constrained by synchronization errors induced by vehicle mobility and by the prevalence of hidden terminals in large coverage ranges.
4. **Need for Adaptation:** Static Slotted ALOHA is poorly suited for dense vehicular environments. Load-adaptive or hybrid protocols are necessary to sustain acceptable QoS across varying density states.

Developing robust and low-overhead synchronization schemes is critical. GNSS-based synchronization can be supplemented with V2I reference signals, but the interplay between short guard intervals and high accelerations still requires more advanced solutions, such as predictive slot alignment or cooperative re-synchronization among neighboring vehicles. [46]

While our analysis focused on a single highway segment, real highways have multiple lanes, and urban grids introduce intersections and two-dimensional topologies. The LWR model can be extended to multi-lane traffic with additional rules for lane-changing. A more general PDE-based framework (like the Aw-Rascle-Zhang model) could potentially capture inertia and more realistic driver behaviors. [47]

When platooning systems or advanced driver assistance features (ACC, CACC) are present, vehicles tend to maintain tightly regulated inter-vehicle spacings, drastically altering the point process properties. Analytical extensions to handle correlated node placements with near-constant headways can refine the interference analysis.

Next-generation cellular V2X technologies propose hybrid access schemes with both scheduling and grant-free (ALOHA-like) modes. Mapping our results to 5G NR V2X or future 6G architectures, which employ more sophisticated waveforms, MIMO transmissions, and dynamic resource pools, remains an exciting avenue for research. [48]

In dense scenarios, altruistic or cooperative transmissions (e.g., transmit with lower probability to reduce collisions) can improve network-wide performance, but rational vehicles may deviate if they perceive that always transmitting yields higher personal utility. A game-theoretic framework that incentivizes cooperation while punishing greedy transmissions could lead to more stable outcomes. Slotted ALOHA, despite its simplicity, has historically been a cornerstone of random access protocol research. In the realm of vehicular networks, its basic principles still offer valuable insights into the interplay of mobility, interference, and delay [49]. However, real-world performance demands a host of enhancements—adaptive control, synchronization support, and synergy with scheduling—to handle the severe fluctuations in vehicle density and the high reliability/low latency requirements of emerging vehicular applications. Our models, while still idealized in certain respects (e.g., ignoring correlated shadowing, driver reaction diversity, and multi-lane complexities), illustrate the fundamental bottlenecks. They highlight the precarious balance between stable operation and collapse when faced with dynamic, bursty traffic flows. These considerations will remain central as we move toward fully connected and autonomous vehicular ecosystems in the coming decades. [50]

References

1. Zhang, H.; Peng, S.; Zhao, Y.; Bian, D. An Improved Algorithm of Slotted-ALOHA Based on Multichannel Statistics. In Proceedings of the 2012 Fifth International Symposium on Computational Intelligence and Design. IEEE, 2012, Vol. 1, pp. 37–40. https://doi.org/10.1109/iscid.2012.18.
2. Yamamoto, M.; Lorlertratna, T.; Ishida, A.; Okada, H.; Mutsuura, K. Slotted ALOHA with power assigning and immediate transmission controls. In Proceedings of the Proceedings of ICC/SUPERCOMM'94 - 1994 International Conference on Communications. IEEE, pp. 897–902. https://doi.org/10.1109/icc.1994.368968.
3. Tian, Y.; Kang, H., Research of Improved ALOHA Anti-collision Algorithm in RFID System; Springer Singapore: Germany, 2017; pp. 137–147. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3229-5_15.
4. Blaszczyszyn, B.; Muhlethaler, P. Interference and SINR coverage in spatial non-slotted Aloha networks. *annals of telecommunications - annales des télécommunications* **2015**, *70*, 345–358. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12243-014-0455-2.
5. Yan, X.; Yin, Z.; Xiong, Y. FGCN (1) - A Query Tree Dynamic Frame Slot ALOHA Collision Resolution Protocol for RFID Tags. In Proceedings of the 2008 Second International Conference on Future Generation Communication and Networking. IEEE, 2008, Vol. 1, pp. 198–201. https://doi.org/10.1109/fgcn.2008.12.
6. Ferrett, T.; Valenti, M.C. Reduced Complexity Detection for Network-Coded Slotted ALOHA using Sphere Decoding, 2015. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.1512.02819.
7. Zhang, X.; Tang, X.; Song, J.; Wang, L. Performance Analysis of ALOHA Algorithm in Mass RFID Tags Scenario. In Proceedings of the ICLEM 2010. American Society of Civil Engineers, September 2010, pp. 2566–2572. https://doi.org/10.1061/41139(387)358.

