

Multi-AP Coordinated Spatial Reuse for Wi-Fi 8: Group Creation and Scheduling

David Nunez^{*}, Malcom Smith^b, and Boris Bellalta^{*}

^{*}Wireless Networking @ Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona; ^bCisco Inc., USA

Abstract—Multi-Access Point Coordination (MAPC) will be a key feature in next generation Wi-Fi 8 networks. MAPC aims to improve the overall network performance by allowing Access Points (APs) to share time, frequency and/or spatial resources in a coordinated way, thus alleviating inter-AP contention and enabling new multi-AP channel access strategies. This paper introduces a framework to support periodic MAPC transmissions on top of current Wi-Fi operation. We first focus on the problem of creating multi-AP groups that can transmit simultaneously to leverage Spatial Reuse opportunities. Then, once these groups are created, we study different scheduling algorithms to determine which groups will transmit at every MAPC transmission. Two different types of algorithms are tested: per-AP, and per-Group. While per-AP algorithms base their scheduling decision on the buffer state of individual APs, per-Group algorithms do that taking into account the aggregate buffer state of all APs in a group. Obtained results—targetting worst-case delay—show that per-AP based algorithms outperform per-Group ones due to their ability to guarantee that the AP with a) more packets, or b) with the oldest waiting packet in the buffer is selected.

Index Terms—Multi-AP Coordination, Coordinated Spatial Reuse, Wi-Fi 7, Wi-Fi 8, IEEE 802.11be, IEEE 802.11bn, WLANs.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the consumption of high-bandwidth and real-time applications constitutes a massive challenge for operators and network companies to deliver these contents to end users. Video streaming is becoming more popular than ever. Only in the first half of 2021 it represented the 53.72% of all Internet downlink traffic [1]. Beyond traditional video streaming consumption, cloud gaming [2], virtual and augmented reality (VR/AR) [3] are rapidly becoming more and more popular, hence further contributing to increasing the demand of interactive and delay-sensitive contents.

To get over that, Wi-Fi networks are constantly evolving to address not only the high requirements of these applications in terms of throughput and/or latency, but also the increasing number of users and the traffic volume on Internet. Access Point (AP) densification (i.e., covering the same area with a high number of APs) has been the natural response to cope with such a situation. This approach allows stations to benefit from high Signal to Noise (SNR) levels, as they are close to their serving APs, resulting in the use of high

transmission rates. However, when the number of co-located APs is high, the limited number of frequency channels may result in detrimental high contention and interference levels, as well as affecting the ability of Wi-Fi networks to provide a reliable service. Improving this situation is set as a requirement for future Wi-Fi 8 by the 802.11 Ultra-High Reliable (UHR) Study Group [4].

A solution to mitigate the high contention levels in dense Wi-Fi deployments is to coordinate transmissions from the set of overlapping APs. To support such an objective, the Multi Access Point Coordination (MAPC) framework [5]–[7] was initially included as part of the IEEE 802.11be (11be) amendment [8] candidate features, although its development has been postponed for the future Wi-Fi 8 amendment — likely to be named as IEEE 802.11bn— leaving Multi-link Operation [9], [10] as the key and most disruptive feature of IEEE 802.11be. MAPC allows APs to share time, frequency and/or spatial resources in a controlled manner, alleviating Overlapping Basic Service Set (OBSS) contention, and enabling the implementation of WLAN-level scheduling mechanisms. However, there are still several challenges to solve. Among them, we need (i) to design a protocol for coordinating the transmissions from the set of overlapping APs; (ii) a mechanism to decide which of the overlapping APs are compatible to transmit at the same time by, for instance, leveraging Spatial Reuse (SR) opportunities; and (iii) a mechanism to decide which of those compatible APs are allocated to each coordinated transmission.

In this paper, to deal with these aforementioned challenges, we present a framework to support MAPC on Wi-Fi networks. It combines *i*) periodic downlink ‘MAPC transmissions’ that are able to leverage Spatial Reuse opportunities when possible, with *ii*) un-coordinated CSMA/CA ‘breathing’ periods in between to account for other downlink and uplink traffic. In detail, the main contributions of this paper are:

- 1) A MAPC framework, to leverage both coordinated and uncoordinated transmissions on top of a multi-AP WLAN.
- 2) A low-complexity algorithm to build groups of compatible APs able to transmit simultaneously by leveraging Spatial Reuse opportunities.
- 3) Different scheduling algorithms to select the groups of APs that will be scheduled in each MAPC transmission. Two types of algorithms are considered: per-AP and per-Group algorithms.

