Quality and Access in Wireless Networks: A Game-Theoretic Optimization Approach

Pavel Malinovskiy[1]

[1]ORCID: 0009-0008-3756-5271
[*]Corresponding author: ifyou@say.do

Abstract

The rapid proliferation of wireless networks has revolutionized how individuals and organizations access information and communicate. However, meeting the ever-growing demand for high-quality service and equitable access across heterogeneous user populations remains an enduring challenge. Existing solutions such as adaptive bitrate streaming (ABR), distributed rate-limiting algorithms, multi-server cloud-assisted architectures, and rural network deployment strategies each tackle specific facets of this complex problem, but lack a unified optimization framework that explicitly balances competing objectives: maximizing Quality of Experience (QoE), ensuring fairness in access, and controlling operational costs.

In this paper, we propose a comprehensive game-theoretic optimization approach for managing quality and access in wireless networks under constrained resources and dynamic demand. Drawing insights from recent advances in ABR for both constant and variable bitrate encodings, distributed flow control in cloud-based services, multipath redundancy in 5G vehicular communications, and innovative rural connectivity schemes such as Direct-to-Mobile (D2M) broadcasting, we model the interaction between service providers and users as a hierarchical Stackelberg game. In our model, the provider acts as the leader by setting pricing and bandwidth allocation policies to maximize revenue and maintain network stability, while users act as followers who adapt their bitrate demands to maximize their individual QoE under imposed constraints and data caps. This framework explicitly incorporates fairness considerations through the inclusion of the Jain fairness index as a constraint in the provider's optimization problem.

We derive closed-form equilibrium strategies for both the provider and the users, characterizing the conditions under which the system achieves efficient and fair resource allocation. Our simulations demonstrate that the proposed approach improves average Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) and fairness, reduces stalls, and achieves higher bandwidth utilization compared to conventional single-server and distributed rate-limiting approaches. Furthermore, our framework is extensible to scenarios involving heterogeneous traffic, multipath redundancy, and access in underserved rural regions, making it applicable to a wide range of deployment contexts.

This work provides a theoretical foundation and practical guidelines for designing next-generation wireless networks that can sustainably deliver high-quality and equitable services even under tight resource and competitive market conditions. We believe that the proposed framework can inform policy-making, infrastructure investment decisions, and the design of adaptive network protocols, contributing to the advancement of inclusive and resilient wireless communication ecosystems.

Keywords

Wireless networks; Quality of Experience; Access fairness; Game theory; Stackelberg equilibrium; Adaptive bitrate streaming; Distributed rate limiting; Multipath redundancy; Direct-to-Mobile broadcasting; Rural connectivity

1 Introduction

Wireless networks have become indispensable for modern society, enabling ubiquitous access to information, communication, and a host of cloud-based services. Over the past decade, the exponential growth of mobile broadband usage, driven by video streaming, real-time conferencing, and Internet of Things (IoT) applications, has placed unprecedented demands on network infrastructure (1; 3). Despite significant advances in 4G, 5G, and beyond, service providers face the persistent challenge of delivering high Quality of Experience (QoE) to heterogeneous users while maintaining fairness and controlling operational costs. In many cases, users compete for limited resources in a shared wireless medium, and the provider must allocate bandwidth judiciously to maximize system-wide performance.

Several techniques have been proposed to address aspects of this challenge. Adaptive Bitrate (ABR) streaming adjusts video quality dynamically to match fluctuating network conditions, trading off resolution for reduced stalls and better responsiveness (3). Distributed rate-limiting mechanisms like Global Random Drop (GRD) and Flow Proportional Share (FPS) help prevent network congestion by enforcing global usage caps (2). Multi-server and cloud-assisted architectures have been deployed to improve scalability and fault tolerance in HTTP Live Streaming (HLS) systems (1), and multipath redundancy techniques in vehicular 5G networks have shown promise for enhancing reliability and throughput under highly variable channel conditions (8). Finally, rural and underserved regions are increasingly targeted by innovative solutions like Direct-to-Mobile (D2M) broadcasting, balloon-based Loon projects, and low-power small cells to extend coverage at low cost (4; 6).

However, these solutions are often implemented in isolation and fail to consider the complex interaction between provider policies and user behavior. Users, motivated by their individual QoE, naturally compete for bandwidth, while providers seek to maximize revenue and minimize costs. This competitive dynamic calls for a unifying mathematical framework that explicitly models and optimizes these conflicting objectives.

In this work, we propose a game-theoretic optimization approach to jointly address QoE maximization, fairness, and cost-efficiency in wireless networks. We model the interaction between the provider and users as a hierarchical Stackelberg game. In this game, the provider (leader) sets per-user prices $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_N)$ and allocates resources to maximize its utility. Each user i (follower) responds by selecting a bitrate b_i to maximize their own perceived utility:

$$U_i(b_i) = \alpha_i \ln(1 + b_i) - (\beta_i + p_i)b_i, \tag{1}$$

where α_i models the user's sensitivity to quality and β_i captures constraints like data caps.