8. Fang, F.; Mao, Y. Binary exponential backoff algorithm for slotted ALOHA: Binary exponential backoff algorithm for slotted ALOHA. *Journal of Computer Applications* **2013**, *33*, 1203–1207. https://doi.org/10.3724/sp.j.1087.2013.01203.
9. Sarker, J.H.; Mouftah, H.T. Secured operating regions of Slotted ALOHA in the presence of interfering signals from other networks and DoS attacking signals. *Journal of Advanced Research* **2011**, *2*, 207–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2011.04.008.
10. Deng, H.; Fu, W.; Yao, M.; Zhou, Y.; Xia, S., Bit Slotted ALOHA Algorithm Based on a Polling Mechanism; Springer Singapore, 2020; pp. 483–492. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-8462-6_54.
11. Lin, Y.J.; Tzeng, S.S. Charging Selection Policies for Framed Slotted ALOHA on Wireless Networks with Directional Energy Transfer. *Wireless Personal Communications* **2024**, *134*, 171–187. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11277-024-10898-7.
12. Eaves, R. ALOHA/TDM Systems with Multiple Downlink Capacity. *IEEE Transactions on Communications* **1979**, *27*, 537–541. https://doi.org/10.1109/tcom.1979.1094430.
13. Badawy, M.; Khater, E.; Tolba, M.; Ibrahim, D.M.; El-Fishawy, N. A New technique for Underwater Wireless Sensor Network: Modified-Slotted-ALOHA Protocol. In Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Innovation and Intelligence for Informatics, Computing and Technologies (3ICT). IEEE, December 2020, pp. 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/3ict51146.2020.9312009.
14. Schoute, F. Dynamic Frame Length ALOHA. *IEEE Transactions on Communications* **1983**, *31*, 565–568. https://doi.org/10.1109/tcom.1983.1095854.
15. Balevi, E.; Gitlin, R.D. *5G World Forum - A Random Access Scheme for Large Scale 5G/IoT Applications*; IEEE, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1109/5gwf.2018.8517065.
16. Blaszczyszyn, B.; Mühlethaler, P.; Banaouas, S., Comparison of the Maximal Spatial Throughput of Aloha and CSMA in Wireless Ad-Hoc Networks; InTech, 2012; pp. 3–22. https://doi.org/10.5772/53264.
17. Iskandarani, M.Z. Vehicular Connectivity Analysis Using Enhanced Quality Slotted ALOHA (EQS-ALOHA). In Proceedings of the Science and Information Conference. Springer, 2024, pp. 484–509.
18. Sakakihara, K.; Hanaoka, M.; Yuba, Y. On the cusp catastrophe of slotted ALOHA systems with capture and multi-packet reception. In Proceedings of the IEEE GLOBECOM 1998 (Cat. NO. 98CH36250). IEEE, Vol. 5, pp. 3093–3098. https://doi.org/10.1109/glocom.1998.776639.
19. Liu, Z.; Zarki, M.E. PIMRC - Performance analysis of DS-CDMA with slotted ALOHA random access for packet PCNs. *Wireless Networks* **1995**, *1*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01196254.
20. Pandey, A. Slotted ALOHA Protocol for Next Generation IoT. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology* **2021**, *9*, 1099–1104. https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2021.38132.
21. Al-Naami, R.; Al-Meer, M. Performance of slotted ALOHA with multi-packet buffers. In Proceedings of the TENCON'92 - Technology Enabling Tomorrow. IEEE, pp. 669–673. https://doi.org/10.1109/tencon.1992.271887.
22. Leung, G.; Tavares, S.; McLane, P.J. Stability of slotted ALOHA access with capture provided by an adaptive array. In Proceedings of the Proceedings of ICC/SUPERCOMM '96 - International Conference on Communications. IEEE, Vol. 1, pp. 607–613. https://doi.org/10.1109/icc.1996.542268.
23. Lee, W.; Humblet, P.A. INFOCOM - Slotted ALOHA in high speed bidirectional bus networks. In Proceedings of the IEEE INFCOM '91. The conference on Computer Communications. Tenth Annual Joint Comference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies Proceedings. IEEE, 1991, pp. 221–227. https://doi.org/10.1109/infcom.1991.147507.
24. Zhang, M.; de Alfaro, L.; Garcia-Luna-Aceves, J. NetAI@SIGCOMM - An Adaptive Tree Algorithm to Approach Collision-Free Transmission in Slotted ALOHA. In Proceedings of the Proceedings of the Workshop on Network Meets AI & ML. ACM, August 2020, pp. 56–61. https://doi.org/10.1145/3405671.3405817.
25. Darus, M.Y.; Kamarudin, A.; Awang, N.; Ali, F.H.M. Analysis performance on contention-based MAC protocols in MANETs. In Proceedings of the 2014 4th World Congress on Information and Communication Technologies (WICT 2014). IEEE, 2014, pp. 303–307. https://doi.org/10.1109/wict.2014.7077284.
26. Thomopoulos, S.C.A. A simple and versatile decentralized control for slotted ALOHA, reservation ALOHA, and local area networks. *IEEE Transactions on Communications* **1988**, *36*, 662–674. https://doi.org/10.1109/26.2786.