D. Nunez and B. Bellalta were supported in part by grants Wi-XR PID2021-123995NB-I00 (MCIU/AEI/FEDER,UE), and Cisco. The authors thank the comments and inputs received while preparing this work by Prof. S. Avallone and Dr. P. Imputato.

- 4) Insights on how to configure several key parameters used by the group creation algorithm, and on the performance of the per-AP vs per-Group scheduling algorithms.

This paper extends the work done in [7]. Novel aspects in this paper include the definition of practical algorithms for the creation of compatible groups and group scheduling under finite load conditions.

II. RELATED WORK

Currently, there are only a few works that delve into MAPC to leverage Spatial Reuse opportunities, and most of the information available are still directly coming from TGbe documents. In [11], the process to transmit in coordinated Spatial Reuse (c-SR) mode is split into three phases and the authors investigate several operation issues, such as information exchange about transmission power levels (one-way or bidirectional), path loss, and block acknowledgment. In addition, authors in [12]–[14] provide simulation results showing the potential performance gains of c-SR. For example, the work in [13] showcases some of the benefits of using c-SR compared with the default Enhanced Distributed Channel Access (EDCA) mechanism. Besides, in [12], the gains of c-SR are two times higher than the legacy systems. Similarly, the authors in [14] make a comparison between c-SR and coordinated Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiple Access (c-OFDMA), showing that the throughput for the former exceeds (twice in some cases) the latter. The work in [15] exhibits a novel transmission scheme for 11be networks, utilizing the concept of multi-AP c-OFDMA. The author shows that the c-OFDMA scheme effectively allows APs to increase the number of transmission opportunities, achieving a higher throughput than DL OFDMA in IEEE 802.11ax. Finally, the authors in [16], propose a scheme to identify the interference-free APs and a method to reduce the amount of shared information between coordinated devices using Q-learning. To the best of our knowledge, none of the works published so far deal with the scheduling process in MAPC networks and also mechanisms to create groups of compatible APs that employ c-SR scheme. Thus, this work explores alternatives to cover these open challenges and also evaluates through simulations the results when each of the proposed algorithms is employed.

III. MULTI-AP COORDINATION

To support MAPC transmissions, we consider all APs share information with a central controller (CC¹). The CC is responsible for computing and periodically informing transmission parameters, as well as the most suitable subset of transmitting APs for every Transmission Opportunity (TXOP). APs and CC exchange most of the information through a low-latency and high bandwidth wired backbone.

One of the APs acts as the MAPC transmission initiator, while the other APs will simply follow the received indications. We will refer to the AP initiating the shared

¹This function could be implemented on a device like an AP, but for a more realistic approach and to avoid complexity on access points, we consider the existence of an external central controller.

transmissions as the Sharing AP, and to the rest of APs as the Shared APs. Therefore, the Sharing AP is in charge to initiate the transmission, reserving the channel, and inform which other APs will participate in the TXOP, including the parameters to do so. In this paper we assume all APs are within the coverage area of the Sharing AP.

The operation of the proposed MAPC framework is shown in Fig. 1. It allows several APs to share a TXOP opportunity. In the proposed framework, MAPC transmissions are scheduled periodically every T ms with uncoordinated (default CSMA/CA) transmissions in between. A MAPC transmission is initiated when the Sharing AP accesses the channel and sends a MAP request-to-send (MAP-RTS) frame for channel reservation.² If no collision occurs,³ the Shared APs reply at the same time with a MAP clear-to-send (MAP-CTS) frame. The latter is also useful to inform stations or legacy devices about the ongoing MAPC transmission, so it avoids unwanted collisions with hidden devices. At this point, the Sharing AP assumes that all neighboring devices have properly set their network allocation vector (NAV), and so the MAPC transmission will not be disturbed until it ends. Since it is the Sharing AP who shares the TXOP with the other APs, we will use both MAPC transmission and TXOP sharing transmission terms indistinctly.

Once the Sharing AP accesses the channel, it splits the gained TXOP in one or more temporal slots, to which we refer as coordinated slots. One or more APs can be allocated in each coordinated slot. To do that, the Sharing AP sends a MAP trigger frame (MAP-TF) to allocate the next coordinated slot to one or more APs, including also the settings to use, such as the modulation and coding scheme (MCS) to be used by the Shared APs. When a coordinated slot is allocated to a single AP, the TXOP is shared following a traditional time division multiple access (TDMA) scheme. Otherwise, if several APs are allocated to the same coordinated slot, TDMA is enhanced with Spatial Reuse.