The provider's objective is to solve:

$$\max_{\mathbf{p}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i b_i^*(p_i) - C\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^*(p_i)\right), \tag{2}$$

subject to the total capacity constraint:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^*(p_i) \leq B_{\text{total}}, \tag{3}$$

where $b_i^*(p_i)$ is the user's best response:

$$b_i^*(p_i) = \max\left(0, \frac{\alpha_i}{p_i + \beta_i} - 1\right). \tag{4}$$

To quantify fairness, we incorporate the Jain's fairness index:

$$J(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i\right)^2}{N \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^2}. \tag{5}$$

The provider may impose a minimum fairness level J_{min} as a policy constraint.

Table 1 summarizes the key parameters used in the model.

Our contributions in this paper are threefold. First, we develop a Stackelberg game model tailored to wireless networks, capturing the interplay of QoE, fairness, and cost. Second, we derive equilibrium strategies and characterize their properties. Third, we demonstrate through simulation that our approach achieves superior PSNR, fairness, and bandwidth utilization compared to traditional methods, making it particularly suited for both dense urban and underserved rural deployments.

This introduction sets the stage for a comprehensive analysis of quality and access optimization using game theory, offering insights relevant to network designers, policymakers, and researchers aiming to build inclusive and efficient wireless systems.

Symbol	Description
N	Number of users
B_{total}	Total available bandwidth
b_i	Bitrate chosen by user i
p_i	Price per unit bitrate charged to user i
α_i	User i's quality preference parameter
β_i	User i's data cap sensitivity
$U_i(b_i)$	User i's utility function
$C(B)$	Provider's cost function
$J(\mathbf{b})$	Jain's fairness index

Table 1: Notation used in the game-theoretic model.

2 System Model

In this section, we present a detailed mathematical model of the wireless network system that captures the interaction between the service provider and a population of heterogeneous users. The model incorporates key aspects of Quality of Experience (QoE), access fairness, data caps, and operational costs, allowing us to formulate the optimization problem as a hierarchical game. We also define the notation and assumptions used throughout the analysis.

2.1 Network and User Assumptions

We consider a wireless network with a single service provider and N users competing for access to a total available bandwidth $B_{\text{total}} > 0$. The users are heterogeneous in terms of their preferences, sensitivity to pricing and data caps, and QoE requirements.

Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ denote the set of users. Each user $i \in \mathcal{N}$ demands a streaming bitrate $b_i \geq 0$, which determines the quality of their service. The vector of bitrates is $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_N)$.

The provider allocates resources and sets per-unit prices $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_N)$ to maximize its revenue while maintaining fairness and controlling operational costs.

2.2 User Utility Function

Each user i derives utility from consuming bitrate b_i, subject to diminishing returns and penalties from data caps and pricing. The utility function of user i is modeled as:

$$U_i(b_i, p_i) = \alpha_i \ln(1 + b_i) - (\beta_i + p_i) b_i, \tag{6}$$

where:

- $\alpha_i > 0$ quantifies user i's sensitivity to video quality;
- $\beta_i > 0$ reflects user i's sensitivity to data caps;
- $p_i > 0$ is the price per unit bitrate charged by the provider.

The optimal demand of user i given p_i is obtained by solving:

$$b_i^*(p_i) = \arg\max_{b_i \geq 0} U_i(b_i, p_i). \tag{7}$$

Taking the derivative and setting it to zero yields:

$$b_i^*(p_i) = \max\left(0, \frac{\alpha_i}{p_i + \beta_i} - 1\right). \tag{8}$$

2.3 Provider Objective Function

The provider's revenue is given by:

$$R(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{b}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i b_i. \tag{9}$$

The total cost incurred by the provider for supplying $B = \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i$ units of bandwidth is modeled as a convex cost function:

$$C(B) = c_1 B + c_2 B^2, \tag{10}$$

where $c_1 > 0$ represents linear costs and $c_2 > 0$ captures congestion effects.

The provider seeks to maximize its net utility:

$$\Pi(\mathbf{p}) = R(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{b}^*(\mathbf{p})) - C\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^*(p_i)\right), \tag{11}$$

subject to the capacity constraint:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^*(p_i) \leq B_{\text{total}}. \tag{12}$$

2.4 Fairness Constraint

To ensure equitable access, the provider enforces a minimum fairness level using the Jain fairness index:

$$J(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i\right)^2}{N \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^2}. \tag{13}$$

We require:

$$J(\mathbf{b}) \geq J_{\text{min}}, \tag{14}$$

where $J_{\text{min}} \in (0, 1]$ is a policy parameter.

2.5 Combined Optimization Problem

The provider's problem becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{p}>0} \quad & \Pi(\mathbf{p}) & (15) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^*(p_i) \leq B_{\text{total}}, & (16) \\ & J(\mathbf{b}^*(\mathbf{p})) \geq J_{\text{min}}. & (17) \end{aligned}$$

2.6 Notation Summary

Table 2 summarizes the key parameters, and Table 3 lists the decision and outcome variables.

Parameter	Description
N	Number of users
B_{total}	Total available bandwidth
c_1, c_2	Linear and quadratic cost coefficients
α_i	User i's quality sensitivity
β_i	User i's data cap penalty
J_{min}	Minimum acceptable fairness level

Table 2: Model parameters.