27. Rivero-Angeles, M.E.; Lara-Rodriguez, D.; Cruz-Perez, F.A. VTC Fall - A new EDGE medium access control mechanism using adaptive traffic load slotted ALOHA. In Proceedings of the IEEE 54th Vehicular Technology Conference. VTC Fall 2001. Proceedings (Cat. No.01CH37211). IEEE, Vol. 3, pp. 1358–1362. https://doi.org/10.1109/vtc.2001.956418.
28. Trejo-Reyes, E.; McLernon, D.; O'Farrell, T. PIMRC - Stabilization of slotted ALOHA using a modified stochastic gradient algorithm. In Proceedings of the 14th IEEE Proceedings on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications, 2003. PIMRC 2003. IEEE, Vol. 2, pp. 1375–1379. https://doi.org/10.1109/pimrc.2003.1260338.
29. Chu, Y.; Mitchell, P.D.; Grace, D. ISWCS - ALOHA and Q-Learning based medium access control for Wireless Sensor Networks. In Proceedings of the 2012 International Symposium on Wireless Communication Systems (ISWCS). IEEE, 2012, pp. 511–515. https://doi.org/10.1109/iswcs.2012.6328420.
30. Gamer, T.; Yao, Y.D. Performance Analysis of Slotted ALOHA in a Weibull Fading Channel. In Proceedings of the 2008 IEEE Sarnoff Symposium. IEEE, 2008, pp. 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1109/sarnof.2008.4520064.
31. Badawy, M.; Khater, E.; Tolba, M.; Ibrahim, D.M.; El-Fishawy, N. A New Technique for Underwater Acoustic Wireless Sensor Network. In Proceedings of the 2020 15th International Conference on Computer Engineering and Systems (ICCES). IEEE, December 2020, pp. 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/icces51560.2020.9334682.
32. Yavascan, O.T.; Uysal, E. GLOBECOM (Workshops) - Analysis of Age-Aware Slotted ALOHA. In Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/gcwkshps50303.2020.9367557.
33. Abdellah, Z.; Abdelkrim, H. Enhanced Slotted Aloha Mechanism by Introducing ZigZag Decoding, 2015. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.1501.00976.
34. wei Deng, H.; Zeng, W.; Yao, M.; li Kong, J., ALOHA Anti-collision Algorithm for Frame Idle Slot Removal and Collision Reduction; Springer International Publishing, 2020; Vol. 97, pp. 160–170. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64690-5_15.
35. Arai, T.; Habuchi, H. PIMRC - A comparison of the M-ary/SSMA ALOHA system and the DS/SSMA ALOHA system. In Proceedings of the 11th IEEE International Symposium on Personal Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications. PIMRC 2000. Proceedings (Cat. No.00TH8525). IEEE, Vol. 2, pp. 1530–1534. https://doi.org/10.1109/pimrc.2000.881674.
36. Zhou, F.; Zhang, H. An new dynamic framed slotted ALOHA algorithm for RFID. In Proceedings of the 2007 International Conference on Communications, Circuits and Systems. IEEE, 2007, pp. 47–50. https://doi.org/10.1109/icccas.2007.6247593.
37. Dillon, D. ICCCN - Differentiated quality of service: slotted ALOHA. In Proceedings of the Proceedings. 13th International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks (IEEE Cat. No.04EX969). IEEE, pp. 343–346. https://doi.org/10.1109/icccn.2004.1401664.
38. Alsbou, N.; Refai, H.H. GLOBECOM - Dynamic Slot Allocation Algorithm for R-ALOHA with Priority (PR-ALOHA). In Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference GLOBECOM 2010. IEEE, 2010, pp. 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/glocom.2010.5683533.
39. Arai, T.; Habuchi, H. Performance evaluation of the M-ary/SSMA ALOHA system with CLSP. In Proceedings of the 2000 IEEE Sixth International Symposium on Spread Spectrum Techniques and Applications. ISSTA 2000. Proceedings (Cat. No.00TH8536). IEEE, Vol. 2, pp. 378–382. https://doi.org/10.1109/isssta.2000.876460.
40. Chung, J.M.; Liu, D.; Ramasamy, K.; Varadarajan, S. VTC Fall - OFDM frame synchronization in slotted ALOHA mobile communication systems. In Proceedings of the IEEE 54th Vehicular Technology Conference. VTC Fall 2001. Proceedings (Cat. No.01CH37211). IEEE, Vol. 3, pp. 1373–1377. https://doi.org/10.1109/vtc.2001.956421.
41. Takanashi, H.; Kayama, H.; Iizuka, M.; Morikura, M. ICC - Enhanced capture effect for slotted ALOHA employing transmission power control corresponding to offered traffic. In Proceedings of the ICC '98. 1998 IEEE International Conference on Communications. Conference Record. Affiliated with SUPERCOMM'98 (Cat. No.98CH36220). IEEE, Vol. 3, pp. 1622–1626. https://doi.org/10.1109/icc.1998.683103.
42. Mandal, P.; De, S.; Chakraborty, S. A receiver synchronized slotted Aloha for underwater wireless networks with imprecise propagation delay information. *Ad Hoc Networks* **2013**, *11*, 1443–1455. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adhoc.2011.01.019.
43. Gupta, S.; Gupta, H. Simulation of Slotted, Controlled and Heirarchical Alohas. *IETE Journal of Education* **2004**, *45*, 183–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/09747338.2004.11415849.