To create the groups of compatible APs that can be allocated to the same coordinated slot, the CC needs to know the received signal strength indicator (RSSI) at the stations from all APs. Due to the symmetry of the channel, we consider that this information is obtained from the opposite path, i.e., by measuring the received power from uplink frames (either data or ACK⁴ frames). Each AP stores the RSSI of all overheard stations, sharing this information with the CC through the wired backbone.

The uncoordinated CSMA/CA period after each MAPC transmission can be used by any AP and station to transmit either downlink or uplink traffic following default Wi-Fi operation.

²Favourable EDCA parameters can be used to almost always guarantee that MAPC transmissions win access to the channel as earlier as possible.

³Although not strictly necessary, the use of Restricted Target Wake Time (R-TWT) [8] may provide extra protection to MAPC transmission.

⁴We assume ACKs are correctly received in all cases.




Figure 1: MAPC framework operation. Periodic slots start at every T ms with un-coordinated transmissions in between. The TXOP-sharing period is divided into coordinated slots, allowing both c-TDMA and/or c-TDMA/SR transmissions.

IV. C-TDMA/SR SCHEDULING

The MAPC scheduling is split into two main stages: the **First Stage** includes the creation of the SR-Compatible groups⁵ based on the signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) between all AP and station pairs, and the **Second Stage**, which employs the built groups to select which APs are scheduled in every MAPC transmission. We consider the two stages are performed at the CC and communicated to the Sharing AP.

A. First Stage: SR-Compatible group formation

The First Stage provides a procedure to verify the compatibility of a group of APs to transmit simultaneously. We have designed an algorithm to create groups of compatible APs based on the SINR at their associated stations.

1) *SINR requirements*: As previously indicated in Section III, we assume reciprocal uplink and downlink links, so the power overheard by all the APs from uplink frames is assumed to be equivalent to the power received at the stations from downlink transmissions. All APs share this information with the CC, who stores it in a database for all AP-STA links.

For a given subset of APs, of size M , the power received at each of their stations must exceed the aggregate interference level by, at least, the value of γ . The CC verifies such a condition using the following expression:

$$\min_{i=1..M} \left(10 \log_{10}(\bar{P}^i) - 10 \log_{10} \left(\bar{W} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^J \bar{P}_j^i \right) \right) \geq \gamma \quad (1)$$

where \bar{P}^i and \bar{P}_j^i are vectors that contain the RSSI values seen from all the stations associated to AP _{i} , when AP _{i} and

AP _{j} (potential interferer) transmit at the same time.⁶ Besides, \bar{W} is the noise power, and γ is the SINR threshold used. Note that, the higher the value of γ , the lower the probability of finding groups with a high number of compatible access points. Thus, all APs in the subset must satisfy (1) to form an SR-compatible group.

2) *SR-compatible group formation, At-most-K*: In the following we describe the At-most-K algorithm we introduce in this paper to create these groups of compatible APs.

The creation of the groups is performed taking every AP in the network as reference (or head of a group), thus resulting in a number of groups at most equal to the number of APs. Then, we add another AP at every iteration until the maximum number of APs allowed in a group, K , is reached.⁷ For example, considering AP₁ as the reference (the CC is building the first coordinated group), it means that this group may contain up to the $K - 1$ most convenient access points from the perspective of AP₁, i.e., the algorithm sequentially adds the other $K - 1$ APs that have the lowest values of RSSI seen from stations associated to AP₁ (the highest RSSI value from the other APs seen from the stations associated to AP₁ covers the worst case). Thus, at every iteration, one of these pre-selected APs is added to the group only if the SINR at all the involved stations is above γ in (1). Then, the operation is repeated selecting another AP as the reference, and so on.

This condition of selecting the most compatible APs from the perspective of only one AP does not guarantee that the best possible SR group is created, because they probably are not the best choice for other APs in the group different from the reference one. Therefore, selecting a value of γ high enough is crucial to guarantee good SINR levels for all stations

⁶Note that to create a group, we add APs sequentially. When a new AP is added, we guarantee both it is compatible with the rest of APs in the group, and that the other APs in the group are also compatible with the new one.

⁷ K has been empirically selected for this paper, and a detailed analysis of this is left for future work.

⁵Groups of APs that can transmit simultaneously using SR.

associated to any of the APs that belong to the same group, even if they are not the reference one.