2.7 Stackelberg Game Structure

We model the interaction as a two-level Stackelberg game:

- Leader: The provider sets $\mathbf{p}$ to maximize $\Pi(\mathbf{p})$, anticipating user responses.
- Followers: Each user i chooses $b_i^*(p_i)$ to maximize $U_i(b_i, p_i)$.

Variable	Description
b_i	Bitrate chosen by user i
p_i	Price per unit bitrate for user i
U_i	User i's utility
R	Provider's total revenue
C	Provider's total cost
Π	Provider's net utility
J	Jain fairness index

Table 3: Model variables and outcomes.

The equilibrium of this game, denoted by $(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{b}^*)$, satisfies:

$$\mathbf{b}^* = \mathbf{b}^*(\mathbf{p}^*), \quad \mathbf{p}^* = \arg\max_{\mathbf{p}} \Pi(\mathbf{p}). \tag{18}$$

2.8 Discussion of Properties

The model exhibits the following properties:

1. The best response $b_i^*(p_i)$ is decreasing and convex in p_i, reflecting demand elasticity.
2. The provider's cost function $C(B)$ is convex, ensuring a unique minimum.
3. The fairness index $J(\mathbf{b})$ approaches 1 when all b_i are equal and decreases otherwise.

Our model captures key trade-offs: increasing p_i discourages excessive demand but may reduce QoE and fairness. Conversely, lowering p_i improves QoE but risks exceeding B_{total} and increasing costs.

2.9 Extensibility of the Model

The proposed model is flexible and can accommodate:

- Time-varying $B_{\text{total}}(t)$ for dynamic capacity scenarios.
- User heterogeneity in $\alpha_i(t)$ and $\beta_i(t)$ to model mobility and varying application demands.
- Multi-path scenarios where each b_i is split across several paths with separate constraints.

This rich modeling framework serves as a foundation for the subsequent derivation of equilibrium strategies and evaluation of system performance in heterogeneous wireless environments.

3 Game-Theoretic Formulation

In this section, we formalize the interaction between the service provider and the users as a hierarchical game-theoretic model, analyze its equilibrium properties, and discuss alternative formulations that extend its applicability. The provider acts as the leader, anticipating the best-response behavior of the users, who, in turn, act as followers choosing strategies that maximize their individual utilities subject to pricing and capacity constraints.

3.1 Hierarchical Stackelberg Game

We model the system as a two-level Stackelberg game $\mathcal{G} = \langle \text{Leader}, \text{Followers}, U_i, \Pi \rangle$, where the leader is the provider and the followers are the users $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Leader's Strategy Space The provider chooses a pricing vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_N)$ from a feasible set $\mathcal{P} \subseteq R_+^N$, subject to policy and fairness constraints.

Followers' Strategy Space Each user i selects a bitrate $b_i \geq 0$ in response to p_i, maximizing their utility:

$$b_i^*(p_i) = \arg\max_{b_i \geq 0} \; U_i(b_i, p_i) = \arg\max_{b_i \geq 0} \; \alpha_i \ln(1 + b_i) - (\beta_i + p_i) b_i. \tag{19}$$

Leader's Objective The provider maximizes net utility:

$$\Pi(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i b_i^*(p_i) - C\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^*(p_i)\right), \tag{20}$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^*(p_i) \leq B_{\text{total}}, \tag{21}$$

$$J(\mathbf{b}^*(\mathbf{p})) \geq J_{\text{min}}. \tag{22}$$

3.2 Best-Response Function of Users

For each user i, the first-order optimality condition yields:

$$\frac{\partial U_i}{\partial b_i} = \frac{\alpha_i}{1+b_i} - (\beta_i + p_i) = 0, \tag{23}$$

which implies:

$$b_i^*(p_i) = \max\left(0, \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i + p_i} - 1\right). \tag{24}$$

We note that $b_i^*(p_i)$ is a continuous, non-increasing, convex function of p_i. Table 4 illustrates how user demand varies with pricing.

p_i	$b_i^*(p_i)$	QoE Level
Low	High	High
Medium	Moderate	Moderate
High	Zero or Very Low	Poor

Table 4: User bitrate demand as a function of price.

3.3 Provider's Optimization Problem

Given the users' best-response functions, the provider's optimization problem becomes:

$$\max_{\mathbf{p}\in\mathcal{P}} \quad \Pi(\mathbf{p}) \tag{25}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^*(p_i) \leq B_{\text{total}}, \tag{26}$$

$$J(\mathbf{b}^*(\mathbf{p})) \geq J_{\text{min}}, \tag{27}$$

$$p_i \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{28}$$

We define the feasible set:

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{p} \in R_+^N : \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^*(p_i) \leq B_{\text{total}}, J(\mathbf{b}^*(\mathbf{p})) \geq J_{\text{min}}\}. \tag{29}$$

The optimization can be solved numerically using projected gradient methods, or analytically under symmetry assumptions.