44. Lo, F.; Ng, T.S.; Yuk, T.I. Performance analysis of a slotted CDMA ALOHA network. *International Journal of Wireless Information Networks* **1996**, *3*, 195–202. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02109335.
45. Choi, H.H.; Oh, J.; Kang, K.M.; Lee, H. Idle-Less Slotted ALOHA Protocol for Drone Swarm Identification. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* **2023**, *72*, 11080–11085. https://doi.org/10.1109/tvt.2023.3261104.
46. Lim, J.T. Simple input control procedure for slotted ALOHA. *Electronics Letters* **1993**, *29*, 1070–1072. https://doi.org/10.1049/el:19930715.
47. Ahmetoglu, M.; Yavascan, O.T.; Uysal, E. MiSTA: An Age-Optimized Slotted ALOHA Protocol, 2021. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2105.05129.
48. Horiuchi, T.; Sakakibara, K.; Taketsugu, J. On Bistable Region of Slotted-ALOHA Systems with Delay Constraints. *Universal Journal of Communications and Network* **2016**, *4*, 29–35. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujcn.2016.040201.
49. Vázquez-Cortizo, D.; Garcia, J.; Blondia, C.; Houdt, B.V. FIFO by sets ALOHA (FS-ALOHA): a collision resolution algorithm for the contention channel in wireless ATM systems. *Performance Evaluation* **1999**, *36*, 401–427. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-5316(99)00033-4.
50. de Graaf, P.; Lehnert, J.S. Performance comparison of a slotted ALOHA DS/SSMA network and a multichannel narrow-band slotted ALOHA network. *IEEE Transactions on Communications* **1998**, *46*, 544–552. https://doi.org/10.1109/26.664310.