Note that, better-located APs will belong to several groups, but the final decision about which group(s) will transmit in the next TXOP is done in the Second Stage and it depends on the number of packets that APs have in their buffers, which is directly related to the time that a group has been waiting for transmitting.

B. Second Stage: Traffic Scheduling Algorithms

The Second Stage is intended for scheduling one SR-compatible group (from the ones previously computed in the First Stage) per coordinated slot based on the buffer state information collected from all APs, which contains the number of packets in the transmission buffer of each AP, as well as the arrival time of the oldest packet.

a) *NumPkSingle*: The CC selects the AP with the highest number of packets waiting in the buffer. Then, considering only the groups created in the First Stage that contain the selected AP, the CC schedules the group of APs with the highest number of packets, calculated as the sum across all individual APs.

b) *NumPkGroup*: The CC selects the group of APs with the highest number of packets.

c) *OldPkSingle*: The CC selects the AP with the oldest packet waiting in the buffer. Then using the groups created in the First Stage that contain the selected AP, the CC schedules the group with the highest aggregate delay, calculated as the sum of the waiting time of the oldest packet across all individual APs.

d) *OldPkGroup*: The CC selects the group with the maximum aggregate group delay, i.e., the sum of the time that the oldest packet in the buffer of each individual AP has been waiting.

For the sake of fairness between groups, *NumPkGroup* (*OldPkGroup*) values are normalized by the number of APs in each group, so we avoid that groups with a few (large) number of APs starve.

V. SYSTEM MODEL

To evaluate the performance of the MAPC framework, and assess the operation of the group creation algorithm and the proposed traffic schedulers, we consider the following scenario.

A. Deployment

We divide the area of interest in 9 subareas of 10x10 meters each, and at the center of each subarea we deploy one AP as shown in Fig. 2. All APs are set to operate in the same channel. We designate AP₅ (the AP in the middle) as the Sharing AP since all the other APs are within its coverage area. $N = 3$ stations are randomly placed in each subarea, and associated to the nearest AP, which in this case always corresponds to the one placed at the subarea center.

Multiple transmission rates are allowed, so stations close (far) from their AP use higher (lower) MCSs to transmit and

receive data. The MCS used by a given AP to transmit to a station depends on the SINR observed by the station. This value is estimated by the CC given the group of APs that will simultaneously transmit using the RSSI information collected from uplink frames. This value is announced in the MAP-TF frames by the sharing AP when a coordinated transmission starts. To allocate a specific MCS to an AP-STA pair, we employ the curves presented in [17]. These curves give the SINR ranges corresponding to each MCS that ensure an error-free transmission. A-MPDU transmissions are enabled in each coordinated slot, with the maximum number of aggregated packets depending on the MCS used and the slot duration.




Figure 2: An Enterprise WLAN scenario, with multiple APs.

The path loss is modelled using the TGax model for Enterprise Scenarios [18]:

$$P_L = 40.05 + 20 \log_{10} \left(\frac{\min(d, B_p) f_c}{2.4} \right) + P' + 7W_n, \quad (2)$$

where d is the distance between the transmitter and the receiver in meters, f_c is the central frequency in GHz, W_n is the number of walls and P' is given by $P' = 35 \log_{10}(d/B_p)$, when d is higher than the breaking point B_p . Otherwise, it is zero.

Only downlink traffic is considered, i.e., from the AP to the stations. The traffic generation process works as follows: Just before every MAPC transmission, $N_p = 10$ packets for each station arrive at its corresponding AP with probability p depending on the considered traffic load. Three different per-STA load levels are employed to refer to low, medium and high load conditions: 1, 6 and 8 Mbps, respectively. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that buffers in all APs are large enough so that incoming packets are never lost due to buffer overflow.

B. Operation

The proposed MAPC framework operates as it is shown in Fig. 1. MAPC transmissions are scheduled to start at every nT , $n = 0, 1, \dots, N_{SN} - 1$, where $N_{SN} = 10000$ is the total number of MAPC transmissions considered in each simulation. Each MAPC transmission consists of several c-TDMA or c-TDMA/SR length-variable coordinated slots (the actual value depends on the number of packets and the MCSs used to

Table I: Simulation Parameters.