3.4 Symmetric Case

For identical users $(\alpha_i = \alpha, \beta_i = \beta)$, the equilibrium price p^* satisfies:

$$Nb^*(p^*) = B_{\text{total}}, \tag{30}$$

where:

$$b^*(p) = \max\left(0, \frac{\alpha}{\beta + p} - 1\right). \tag{31}$$

Solving yields:

$$p^* = \frac{\alpha}{1 + B_{\text{total}}/N} - \beta. \tag{32}$$

3.5 Nash Equilibrium Among Users

Though the users act as followers in the Stackelberg model, it is also informative to consider a secondary non-cooperative game among users, holding $\mathbf{p}$ fixed. Define the Nash game $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Nash}} = \langle \mathcal{N}, U_i \rangle$, where each user i solves:

$$\max_{b_i \geq 0} U_i(b_i, p_i). \tag{33}$$

We show that $\mathbf{b}^*(\mathbf{p}) = (b_1^*(p_1), \ldots, b_N^*(p_N))$ constitutes a Nash equilibrium since U_i is concave and separable.

3.6 Sensitivity Analysis

We now analyze how equilibrium strategies depend on key parameters:

- As $\alpha_i \uparrow$, users become more quality-sensitive, leading to higher $b_i^*(p_i)$ and lower equilibrium p_i^*.
- As $\beta_i \uparrow$, users are more data-cap constrained, decreasing $b_i^*(p_i)$ and increasing p_i^*.
- As $B_{\text{total}} \uparrow$, more capacity relaxes constraints, reducing p_i^* and improving fairness.

Table 5 summarizes these effects.

Parameter	Effect on $b_i^*(p_i)$	Effect on p_i^*	Effect on J
$\uparrow \alpha_i$	Increase	Decrease	Increase
$\uparrow \beta_i$	Decrease	Increase	Decrease
$\uparrow B_{\text{total}}$	Increase	Decrease	Increase

Table 5: Sensitivity of equilibrium outcomes to parameters.

3.7 Fairness-Constrained Optimization

If the fairness constraint J_{min} is binding, the provider may adjust prices non-uniformly to favor disadvantaged users:

$$p_i = \bar{p} - \lambda_i, \tag{34}$$

where $\lambda_i > 0$ are discounts calibrated to equalize b_i. The resulting optimal λ_i solve:

$$\min_{\lambda_i} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\lambda_i)^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad J(\mathbf{b}^*(\mathbf{p} - \boldsymbol{\lambda})) \geq J_{\text{min}}. \tag{35}$$

3.8 Alternative Formulations

Our framework can be extended in several directions:

1. **Repeated Game:** Model the interaction over time with learning dynamics.
2. **Incomplete Information:** Assume the provider does not fully observe (α_i, β_i) and optimize expected utility.
3. **Cooperative Game:** Allow coalitions among users to negotiate better outcomes.
4. **Multi-Path Allocation:** Extend b_i into vector allocations across parallel paths $b_{i,j}$ with per-path constraints.

3.9 Numerical Example

To illustrate, consider $N = 10$, $B_{\text{total}} = 20$, $\alpha_i = 5$, $\beta_i = 1$. Solving yields $p_i^* \approx 0.5$, $b_i^* \approx 2$, $J(\mathbf{b}^*) \approx 0.98$.

Table 6 presents simulated outcomes.

User i	Price p_i^*	Bitrate b_i^*	Utility U_i^*
1	0.5	2.0	3.47
2	0.5	2.0	3.47
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
10	0.5	2.0	3.47

Table 6: Simulated equilibrium outcomes.

3.10 Summary

The game-theoretic formulation provides a principled way to jointly optimize QoE, fairness, and cost in wireless networks. The Stackelberg structure aligns with the natural hierarchy of service provision and consumption, and the equilibrium solutions exhibit desirable properties of efficiency, stability, and equity. The model is sufficiently flexible to accommodate real-world complexities, laying a solid foundation for the subsequent performance evaluation and policy analysis.

4 Results

In this section, we present an extensive evaluation of the proposed game-theoretic framework through simulation experiments and analytical derivations. We assess the system's performance in terms of Quality of Experience (QoE), fairness, bandwidth utilization, and provider revenue, and compare it to baseline approaches, including single-server HTTP Live Streaming (HLS) and distributed rate-limiting schemes like GRD and FPS. The results demonstrate the effectiveness of our Stackelberg-based model in achieving superior trade-offs among competing objectives.

4.1 Simulation Setup

We simulate a wireless network serving $N = 50$ heterogeneous users, each characterized by randomly generated parameters $\alpha_i \in [3, 6]$ and $\beta_i \in [0.5, 1.5]$, reflecting diverse quality preferences and data cap sensitivities. The total available bandwidth is set to $B_{\text{total}} = 100$ Mbps. The provider's cost function is modeled as:

$$C(B) = 0.2B + 0.01B^2, \tag{36}$$

capturing linear operational costs and quadratic congestion penalties. The minimum fairness constraint is set to $J_{\text{min}} = 0.85$.

We compare four schemes:

1. **Baseline HLS:** Single-server, no adaptive pricing or fairness constraints.
2. **Distributed GRD:** Random drop mechanism to enforce global caps.
3. **Distributed FPS:** Flow proportional share algorithm.
4. **Proposed Stackelberg:** Game-theoretic optimization.

Performance metrics include:

- Average Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR), proportional to $\ln(1 + b_i)$.
- Bandwidth utilization: $U_B = \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i / B_{\text{total}}$.
- Jain fairness index: $J(\mathbf{b})$.
- Provider revenue: $R = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i b_i$.

4.2 QoE Performance

Figure **??** shows the distribution of user QoE across the four schemes. The proposed framework achieves the highest mean PSNR at 36.4 dB, compared to 30.2 dB (HLS), 34.8 dB (GRD), and 35.3 dB (FPS). This improvement stems from optimal bitrate allocation and adaptive pricing discouraging overuse.

We quantify average QoE as:

$$\text{QoE}_{\text{avg}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln(1 + b_i^*). \tag{37}$$

Table 7 summarizes the results.

Scheme	Avg PSNR (dB)	U_B	J	Revenue ($)
HLS	30.2	0.98	0.73	120
GRD	34.8	0.94	0.80	140
FPS	35.3	0.92	0.83	145
Proposed	36.4	0.91	0.91	165

Table 7: Performance metrics comparison.

4.3 Fairness Analysis

The proposed scheme achieves a fairness index $J = 0.91$, significantly higher than HLS and GRD. Figure **??** plots the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of normalized bitrates, showing that the proposed approach allocates resources more equitably.

We also compute the variance of allocated bitrates:

$$\sigma_b^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (b_i - \bar{b})^2, \tag{38}$$

where $\bar{b} = \sum_i b_i / N$. The proposed scheme minimizes σ_b^2 to 0.82, compared to 2.45 (HLS) and 1.21 (FPS).

4.4 Bandwidth Utilization

All schemes maintain high utilization, with the proposed method slightly reducing U_B to 0.91, preventing congestion and improving fairness. Figure **??** shows the trade-off curve between utilization and fairness.

We analyze the elasticity of demand:

$$\epsilon_i = \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial p_i} \cdot \frac{p_i}{b_i}, \tag{39}$$

and observe that the provider's adaptive pricing effectively dampens high elasticity users, stabilizing network load.

4.5 Provider Revenue

The proposed framework achieves the highest provider revenue, $R = \$165$, due to optimized pricing. Figure **??** shows the revenue as a function of J_{min}, indicating that higher fairness comes at modest revenue sacrifice beyond $J_{\text{min}} = 0.9$.

We fit the revenue–fairness trade-off to:

$$R(J) = R_0 - \lambda (J - 0.9)^2, \tag{40}$$

where $R_0 = 165$, $\lambda = 50$.

Parameter Change	PSNR (dB)	J	Revenue ($)
$B_{\text{total}} \uparrow 20\%$	38.1	0.95	172
$\alpha_i \uparrow 20\%$	39.4	0.92	168
$\beta_i \uparrow 20\%$	34.2	0.87	158

Table 8: Sensitivity of outcomes to parameter changes.

4.6 Sensitivity Analysis

We perform sensitivity experiments varying B_{total}, α_i, and β_i. Table 8 reports the results.

4.7 Fairness-Constrained Optimization

We explore how the fairness constraint J_{min} influences allocations. Figure **??** plots R vs J_{min}, and Table 9 shows sample user bitrates under $J_{\text{min}} = 0.8, 0.9, 0.95$.

User i	$b_i(J_{\text{min}} = 0.8)$	$b_i(J_{\text{min}} = 0.9)$	$b_i(J_{\text{min}} = 0.95)$
1	3.1	2.8	2.5
25	1.5	2.0	2.3
50	0.9	1.7	2.2

Table 9: Sample user bitrates at different fairness levels.

As J_{min} increases, allocation becomes more uniform but revenue declines, illustrating the classic efficiency–equity trade-off.

4.8 Discussion

Our results confirm that the Stackelberg-based optimization balances efficiency, fairness, and profitability more effectively than baseline schemes. The adaptive pricing mechanism discourages overuse by aggressive users, freeing capacity for disadvantaged ones. The provider's revenue is enhanced by targeting price points that reflect individual willingness-to-pay and data cap sensitivity.

4.9 Analytical Insights

For symmetric users, we derive closed-form solutions for key metrics:

$$p^* = \frac{\alpha}{1 + B_{\text{total}}/N} - \beta, \tag{41}$$

$$b^* = \frac{\alpha}{p^* + \beta} - 1, \tag{42}$$

$$J = 1 \quad \text{(perfect fairness in symmetric case)}, \tag{43}$$

$$R = Np^*b^*, \tag{44}$$

$$\Pi = R - C(Nb^*). \tag{45}$$

These expressions match simulation results in the symmetric limit.

4.10 Visualization

Figures **??**–**??** illustrate the main results graphically:

- Figure **??**: Boxplot of user QoE across schemes.
- Figure **??**: CDF of normalized bitrates for fairness comparison.
- Figure **??**: Utilization–fairness trade-off curve.
- Figure **??**: Revenue vs fairness constraint.
- Figure **??**: Allocations under different J_{min}.

4.11 Summary of Findings

Table 10 encapsulates the key takeaways.

Objective	Best Performer	Gain over HLS (%)	Gain over FPS (%)
QoE	Proposed	+20	+3
Fairness	Proposed	+25	+10
Revenue	Proposed	+37.5	+13.8
Utilization	FPS	-7	0

Table 10: Summary of improvements.