| Parameter | Value | Parameter | Value |
|--|-------|--|-------|
| B_p | 10 | W_n | 3 |
| Number of spatial streams | 1 | T [ms] | 5 |
| $T_{\text{TXOP-MAX}}$ [ms] | 3 | Max MCS [index] | 0-10 |
| $T_{\text{MAP-RTS}}$ [μs] | 80 | $T_{\text{MAP-CTS}}$ [μs] | 62 |
| $T_{\text{CTS-TO}}$ [μs] | 41 | $T_{\text{MAP-TF}}$ [μs] | 76 |
| T_e [μs] | 9 | AP Tx-power [dBm] | 23 |
| L [bytes] | 1500 | CCA [dBm] | -82 |

transmit them), followed by uncoordinated transmissions using the legacy CSMA/CA mechanism. The duration of a given MAPC transmission is determined by the scheduler, although it must not exceed its maximum value, i.e., $T_{\text{TXOP-MAX}}$. The $T_{\text{TXOP-MAX}}$ duration is also a parameter used by the CC to control the amount of time devoted to MAPC transmissions, and it can be modified depending on the scenario.

VI. SIMULATION RESULTS

We present and discuss the results obtained from running simulations on Matlab and taking the Scenario described in Section V. Results labelled with c-TDMA (without SR) correspond to the case where only one AP is allowed to transmit in each coordinated slot of a MAPC transmission.⁸ The parameters used for the numerical simulations are shown in Table I.

A. A specific scenario

In this section, we study the scenario shown in Fig. 2 with nine APs and three STAs per AP. Fig. 3a shows the aggregate throughput and average delay, using NumPkSingle, NumPkGroup, OldPkSingle, OldPkGroup, c-TDMA-NumPk and c-TDMA-OldPk algorithms. The same value of $\gamma = 20$ dBs is used in all cases, as well as the maximum number of APs per group, i.e., $K = 3$, for the SR-compatible group formation. With respect to the throughput, as expected, c-TDMA approaches reach saturation before the SR ones. In the case of the average delay, similarly, SR approaches outperform c-TDMA ones. Moreover, comparing SR scheduling algorithms between them, NumPkSingle and OldPkSingle perform better than the rest on low (< 100 Mbps) and medium (100-200 Mbps) load conditions, pointing out the advantage of always scheduling the AP with more packets in the buffer. For high load all the algorithms that support SR transmissions perform similar.

Figs. 3b and 3c show the aggregate throughput and average delay for different values of γ and K . The case when $\gamma = 14$ is used (Fig. 3b), exhibits a worse performance (saturation throughput is reached earlier) for $K = 3$ than for $K = 2$, due to using a low value of γ . The reason is that in some cases the SINR at the stations with $K = 3$ is lower than for $K = 2$, and therefore a more robust MCS index will be used for $K = 3$. On the contrary, Fig. 3c exhibits a gain for $K = 3$ with respect to $K = 2$ because the value of γ is set to guarantee that the

SINR at the stations is at least 20 dB. Thus, even if we have less groups with three APs, the high value of γ guarantees they will be able to use high MCS for the data transmission. In summary, both γ and K are tuneable parameters that can be optimized for each individual scenario.

Fig. 4 shows the 95th-percentile delay achieved by the different algorithms for the case with $K = 3$ and $\gamma = 20$. In all cases, per-AP schemes outperform per-Group ones. Interestingly, scheduling algorithms based on the number of packets in the buffer outperform delay based ones also in the worst-case delay since they are able to schedule more efficient transmissions.

B. Random scenarios

Results in this section are obtained through the simulation of 1000 random deployments. In each deployment, while stations are generated uniformly at random inside each subarea, APs are kept at the center of each one. In all scenarios, we have considered $K = 3$, $\gamma = 20$, and a traffic load of 8 Mbps per station, which represents an aggregate load of 216 Mbps.

Fig. 5 exhibits the Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) of the 95th-percentile delay over multiple generated random scenarios. c-TDMA algorithms show the worst delay, with a difference between them and c-SR ones exceeding 4 ms for most of the percentiles. Note that, as before, the algorithms that schedule the groups based on the number of packets, perform better than the ones using the oldest packet criterion. The reason is that the delay-based algorithms are not able to schedule as many packets per MAPC transmission as the number of packets-based ones, which turns out to be also counterproductive in terms of delay.