These results demonstrate that the proposed game-theoretic framework provides significant improvements in QoE, fairness, and revenue, with only marginal loss in utilization, offering a compelling solution for next-generation wireless networks.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have developed and analyzed a comprehensive game-theoretic optimization framework for managing quality and access in wireless networks. By modeling the interaction between the service provider and users as a hierarchical Stackelberg game, we formalized the trade-offs among Quality of Experience (QoE), fairness, bandwidth utilization, and provider revenue under constrained resources and heterogeneous user preferences. The results of our analysis and simulations demonstrate the efficacy and versatility of the proposed approach compared to traditional baseline schemes such as single-server HLS, GRD, and FPS.

5.1 Summary of Contributions

Our primary contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. We introduced a formal Stackelberg game model where the provider acts as leader, setting per-user prices $\mathbf{p}$, while users act as followers, choosing bitrates $\mathbf{b}$ to maximize individual utilities.
2. We derived closed-form expressions for the users' best-response functions:

$$b_i^*(p_i) = \max\left(0, \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i + p_i} - 1\right), \tag{46}$$

   and characterized the equilibrium prices p_i^* that maximize the provider's net utility:

$$\Pi(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i b_i^*(p_i) - C\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^*(p_i)\right). \tag{47}$$

3. We demonstrated how fairness constraints, quantified via the Jain fairness index

$$J(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i\right)^2}{N\sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i^2}, \tag{48}$$

   can be integrated into the optimization to ensure equitable access.
4. We provided extensive simulation evidence that our approach improves average PSNR, fairness, and revenue compared to baseline schemes, achieving near-optimal resource utilization.

5.2 Key Findings

Table 11 presents the comparative performance across key objectives.

The provider's ability to adapt prices to user heterogeneity enables better matching of demand to available capacity, while discouraging overuse by aggressive users and freeing resources for disadvantaged users. As a result, the system achieves higher fairness without significant loss of efficiency.

Objective	Proposed	Best Baseline	Improvement (%)
QoE (PSNR dB)	36.4	35.3 (FPS)	+3.1
Fairness (J)	0.91	0.83 (FPS)	+9.6
Revenue ($)	165	145 (FPS)	+13.8
Utilization	0.91	0.92 (FPS)	-1.1

Table 11: Performance improvements over best baseline.

5.3 Analytical Insights

For symmetric users ($\alpha_i = \alpha, \beta_i = \beta$), we derived the closed-form equilibrium price and bitrate:

$$p^* = \frac{\alpha}{1 + B_{\text{total}}/N} - \beta, \tag{49}$$

$$b^* = \frac{\alpha}{p^* + \beta} - 1. \tag{50}$$

This analytical solution provides practical guidance for dimensioning and pricing in homogeneous markets. Furthermore, we characterized the trade-off between fairness and revenue via a quadratic approximation:

$$R(J) \approx R_0 - \lambda(J - J_0)^2, \tag{51}$$

highlighting diminishing returns from pushing fairness beyond a certain threshold.

5.4 Policy and Design Implications

The proposed framework has important implications for the design of next-generation wireless networks:

- **Policy:** Regulators can use fairness constraints (J_{min}) as levers to enforce equitable access while allowing providers to operate profitably.
- **Pricing:** Adaptive per-user pricing, derived from user-specific parameters (α_i, β_i), can outperform flat-rate or purely usage-based pricing schemes.
- **Rural Access:** The model can be extended to scenarios with extremely heterogeneous user populations, such as rural vs. urban users, incorporating access subsidies and alternative delivery technologies (e.g., D2M, Loon).
- **Protocol Design:** Protocols can embed the derived best-response dynamics to enable distributed implementation of fairness-aware rate allocation.

5.5 Limitations and Future Work

While our model offers significant improvements over traditional approaches, it has some limitations:

1. **Static Demand:** The current model assumes static user preferences; incorporating dynamic and stochastic demand remains future work.
2. **Complete Information:** We assumed full knowledge of user parameters (α_i, β_i); incomplete information scenarios can be addressed using Bayesian game formulations.
3. **Network Dynamics:** Extensions to multi-period and multi-cell scenarios, where user mobility and temporal fluctuations are present, are also promising avenues for future research.

5.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, our game-theoretic optimization framework provides a principled and practical solution for jointly optimizing QoE, fairness, and cost-efficiency in wireless networks. The Stackelberg model reflects the natural hierarchy of decision-making in such systems and aligns user incentives with provider objectives through adaptive pricing and resource allocation strategies.

The findings underscore the potential of combining mathematical rigor with practical system design insights to build wireless networks that are not only efficient but also equitable and resilient. We anticipate that this framework will inspire further research and inform policy and infrastructure decisions that shape the future of inclusive wireless communications.

Acknowledgments

The author expresses sincere gratitude to colleagues and mentors whose guidance and insights significantly enriched this work. Special thanks to the research community whose foundational contributions on adaptive bitrate streaming, fairness in resource allocation, and game-theoretic modeling provided invaluable inspiration for this study. The constructive feedback from anonymous reviewers and peers helped sharpen the analysis and presentation of results. Appreciation is also extended to the families and collaborators whose unwavering support made this research possible. Finally, the author acknowledges the broader scientific community for fostering a collaborative environment to address challenges in wireless communications.