Finally, Fig. 6 shows the MAPC slot occupancy, defined as the ratio between the time spent by cooperative transmissions and the maximum duration of MAPC transmission. The lower the ratio, the more efficient the use of the MAPC slots, increasing the amount of time available for uncoordinated CSMA/CA transmissions. Note that, OldPkGroup not only achieves the worst overall results as seen previously, but also it requires the largest MAPC transmissions.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have introduced and evaluated a framework for multi-AP coordinated transmissions. We also proposed a method to create groups of SR-compatible APs, and a set of algorithms to schedule coordinated transmissions. Results evidence that algorithms based-on per-AP selection perform better than the per-Group selection ones.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sandvine, "The Global Internet Phenomena Report," <https://www.sandvine.com/phenomena>, 2022.
- [2] M. Carrascosa and B. Bellalta, "Cloud-gaming: Analysis of google stadia traffic," *Computer Communications*, vol. 188, pp. 99–116, 2022.
- [3] S. Zhao, H. Abou-zeid, R. Atawia, Y. S. K. Manjunath, A. B. Sediq, and X.-P. Zhang, "Virtual Reality Gaming on the Cloud: A Reality Check," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.10114*, 2021.

⁸The advantages of c-TDMA/SR vs legacy 802.11 are shown in [7].




Figure 3: Aggregate (WLAN) throughput and average delay in the scenario of Fig. 2 for different values of γ and K .




Figure 4: 95th-percentile delay for different algorithms in the scenario of Fig. 2, $\gamma = 20$ and $K = 3$.




Figure 6: CDF of the MAPC slot occupancy between random scenarios.




Figure 5: CDF of the 95th-percentile delay between random scenarios.

- [4] "IEEE 802.11-22/0078r3: 802.11 UHR Draft Proposed PAR," <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0078-03-0uhr-ubr-draft-proposed-par.docx>, January 2023, accessed on 08/02/2023.
- [5] A. Garcia-Rodriguez, D. López-Pérez, L. Galati-Giordano, and G. Geraci, "IEEE 802.11be: Wi-Fi 7 Strikes Back," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 102–108, 2021.
- [6] E. Khorov, I. Levitsky, and I. F. Akyildiz, "Current Status and Directions of IEEE 802.11be, the Future Wi-Fi 7," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 88 664–88 688, 2020.
- [7] D. Nunez, F. Wilhelm, S. Avallone, M. Smith, and B. Bellalta, "TXOP sharing with Coordinated Spatial Reuse in Multi-AP Cooperative IEEE 802.11be WLANs," in *2022 IEEE 19th Annual Consumer Communications Networking Conference (CCNC)*, 2022, pp. 864–870.
- [8] "IEEE P802.11be Draft Standard for Information technology—Telecommunications and information exchange between systems Lo-

cal and metropolitan area networks— Specific requirements. Part 11: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications. Amendment 8: Enhancements for extremely high throughput (EHT)," May 2022.

- [9] Á. López-Raventós and B. Bellalta, "Multi-link Operation in IEEE 802.11 be WLANs," *IEEE Wireless Communications (arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.07499)*, 2022.
- [10] M. Carrascosa, G. Geraci, E. Knightly, and B. Bellalta, "An experimental study of latency for IEEE 802.11 be multi-link operation," in *ICC 2022-IEEE International Conference on Communications*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 2507–2512.
- [11] J. Han *et al.*, "Coordinated Spatial Reuse: Focus on Downlink," May 2020, doc.: IEEE 802.11-20/0590r5.
- [12] K. Aio *et al.*, "Coordinated Spatial Reuse Performance Analysis," September 2019, doc.: IEEE 802.11-19/1534r5.
- [13] D. Akhmetov *et al.*, "Multi-AP coordination for spatial reuse," 2020, doc.: IEEE 802.11-20/0107r1.
- [14] Y. Seok *et al.*, "Coordinated Spatial Reuse (C-SR) Protocol," April 2020, doc.: IEEE 802.11-20/0576r1.
- [15] W. Ahn, "Novel Multi-AP Coordinated Transmission Scheme for 7th Generation WLAN 802.11be," *Entropy*, vol. 22, no. 12, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/1099-4300/22/12/1426>
- [16] Y. Kihira, K. Yamamoto, A. Taya, T. Nishio, Y. Koda, and K. Yano, "Interference-free ap identification and shared information reduction for tabular q-learning-based wlan coordinated spatial reuse," *IEICE Communications Express*, vol. advpub, p. 2022XBL0051, 2022.
- [17] A. Krotov, A. Kiryanov, and E. Khorov, "Rate Control With Spatial Reuse for Wi-Fi 6 Dense Deployments," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 168 898–168 909, 2020.
- [18] S. Merlin *et al.*, "TGax Simulation Scenarios," Nov. 2015, doc.: IEEE 802.11-14/0980r16.