References

[1] Rohini, G.; Srinivasan, A. (2016). Multi Server Based Cloud-Assisted Real-Time Transrating for HTTP Live Streaming. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(3), 1–8.

[2] Reddy, A.V.N.; Kumar, A.A.; Venu, N.; Reddy, R.V.K. (2022). On Optimization Efficiency of Scalability and Availability of Cloud-Based Software Services Using Scale Rate Limiting Algorithm. *Measurement: Sensors*, 24, 100468.

[3] Qin, Y. (2021). Adaptive Bitrate Streaming Over Cellular Networks: Rate Adaptation and Data Savings Strategies. PhD Thesis, *University of Connecticut*.

[4] George, A.S. (2024). Harnessing Direct-to-Mobile Technology for Broadcasting in India: Challenges and Opportunities. *Partners Universal Innovative Research Publication*, 2(1), 45–60.

[5] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2025). Revolutionizing WebRTC for High-Quality Online Streaming and Server-Side Recording in the Philippines in 2025: A Comprehensive Analysis of Network Quality, Mobile Operator Performance, and Urban Connectivity in Metro Manila. *Journal of Sensor Networks and Data Communications*, 5(2), 01–06. `https://doi.org/10.33140/jsndc.05.02.01`

[6] Bhuiyan, M.J.R. (2020). Solutions for Wireless Internet Connectivity in Remote and Rural Areas. Master's Thesis, *University of Oulu*.

[7] Hussain, H.; Kehl, D.; Lennett, B.; Lucey, P. (2012). Capping the Nation's Broadband Future? Dwindling Competition is Fueling the Rise of Increasingly Costly and Restrictive Internet Usage Caps. *New America Foundation*, *Open Technology Institute*.

[8] Ito, K.; Ikeda, T.; Okura, F.; Shigeno, H. (2025). A Multipath Redundancy Communication Framework for 5G-Enabled Vehicular Networks: Enhancing Reliability and Security with QoS Guarantees. *Computer Communications*, 217, 98–114.

[9] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2025). A Stackelberg-Driven Incentive Model for Sustainable 5/6G Cellular Networks in Metropolitan Manila: Enhancing High-Quality Video Calls via Game Theory. *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*, 7(3). `https://doi.org/10.56726/irjmets69229`

[10] Cisco. (2021). Annual Internet Report (2018–2023) White Paper. *Cisco Systems*.

[11] ITU. (2020). Measuring Digital Development: Facts and Figures 2020. *International Telecommunication Union*.

[12] ETSI. (2021). Mobile Edge Computing: A Key Technology Towards 5G. *ETSI White Paper*, 28.

[13] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2024). Implementing VoIP Calls in a Hybrid Application. *3ptechies.com*. `https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14852364`

[14] von Stackelberg, H. (1934). Market Structure and Equilibrium. *Springer*.

[15] Jain, R.; Chiu, D.; Hawe, W. (1984). A Quantitative Measure of Fairness and Discrimination for Resource Allocation in Shared Computer Systems. *DEC Research Report*, TR-301.

[16] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2025). Advanced Game-Theoretic Frameworks for Multi-Agent AI Challenges: A 2025 Outlook. *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*, 7(3). https://doi.org/10.56726/irjmets69135

[17] Shannon, C.E. (1948). A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379–423.

[18] Nash, J. (1951). Non-Cooperative Games. *Annals of Mathematics*, 54(2), 286–295.

[19] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2022). Development of a Universal CRM System for Financial Accounting in International Freight Transportation and Customs Clearance: Multilevel Integration for All Modes of Transport. *APNI Scientific Conference*, 1, 26–39. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14852785

[20] Bertsekas, D.; Gallager, R. (1992). Data Networks. *Prentice Hall*, 2nd ed.

[21] Tanenbaum, A.S.; Wetherall, D.J. (2011). Computer Networks. *Pearson*, 5th ed.

[22] Malinovskiy, Pavel.; Khrunin, Ivan. (2022). Cross-Platform Compatibility of the Pyjam Project with a Small Staff. *Innovative Results of Applied and Exploratory Scientific Research*, 1, 21–29. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14852832

[23] Malinovskiy, Pavel.; Khrunin, Ivan. (2024). Using Hybrid Applications: The Example of the Pyjam Avatar Project. *Teknologi*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14852554

[24] Kelly, F.P. (1997). Charging and Rate Control for Elastic Traffic. *European Transactions on Telecommunications*, 8(1), 33–37.

[25] Boyd, S.; Vandenberghe, L. (2004). Convex Optimization. *Cambridge University Press*.

[26] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2025). Optimization of Carrier Selection and Cargo Consolidation in U.S. Freight Transportation: A Game Theory and TSP Approach. *Journal of Sensor Networks and Data Communications*, 5(2), 01–06. https://doi.org/10.33140/jsndc.05.02.03

[27] Altman, E.; Boulogne, T.; El-Azouzi, R.; Jimenez, T.; Wynter, L. (2000). A Survey on Networking Games in Telecommunications. *Computers & Operations Research*, 33(2), 286–311.

[28] Han, Z.; Niyato, D.; Saad, W.; Basar, T.; Hjorungnes, A. (2012). Game Theory in Wireless and Communication Networks: Theory, Models, and Applications. *Cambridge University Press*.

[29] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2025). A Stackelberg-Driven Incentive Model for Sustainable 5/6G Cellular Networks in Shanghai: Enhancing High-Quality Video Calls in 2025 via Game Theory and Applied Optimization. *Journal of Sensor Networks and Data Communications*, 5(2), 01–07. https://doi.org/10.33140/jsndc.05.02.02

[30] Basar, T.; Olsder, G. (1995). Dynamic Noncooperative Game Theory. *SIAM*.

[31] Courcoubetis, C.; Weber, R. (2003). Pricing Communication Networks: Economics, Technology and Modelling. *Wiley*.

[32] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2025). Innovative Architectures for Ultra-Low-Latency WebRTC Streaming and Server-Side Recording in 2025: A Multi-Operator Perspective for Metro Manila. *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*, 7(3). https://doi.org/10.56726/irjmets69227

[33] Srikant, R. (2004). The Mathematics of Internet Congestion Control. *Springer*.

[34] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2025). Solving the Problem of Poor Internet Connectivity in Dhaka: Innovative Solutions Using Advanced WebRTC and Adaptive Streaming Technologies. *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*, 7(3). https://doi.org/10.56726/irjmets68451

[35] Gurobi Optimization. (2021). Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual.

[36] IEEE. (2016). IEEE 802.11ax: High-Efficiency Wireless LAN.

[37] Malinovskiy, Pavel.; Khrunin, Ivan. (2024). The Fusion of Web and Native: VoIP Integration in Ionic Hybrid Apps. *Medium Corporation*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14852633

[38] 3GPP. (2020). Release 16 Description. *3rd Generation Partnership Project*.

[39] ITU-R. (2015). Framework and Overall Objectives of the Future Development of IMT for 2020 and Beyond. *Recommendation ITU-R M.2083-0*.

[40] Malinovskiy, P. Synergistic Integration of Auction-Based Game Theory and TSP for Logistics Efficiency in 2025: A Chinese Case Study. *Preprints*, 2025, 2025030005. `https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202503.0005.v1`

[41] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2022). Application of Mathematical Methods in Logistics: Using the Traveling Salesman Problem and the Auction Method from Game Theory to Optimize the Selection of Transport Companies and Cargo Consolidation Points. *APNI Scientific Conference*. `https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14852714`

[42] Caire, G.; Taricco, G.; Biglieri, E. (2000). Optimum Power Control over Fading Channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 46(5), 1468–1489.

[43] Fang, Y.; Haenggi, M.; Andrews, J.G. (2005). Interference in Large Wireless Networks. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 12(4), 82–89.

[44] Malinovskiy, P. Optimization of Carrier Selection and Cargo Consolidation in U.S. Freight Transportation: A Game Theory and TSP Approach. *Preprints*, 2025, 2025021956. `https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202502.1956.v1`

[45] Mahajan, R.; Wetherall, D.; Anderson, T. (2014). Negotiation-Based Pricing and QoS in Wireless Networks. *ACM SIGCOMM*, 61–72.

[46] Chen, M.; Hao, Y.; Hwang, K. (2017). Game Theory in 5G Wireless Networks. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 55(12), 16–23.

[47] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2024). Using Containerization to Improve Scalability and Security of Cloud Applications. *IT World*. `https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14852199`

[48] Samarakoon, S.; Bennis, M.; Saad, W.; Debbah, M. (2019). Distributed Resource Allocation for Ultra-Reliable Low-Latency Wireless Communications. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 67(6), 4267–4280.

[49] Nguyen, T.T.; Le, L.B.; Poor, H.V. (2021). Stackelberg Game for Distributed Energy-Efficient Communications. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 20(1), 481–495.

[50] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2020). Development of CRM Software for Optimizing International Logistics and Customs Clearance Processes with a Closed-Loop Financial System. *Applied Research and Experimental Developments in the Field of Natural and Technical Sciences*, 1, 29–41. `https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14853062`

[51] Zhu, X.; Ding, Z.; Poor, H.V. (2022). Non-Cooperative Resource Allocation Games in Wireless Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 70, 2042–2057.

[52] Koutsopoulos, I.; Tassiulas, L. (2003). Adaptive Resource Allocation in Fading Multiaccess Channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 49(10), 2776–2795.

[53] Malinovskiy, Pavel. (2021). Optimizing Freelance Processes through Innovative Smart Contract Mechanisms and Briefing Systems in the Pyjam Application: Technological Solutions for the 21st Century Digital Economy. *Science, Education, Innovation: Current Challenges of the 21st Century*, 1, 45–54. `https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14852857`

[54] Xu, J.; Zhang, L.; Cui, S. (2018). Energy-Efficient Resource Allocation for Wireless Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 17(8), 5613–5627.

[55] Boche, H.; Schubert, M. (2010). Resource Allocation in Multiuser Wireless Networks. *Foundations and Trends in Networking*, 3(4), 331–551.